



Members of the Planning Committee of the Chilterns Conservation Board for the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty are hereby summoned to a meeting of

**Planning Committee**

**on 10.00 a.m. Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> March 2019**

**at The Chilterns Conservation Board office,  
90 Station Road, Chinnor, OX39 4HA**

**Agenda**

1. Apologies	10.00 – 10.01
2. Declarations of Interest	10.01 – 10.03
3. Minutes of Previous Meeting	10.03 – 10.06
4. Matters Arising	10.06 – 10.20
5. Public Question Time	10.20 – 10.30
6. Co-option to Planning Committee	10.30 – 10.40
7. Model Policy update	10.40 – 10.50
8. Offsetting and environmental net gain discussion	10.50 – 11.30
9. Planning Application responses and updates	11.30 – 12.15
10. Development Plans responses and updates	12.15 – 12.25
11. Any urgent business	12.25 – 12.29
12. Date of Next and Future Meetings	12.29 – 12.30

**Item 3      Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**Author:**                                Lucy Murfett Planning Officer

**Lead Organisations:**      Chilterns Conservation Board

**Resources:**                        Budget of £500 per year for minute-taker plus staff time

**Summary:**                        Minutes of the previous meeting are attached (at Appendix 1) and require approval.

**Purpose of report:** To approve the Minutes of the previous meeting.

**Background**

1. The draft minutes from the meeting on Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2018 are attached (at Appendix 1) for approval.

**Recommendation**

1.      **That the Committee approves the minutes of its meeting which took place on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2018.**

Appendix 1

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE OF THE CHILTERN'S CONSERVATION BOARD FOR THE CHILTERN'S AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY**

**held on Wednesday 21<sup>st</sup> November 2018 at The Chilterns Conservation Board office, 90 Station Road, Chinnor OX39 4HA commencing at 10.00 AM**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Appointing Body</b>
<b>Appointed by Local Authorities</b>	
Cllr David Barnard	North Herts District Council
Cllr Hugh McCarthy	Wycombe District Council
Cllr Nick Rose	Chiltern District Council

<b>Appointed by the Secretary of State</b>	
Colin Courtney	Secretary of State
Helen Tuffs	Secretary of State
Elizabeth Wilson	Secretary of State- Chair

<b>Elected by Parish Councils</b>	
Cllr Alison Balfour-Lynn	Hertfordshire
Cllr Sue Biggs	Oxfordshire

<b>Co-opted Members</b>	
Chris Hannington	

<b>Officers present-</b>	
Lucy Murfett	CCB Planning Officer
Mike Stubbs	CCB Planning Advisor

<b>And others</b>	
Deirdre Hansen	Minute taker
Fiona Mullins	Community First Oxfordshire
John Nicholls	Board Member, observing

**And 1 member of the public was present.**

The Chair welcomed all present and as there were some new faces, she asked everyone to introduce themselves.

**343. Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received from Cllr Lynn Lloyd, South Oxfordshire District Council

**344. Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made

**345. Minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held 18<sup>th</sup> July 2018 were approved as a true record and signed by the Chair once 'and' was added in the second sentence in item 340.

**346. Matters Arising from the minutes**

- Re.336 links to Local Authority websites. Cllrs McCarthy and Rose had asked their authorities about a link to the CCB. And the Planning Officer had put a LA link on the CCB web site.
- Meeting dates for 2019 had been circulated.

*10.10 Cllr Alison Balfour-Lynn arrived.*

**347. Public Question time**

No public questions.

**348. AONB Management Plan- Latest consultation version.**

The revised draft had been brought to the meeting. The Committee went through the latest version of the development chapter, discussed it in depth and provided feedback. The Planning Officer will circulate the amended chapter with the comments incorporated.

It was noted that the public responses to the first consultation and the CCB actions to these had been tabulated by the Planning Officer.

Members were asked to encourage their local authorities and others to comment on the public consultation.

The Chair thanked the Members for their contributions.

NB. Cllr David Barnard offered to represent the CCB at the Luton Airport Development Committee.

- 1. The Committee PROVIDED feedback through the workshop on the Development Chapter of Draft Two of the Chilterns AONB Management Plan.**
- 2. The Committee was ENCOURAGED to promote responses from local authorities, organisations and the public.**

**349. Affordable Housing in the Chilterns AONB.**

The Chair introduced Fiona Mullins of Community First Oxfordshire, who gave a presentation on Community Led Housing. This involves community engagement and consent. The benefits are clearly defined and legally protected. She emphasised that community led housing needs access to land, finance and professional help.

The Committee had opportunity to ask questions, to provide feedback and comment.

The Members discussed policies and objectives that could be included in the Management Plan and it was noted that the NPPF 2018 has a definition on affordable housing. Interesting thoughts were tabled which can be taken forward.

The Chair thanked Fiona Mullins for her presentation and contributions.

*12.30 Cllr David Barnard left the meeting.*

- 1. The Committee PROVIDED feedback through discussion on the need for, and the feasibility of, initiatives to promote affordable housing in the Chilterns AONB.**

**350. Planning Applications Update**

The Planning Advisor informed the Committee about and sought approval for, the 37 responses and 2 appeal representations that have been made by the Planning Advisor under delegated powers in connection with Planning Applications as detailed in the agenda.

The responses were briefly discussed, and particular note was made of:

- P16/S3142/0 land at Kennylands Road, Sonning Common (appeal reference APP/Q3115/W/17/3183391
- P16/S3630/O Peppard Road and Kiln Road, Sonning Common
- 18/07274/FUL Land north and east of Glynswood High Wycombe
- 18/01506/APP Land at Beechwood Lane, Wendover

- 1. The Committee NOTED and APPROVED the responses made in connection with the applications as listed.**

**351. Development Plan Responses**

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that she had submitted representations on 9 development plan documents, 1 was a CIL consultation and 2 were infrastructure consultations, 1 for Heathrow Airport and 1 for Luton Airport. The CCB had also participated in 2 plan examinations, Bucks Minerals and Waste and the Wycombe Local Plan.

The Planning Officer was commended and thanked for her detailed and thorough work at the Wycombe Local Plan examination.

- 1 The Committee APPROVED the responses that had been sent, NOTED the current consultations on development plans and provided comments to the Planning Officer as appropriate.**

**352. Urgent Business**

- a. The Planning Officer was asked about the governments document on “Building upwards”. She will look into this.

The Planning Officer was thanked for her work and the members thanked for their contributions.

**Date of the next meeting Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> March 2019 at CCB offices at 10.00 am.**

**Future dates: Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> July and 20<sup>th</sup> November 2019.**

**The Chair.....**

**Date.....**

**Item 6      Co-option to the Planning Committee**

<b>Author:</b>	Lucy Murfett Planning Officer
<b>Lead Organisations:</b>	Chilterns Conservation Board
<b>Resources:</b>	Co-optee's travel expenses
<b>Summary:</b>	Committee to consider the co-option of additional members
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	As above

**Background**

1. The Board's standing orders set out that Planning Committee is able to co-opt non-Board members onto the Committee. The process is that such persons shall not exceed four per committee and that they must be nominated by two members of the committee and approved by a majority vote of the committee. They are non-voting and cannot be counted in determining whether a committee is quorate. Co-opted members do not receive an allowance but the Board can decide to pay travel expenses at the normal rates.
2. In the past various professionals have been co-opted onto the Planning Committee, among them Mike Stubbs, Gill Gowing and Richard Bossons and their skills and expertise have bolstered the workings of the Committee. A representative of the Chiltern Society planning group has also at times held a co-opted place. We have one current co-optee, Chris Hannington, a Landscape Architect and Manager for Trees and Landscape at Wokingham Borough Council, who has served since his co-option in July 2017.
3. Another suitable candidate has come forward, Paul Hayes, and Planning Committee is therefore invited to co-opt Paul.
4. Paul Hayes MRICS is a chartered surveyor and register valuer by profession. He has lived in the Chilterns for 30 years, and is passionate to preserve and enhance the AONB. He is a keen angler, fishing many years on the River Chess, and bird watching at BBOWT College Lakes, and various wildlife trust sites around the country. He has worked as a property pension fund manager, and director level for an international bank for property lending. He currently works for private practices, both niche and international, as a senior consultant. He has worked on and project managed a rural barn conversion in North Norfolk, as a total rebuild.
5. Suggestions for other professionals who share the Board's vision and might be willing to serve would be welcomed. Areas of expertise that would be of assistance include someone with expertise in planning law and an infrastructure planning expert.

**Recommendation**

1. **That the Committee agrees to co-opt Paul Hayes to the Planning Committee.**
2. **To note the other co-opted places that exist on the Planning Committee and make suggestions.**

**Item 7**                      **Model Policy Update****Author:**                      Lucy Murfett Planning Officer**Lead Organisations:**      Chilterns Conservation Board**Resources:**                Staff time**Summary:**                To adopt an update to the AONB model policy to refresh references post the new version of the NPPF.**Purpose of report:** as above**Background**

1. In 2016 Planning Committee and full Board considered and endorsed a model planning policy for the Chilterns AONB (Planning Committee on 29<sup>th</sup> September 2016, and Board on 13<sup>th</sup> October 2016). The Planning Officer has used this regularly in responses to development plan consultations, both for local and neighbourhood plans. The aim is to provide a policy which all authorities can slot into emerging plans, providing a strong and consistent development management plan policy on the AONB across Oxon, Bucks, Beds, and Herts. The idea arose from local authority planning policy officers themselves seeking help with emerging local plan policies, and the wording was developed with help from officers at AONB Planning Forum.
2. The model policy, with some small amendments, has been put into draft local plans in North Herts, Central Beds, Aylesbury Vale. Although not included in others, like South Oxfordshire and Wycombe DCs, it has helped inform discussions.
3. The publication by Government of updates to the National Planning Policy Framework has meant that references in the model policy need to be refreshed, and committee is invited to approve a revised version of the model policy so that it has continuing use and relevance. Some wording has been rearranged in criterion d and the major development sentence moved to the bottom for clarity. The proposed updated version is at Appendix 2 overleaf.

**Recommendations**

1. **That the Committee approves revised AONB Model Policy (v2).**

**Appendix 2****AONB Model Policy and supporting text (v2 updated Feb 2019)****Policy x The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty**

- 1. Planning permission for any proposal within the AONB, or affecting the setting of the AONB, will only be granted when it:**
  - a. conserves and enhances the Chilterns AONB’s special qualities, distinctive character, tranquillity and remoteness in accordance with national planning policy and the overall purpose of the AONB designation;**
  - b. is appropriate to the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of the area or is desirable for its understanding and enjoyment;**
  - c. meets the aims of the statutory Chilterns AONB Management Plan, making practical and financial contributions towards management plan delivery as appropriate;**
  - d. delivers the highest quality design as set out in the Chilterns Building Design Guide and technical notes, respecting the natural beauty of the Chilterns, its traditional built character and reinforcing the sense of place and local character; and**
  - e. avoids adverse impacts from individual proposals (including their cumulative effects), unless these can be satisfactorily mitigated.**
- 2. Permission for major developments in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be refused unless exceptional circumstances prevail as defined by national planning policy.**

**Model local plan supporting text**

1. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) are designated by the Government for the purpose of ensuring that the special qualities of the finest landscapes in England and Wales are conserved and enhanced. In policy terms they have the same planning status as National Parks<sup>1</sup>. The Chilterns AONB was designated in 1965 and extended in 1990. The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 places a statutory duty on local authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of AONBs when

<sup>1</sup> [NPPF paragraph 172](#) “Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas”

coming to decisions or carrying out their activities relating to, or affecting, land within these areas<sup>2</sup>.

2. The Chilterns AONB covers 13 local authorities and the Councils work together to safeguard the future of this shared nationally protected area through the Chilterns Conservation Board. The Board prepares a statutory AONB Management Plan which may be a material consideration in planning decisions<sup>3</sup>.
3. The AONB is a nationally designated landscape and as such permission for major developments will be refused unless exceptional circumstances prevail as defined by national planning policy<sup>4</sup>. National guidance explains that whether a proposal constitutes major development is a matter for the relevant decision taker, taking into account its nature, scale and setting, and whether it could have a significant adverse impact on the purposes for which the area has been designated or defined<sup>5</sup>. ‘Major development’ is not restricted to the definition of major development in NPPF glossary or to proposals that raise issues of national significance, and will include consideration of whether a proposal has the potential to have a serious adverse impact on the AONB.
4. *Add locally specific paragraph on AONB extent and special qualities and characteristics within each district. For example, for South Oxfordshire: The Chilterns Hills and the North Wessex Downs are part of a broad belt of chalk upland running across England in an arc from Dorset to Yorkshire. The Goring Gap, where the River Thames carves through the chalk escarpment, forms the boundary between the two AONBs in South Oxfordshire. Although both areas are chalk upland, their character differs: the Chilterns AONB is a generally more enclosed and wooded landscape than the broader more open uplands of the North Wessex Downs. The Chilterns escarpment in South Oxfordshire is particularly impressive, and the beech woods are justifiably famous.*
5. In determining compliance with criterion a, actions to conserve and enhance the AONB shall be informed by landscape assessment, having considered any relevant landscape character assessments and landscape and visual impact assessments and shall focus upon:
  - i. the Chilterns AONB’s special qualities which include the steep chalk escarpment with areas of flower-rich downland, broadleaved woodlands (especially beech), commons, tranquil valleys, the network of ancient routes, villages with their brick and flint houses, chalk streams and a rich historic environment of hillforts and chalk figures;

---

<sup>2</sup> [Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 Section 85](#)

<sup>3</sup> See the Government’s [Planning Practice Guidance 8-004-20140306](#) Paragraph 004

<sup>4</sup> [NPPF paragraph 172](#) “Planning permission should be refused for major development<sup>55</sup> other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

a) the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;

b) the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and  
c) any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.”

<sup>5</sup>[NPPF footnote 55](#)

- ii. the scope for enhancing and restoring those parts of the landscape which are previously developed, degraded or subject to existing intrusive developments, utilities or infrastructure;
  - iii. locally distinctive patterns and species composition of natural features such as chalk downland, trees, hedgerows, woodland, field boundaries, rivers and chalk streams;
  - iv. the locally distinctive character of settlements and their landscape settings, including the transition between man-made and natural landscapes at the edge of settlements;
  - v. visually sensitive skylines, geological and topographical features;
  - vi. landscapes of cultural, historic and heritage value;
  - vii. important views and visual amenity, including key views from the steep north-west facing chalk escarpment overlooking the low clay vale, and foreground views back to the AONB; and
  - viii. Tranquillity, dark skies and remoteness and the need to avoid intrusion from light pollution, noise, and motion.
6. Development proposals which lie outside the AONB but within its setting can also have impacts on it. The Council's duty of regard applies to development outside but which would affect land in an AONB<sup>6</sup>. For example, views out of the AONB from key visitor viewpoints into surrounding areas can be very significant. Although it does not have a defined geographical boundary, the setting of the Chilterns AONB is the area within which development and land management proposals, by virtue of their nature, size, scale, siting, materials or design could be considered to have an impact, either positive or negative, on the natural beauty and special qualities of the Chilterns AONB. Advice on development in the setting of the AONB is contained within guidance produced by the Chilterns Conservation Board<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> [Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 Section 85](#) : in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty”

<sup>7</sup> Chilterns Conservation Board [Position Statement on Development affecting the setting of the Chilterns AONB](#)

**Item 8                      Offsetting and environmental net gain discussion****Author:** Lucy Murfett Planning Officer**Lead Organisations:** Chilterns Conservation Board**Resources:** Staff time**Summary:** To discuss and consider issues and opportunities for achieving environmental net gain through offsetting and compensation in the Chilterns AONB.**Purpose of report:** To steer the Board's approach to the above.**Background**

1. The newly adopted Chilterns AONB Management Plan 2019-24 establishes a principle that development in or affecting the AONB will contribute in practical and financial ways to delivering the aims of the Chilterns AONB Management Plan:

**Strategic Objective DO2    Ensure that where development happens, it leaves the AONB better than it was before – richer in wildlife, quieter, darker at night, designed to have a low impact on the environment, and beautiful to look at and enjoy.**

**Policy DP10                      Make sure that all development that is permitted in the AONB or affecting its setting delivers a net gain for the Chilterns by**

- on-site improvements for biodiversity, landscape, the rights of way network, AONB visitor facilities and/or
- financial contributions, secured through s106<sup>53</sup>, CIL<sup>54</sup>, or offsetting schemes, towards wider green infrastructure projects that enhance the AONB by meeting the aims of this AONB Management Plan.

**Policy DP14                      Avoid new or upgraded infrastructure (roads, railways, airports, pylons, masts etc) which harm the AONB landscape, nature, air quality, tranquillity or the visitor experience. Fully assess impacts on the AONB, including increased recreation pressure, traffic, overflying and severance of ecological connectivity in the AONB. Avoid, mitigate and compensate to achieve a net gain for the AONB.**

2. The model policy (see item 7) reinforces this, requiring that development: “meets the aims of the statutory Chilterns AONB Management Plan, making practical and financial contributions towards management plan delivery as appropriate.”
3. Government policy is also evolving fast in this sector, as shown by the recent DEFRA consultation on mandatory net biodiversity net gain and the longer-term commitment to

a wider system of requiring environmental net gain from development (see the Board's response at item 10).

**Recommendations**

1. **That the Committee discusses offsetting and net gain and provides a steer for the implementation of AONB Management Plan policy.**

**Item 9**                      **Planning Applications Update**

**Author:**                      Mike Stubbs Planning Advisor

**Lead Organisations:**      Chilterns Conservation Board

**Resources:**                Staff time

**Summary:**                 Representations have been made regarding a number of planning applications and a number of previous cases have been determined.

**Purpose of report:** To inform the Committee about, and seek approval of, the responses that have been made under delegated powers in connection with the planning applications as listed and to update the Committee on any outcomes.

**Background**

4.      News on the outcome of previous planning applications on which the Board has made representations is summarised in Appendix 3.
5.      Since the last Planning Committee papers for the July 2018 meeting, the Board has made 17 formal representations on planning applications and 5 appeal representations, of which 7 were objections, 8 were comments and 2 were in support. The formal representations are summarised in Appendix 4.
6.      Current live casework is listed in Appendix 5.

**Recommendations**

1.      **That the Committee notes and approves the responses made in connection with the applications listed in Appendix 4.**

## APPENDIX 3

## Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon

Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded
Land West of Cockernhoe / Land East of Cockernhoe	NHDC	16/02014/1	Erection of 660 dwellings	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	05.03.16
Land south and north-west of Cockernhoe and east of Wigmore, Cockernhoe	NHDC	17/00830/1	Mixed use application for up to 1,400 new dwellings and other uses - Outline planning application with all matters reserved	Pending	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported</b>	3.8.17
New Barn Farm, Cholsey	OCC	MW 0094.16	Extraction of sand and gravel with associated processing plant, conveyors, office and weighbridge, parking areas.	Granted 8.11.18	<b>CCB Objection as previously noted</b>	9.2.17
Land to the south of Newnham Manor, Crowmarsh Gifford Planning Application	SODC	P16/S3852/FUL	Hybrid planning application for the erection of 100 new residential dwellings	Pending	<b>CCB Qualified Objection as previously reported</b>	23.6.18
Land off Crowell Road, Chinnor. Amended plans and additional documentation submitted 30th August 2017.	PINS	APP/Q3115/W/17/3188694  Appeal C (54 dwellings)	Full planning application for residential development comprising 58 dwellings, new vehicular and pedestrian access, internal roads and footpaths, car parking, public open space, landscaping, drainage and other associated infrastructure	Appeal against non-determination submitted 7.11.17  Appeal dismissed 24.12.18	<b>CCB Comments previously reported. Planning Appeal dismissed (AONB setting being an issue) – Extracts from Inspector's decision.</b>  <i>57. It is accepted that, due to some inter-visibility, the site lies within the undefined setting of the AONB the boundary of which is around 800 metres away.</i>  <i>61. The LCA draws a line along Crowell Road and contrasts with the Bellway scheme opposite the site. The Bellway scheme was considered to be visually prominent in views to, and from, the AONB whilst the appeal site is noted as only</i>	12.09.17

					<p><i>having potential views from the escarpment. This is consistent with the views of the Chilterns Conservation Board which does not object to the proposal subject to delivery of proposed mitigation.</i></p> <p><i>68. The development would cause little landscape harm and would not conflict with Policies C4, G2 and G4 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and CS Policies CSEN1, and CSQ3.</i></p> <p><i>88. The Council can demonstrate a three year housing land supply and affordable housing in excess of that required by policy would be an important benefit. However, the total benefits would be outweighed by the harm to the housing strategy bolstered by residual harm albeit small to the surrounding landscape and nearby heritage assets. In transportation terms the network would continue to operate well within capacity. Overall the proposal would be contrary to the development plan as a whole'</i></p>	
Land at Britwell Road Watlington	SODC	P17/S3231/O	(1) Full planning permission for the demolition of the existing pig farm and its associated buildings; the erection of 183 dwellings (2) Outline permission for up to 650sqm of Use Class B1a floorspace	Pending	<p><b>Part CCB Comment</b> on LVIA / <b>Part Objection</b> to raised numbers above SODC Capacity Study</p> <p><b>CCB Objection / comments as previously reported</b></p>	25.10.17
OS Parcel 8784 & OS Parcel 0006 Mill Lane Monks Risborough	WDC	17/07666/OUT	Outline application (Including details of access) for the erection of up to 300 dwellings	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments As previously reported</b></p> <p>Further consultation 4.4.18 (amended details as reported in current applications)</p>	30.10.17 Further consultation 4.4.18

Shirburn Road Watlington	SODC	P18/S0002/O	Outline application for up to 37 Assisted Living Units, and provision of a Care Home (All C2 Use.	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported.</b>  CCB recommended various design amendments to improve the AONB setting relationship.	2.2.18
Century Park Luton	LBC	17/02300/EI A	Outline Consent for a business park comprising office space (Class B1), warehouse and industrial space and Full application for the construction of a 2km Century Park Access Road	Pending	<b>CCB Holding Objection / Part comment as previously reported</b>  Objection based on vehicular routing and cumulative impacts on the AONB, without necessary assurances in the application details.	21.1.18
Abbey View Primary Academy	BCC	CC/0017/18	Development of a new two storey 2FTE (420 place) primary school	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported.</b>	2.5.18
Land at White Cross Farm, Reading Road, Cholsey, Oxfordshire	OCC	0033/18	Planning Application to allow the development of an offline River Thames marina basin with fixed and floating pontoon moorings for approximately 280 boats.	Pending	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported.</b>	1.6.18
22 & 24 Chapel Road & Land To The Rear Of 26 & 16 Chapel Road Flackwell Heath	WDC	18/05414/O UT	Outline application (all matters reserved accept for access) for the redevelopment of site comprising erection of 950m <sup>2</sup> of B1 office space and the erection of up to 22 affordable housing units	Pending	<b>CCB Comment as previously reported</b>	27.3.18
Site LA5, Icknield Way Tring	DBC	4/00958/18/MFA	Hybrid planning application for 240 dwellings, cemetery car park with toilet block and public open space	Pending	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported / subsequent amendments supported.</b>  Amendments were submitted (August 2018) and supported: (a) Additional details to reduce / prevent lighting 'glare'. (b) New planting to the western boundary and a redesign of layout here. (c) CCB recommended that the cemetery extension element is further enhanced by promoting design concepts derived from natural burial	22.5.18

					grounds within the UK for example with the design of woodland or wildflower meadows, and without headstones, tarmac drives and formal features. (e.g. as designed at Chesham Bois).	
Old Rifle Range Farm, Risborough Road, Great Kimble, Bucks	WDC	18/05926/F UL	Demolition of commercial buildings and erection of 10 x market dwellings (6 x 3 bed and 4 x 4 bed) and 5 x 2 bed affordable dwellings	Refused 17.1.19	<p><b>CCB Objection as previously reported</b></p> <p><b>Reason 1 Green belt</b></p> <p><b>Reason 2</b> <i>The proposal fails to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty in this Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It fails to protect the rural character of this part of the District and fails to respect the character and sense of place of villages and hamlets and the setting of this part of the AONB. As such the development is likely to damage the special character, appearance and scenic beauty of this landscape. As such the proposal is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paras 172); Policies CS2 (Main Principles for the Location of Development), CS7 (Rural settlements and the Rural Areas) and CS 17 (Environmental Assets) of Adopted Core Strategy (July 2008); Policy L1 (the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) of the adopted Wycombe District Local Plan to 2011 (As saved, extended and partially replaced); Policy DM40 (The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) of the New Local Plan - Submission Version 2018; the Chilterns Building Design Guide and the Chilterns Management Plan.</i></p>	21.5.18
Land Lower Icknield Way Chinnor. Development of 79a - 83	SODC	P18/S1004/ O	60 dwellings, with associated open space, landscaping, vehicular access and footpath links.	Pending	<b>CCB Comment as previously reported</b>	20.4.18

White House Farm Cryers Hill Lane Cryers Hill Bucks	WDC	17/08051/F UL	Demolition of existing dwellinghouse and construction of replacement detached dwellinghouse	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	27.3.18
Abbey Barn Lane- Abbey Barn South Reserve Site Abbey Barn Lane High Wycombe Bucks	WDC	18/05363/F UL	A hybrid planning application seeking outline consent for up to 550 residential dwellings (with a minimum of 520 dwellings); up to an 120 apartment Extra Care and medical	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	27.3.18
Land at Beechwood Lane Wendover Bucks	PINS	APP/J0405/W/18/3210 518	Erection of one dwelling	Appeal	<b>CCB Written Representations</b>  This application site is within the AONB and to develop it would be deeply harmful. CCB recommends that planning permission is refused because this site is an unsuitable location for housing, having particular regard to the effect of the development on the landscape character and special qualities of the surrounding Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which include its landscape character and visual sensitivity.	30.5.18
Land to the east of Benson Lane Crowmarsh	SODC	P18/S0827/O	Outline planning application for up to 150	Pending	<b>CCB Comment as previously reported.</b>	12.5.18
Land South of R Thames and W of Gatehampton Viaduct	West Berkshire	17/03203/F UL	Safari tents	Refused 19.12.18	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported</b>  <i>'The application site is located within the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and alongside the Chilterns Area of outstanding Natural Beauty, areas of nationally significant landscape quality that are to given special consideration in decision making. It is also situated alongside the River Thames on the opposite bank from the Thames Path National Trail. The site is visible in wider views from both the North Wessex Downs</i>	22.3.18

				<p><i>AONB, the Chilterns AONB and the Thames Path. The site forms part of the tranquil landscape of the Thames Valley Floodplain that is interspersed by limited development of a predominantly rural character in the area surrounding the site. The imposition of the proposed 4 large tents and a breeze house, together with the associated car parking and camping paraphernalia would fundamentally alter the character and appearance of the site, detracting from the contribution of the site to the tranquillity of surrounding views and thereby detracting from the setting of the North Wessex Downs AONB, the Chilterns AONB and the River Thames. Therefore the proposed works are contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2018), Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Local Plan Core Strategy (2006-2026) 2012, which require development to demonstrate a high quality and sustainable design that respects and enhances the character and appearance of the area, and that consideration is given to the sensitivity of the area to change and to ensuring that new development is appropriate in terms of location, scale and design in the context of the existing settlement form, pattern and character. Furthermore the proposed works are contrary to the requirements of Policy RL5A of the West Berkshire District Local Plan (1991-2006) Saved Policies 2007 which states that in order to protect the particular environment and setting of the river within West Berkshire the Council will permit proposals for recreational schemes only where it is not located in an area or a proposed form which</i></p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<i>would harm the character or landscape setting of the river.</i>	
Land South West Of Asheridge Road Chesham	CDC	CH/2018/0659/OA	Outline application for the development of site to provide up to 99 dwellings	Pending	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported</b>	5.6.18
Chinnor Hill Kennels	SODC	P18/S1674/O	Redevelopment for 5 dwellings	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	21.6.18
Part of OS Field 5828 Amersham Road, Coleshill Bucks	CDC	CH/2018/0573/FA	Erection of temp agricultural workers dwelling and agricultural building	Refused 21.12.18	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported</b>  Refused green belt / ecology / drainage (no AONB reason).	4.7.18
Greendene Farm near Chazey Heath RG4 7UG	SODC	P18/S0650/FUL	65-bedroom elderly care home	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	3.10.18
OS Parcel 2814 opp Tiles Farm Asheridge Rd Chesham (Bramley Apple Paddocks)	PINS	CH/2017/1648/FA & APP/X0415/C/17/3/3190005	Caravan site	Appeal dismissed 8.10.18	<b>CCB Written Representation</b>  <i>(65) For the reasons given I find that the development has caused significant harm to the scenic beauty of the local landscape within the vicinity of the site, contrary to the aims of the Framework, policy CS22 of the CS and policy LSQ1 of the Local Plan.</i>	16.7.18
The Pavilion, Thames Road, Goring	SODC	P18/S1983/FUL	Replacement dwelling and boathouse	Granted 28.1.19	<b>CCB Comments</b>  CCB sought amendments to recommend a reduction in the scale of development along the river frontage. Subsequently amended plans delivered these suggestions.	12.7.18
Tralee Farm 20 Wycombe Road Holmer Green Bucks	WDC	18/07194/O UT	Outline application (including details of access, layout & scale) for erection of 103 dwellings with all other matters reserved	Pending	<b>CCB Comment / Part Objection as previously made</b> (based on Local Plan due process)	25.9.18
Kitcheners Field, Castle Hill, Berkhamsted,	DBC	4/01663/18/FUL	Light external drive and parking area	Pending	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported</b>	26.7.18
Upper Little London Farm Little London Wendover Buckinghamshire HP22 6QQ	AVDC	17/00148/A OP (amended landscape assessment documentation submitted June 2018).	Outline application for the demolition of the existing metal barns and outbuildings, conversion of four historic brick barns into one single	Pending	<b>CCB Comments (original CCB Objection 10th April 2017 as previously reported).</b>	24.7.18

			dwelling, provision of three open fronted parking barns, replacement of existing farm house and erection of 10 new dwellings and details of alterations to existing access only with all other matters reserved AVDC reference CCB Comments (previous objections raised). 24th July 2018			
Land off Pyrton Lane Watlington	SODC	P16/S2576/0	Outline application for the erection of up to 100 residential dwellings including vehicular access, public open space, car parking, landscaping and drainage. (As amended by drawings and additional information received 20 September 2016, 27 October 2016, 24 August 2017 and 13 June 2018).	Pending	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported</b>	16.7.18
Great Kimble Church Of England School Church Lane Great Kimble	BCC	CC/0121/17	Application for the approval of details pertaining to condition 3 (Archaeology), 4 (Arboricultural Method Statement), 6 (Construction Traffic Management Plan) and 8 (Facing Bricks)	Granted 6.8.19	<b>CCB Support as previously reported</b>	27.7.18
Crowell Hill Farm Crowell Hill, nr Chinnor	SODC	P18/S2682/0	Outline application incorporating access details for demolition of existing industrial (B2) buildings. Removal of concrete hardstanding and erection of 5 detached dwellings	Pending	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported.</b>	16.10.18

Land at Britwell Road Watlington	SODC	P17/S3231/O	- (1) Full planning permission for the demolition of the existing pig farm and its associated buildings; the erection of 183 dwellings (Use Class C3); the realignment of Britwell Road and the creation of a new vehicular access (2) Outline permission for up to 650sqm of Use Class B1a floorspace with access and all other matters reserved.	Pending	<b>CCB Comments (supplementary) following previous objection</b>	28.8.18
Land to the rear of 44 Kennylands Road Sonning Common	SODC	P18/S2631/FUL	Erection of 25 dwellings together with associated landscaping, and public open space	Granted 16.1.19	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	23.8.18
Land Between Longwick Road & Mill Lane Princes Risborough Bucks	WDC	18/06916/OU TEA	Outline application (including details of access only, with all other matters reserved) for the erection of up to 360 dwellings.	Pending	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported</b>	1.9.18
Land Adjacent To Ridgeside Stables Penn Road Hazlemere	WDC	18/06887/OU T	Outline application (including details of access) for construction of up to 90 dwellings with all other matters reserved.	Withdrawn 15.10.18	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported</b>	7.9.18
Outline application for up to 37 Assisted Living Units, and provision of a Care Home (All C2 Use), 4	SODC	P18/S0002/O	As clarified by alternative indicative layout and additional information accompanying Agents letter	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	16.7.18

staff accommodation units and site access (all other matters reserved for future consideration) at Shirburn Road Watlington			dated 18 June 2018.			
Land Rear of Park Mill Farm Park Mill Princes Risborough Bucks	PINS	18/07096/OU TEA (150 scheme)  APP/K0425/W/18/321796 7 (150 scheme)  18/07097/OU TEA (500 scheme)  APP/K0425/W/18/321796 6 (500 scheme)	Outline application with all matters reserved for the construction of up to 150 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and sustainable urban drainage features at WDC reference (150 scheme)  Outline application with all matters reserved for the construction of up to 500 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and sustainable urban drainage features Land Rear Of Park Mill Farm Park Mill Princes Risborough Buckinghamshire WDC reference	Appeal against Non-determination (Inquiries set for 24.9.19)	<b>CCB Representations</b>  Comments related to: (1) Emerging Local Plan 2033 CCB Representations (2) Landscape impacts. The applicant's Environmental Statement (ES) reports in chapter 8 (landscape 8.14) that Policy L1 and CS 17 on setting are material and rightly recognises the strategic objective in the emerging Local Plan to ' <i>Cherish the Chilterns</i> '. The AONB is some 625 metres from the AONB boundary, at the base of the escarpment, with Brush Hill and Whiteleaf Hill about 1.8km to the east. The application site sites within the Southern Clay Vale. (3) Cumulative impacts. The future of the site must be properly assessed as part of the wider area of land under discussion for development. The plan making process will allow for the cumulative impacts of development to be taken into account, following sustainability appraisal. The impact on views from the AONB should not be assessed for this application site alone, but in combination with the remaining policy area as identified for growth (4) On-Site Mitigation. To protect the setting of the Chilterns AONB as enjoyed from publicly accessible and very popular vantage points, a detailed mitigation and enhancement strategy should be put in place. The submitted master-plan indicates broad	17.9.18

					parameters and design concepts that (a) development is more confined to the eastern part of the site and that (b) the applicant's LVIA specifically reports back as to how roofscapes / design / density / layout takes account of views down from the escarpment, to ensure that the existing setting is conserved and enhanced, wherever possible.	
Rumbolds Pit, Eyres Lane, Ewelme, Wallingford	OCC	MW.0088/18	Change of use for the storage of recycled material on land to the south of the primary working area. In addition to storage of recycled materials it is proposed to store empty waste skips in the ancillary area – details submitted pursuant to condition 4 of MW.0098/17 regarding landscaping and planting	Granted 20.11.18	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	6.8.18
Navarac Oakley Wood near Nuffield		P18/S2357/F UL	Demolish existing residence and build new residence SODC + Demolition of an existing workshop and sheds, construction of two new live/work units.	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	9.8.18
Abbey Barn Reserve Site	WDC	18/05363/FU L	550 dwellings	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	10.10. 18
Bury Spinney Houghton Regis	PINS	APP/P0240/ W/18/321149 3	100 dwellings	Pending  Inquiry 14.5.19	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	23.10.18

The Old Reservoir Greenmore Woodcote	SODC PINS	PINS reference: APP/Q3115/ W/18/319727 0  SODC reference P17/S4336/F UL	Planning Appeal by Mr C Stanley against the decision to refuse planning permission for the Change of use of the land to a park home site and the development of all associated infrastructure to allow the siting of 16 residential park homes with landscaping at	Appeal dismissed  30.10.18	<b>CCB Written Representations</b>  CCB Comments based around Policy CSEN1 on landscape matters. The appellant's statement of case did not address AONB matters and made the point that CSEN1 is a landscape policy and not appropriate at this stage.  This Inspector disagreed with this point and dismissed the appeal on grounds that landscape would be harmed by a proposed urban layout and <i>'it follows that the proposal would not conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the Chilterns AONB. Whilst such harm would be limited and localised, there would be conflict with CS Policy CSEN1 which seeks to protect the district's distinct landscape character'</i> .	17.8.18
Land north and east of Glynswood High Wycombe	18/07274/O UT	WDC	39 dwellings	Pending	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported</b>	3.10.18
Harebridge Lane, Aston Clinton	18/02793/AO P	AVDC	8 dwellings	Pending	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported</b>	16.10.18
Nuffield Garage, Crowmarsh Hill nr Wallingford	P18/S2871/F UL	SODC	Retrospective change of use to car sales and erection of fencing.	Refused 5.11.18	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported</b>	10.10.18
Newnham Manor Crowmarsh Gifford	P16/S3852/ FUL	SODC	Hybrid planning application for the erection of 100 new residential dwellings including new access road off the A4074, public open space (full application) and the provision of school land	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	2.7.18

			(outline application) at Newnham Manor, Crowmarsh Gifford (as amended by plans submitted 11 July 2018). Amended Plans			
Land at Hithercroft Farm Wallingford	SODC	P18/S2506/O	Outline planning application, with all matters reserved (except for access in to the site) for the erection of up to 170 dwellings and 3.1ha of employment floorspace	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	25.9.18

## APPENDIX 4

## New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee

Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Land at Abbey View Primary Academy Kennedy Avenue Daws Hill Lane High Wycombe Bucks	BCC	BCC reference: CC/0017/18	Amendment to Condition 2 of consent CC/0017/18 relating to location of proposed MUGA on Site.	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>CCB previously commented on application CC/0017/18 (Development of a new two storey 2FTE (420 place) primary school and 52 place pre-school, to be constructed in two phases, with associated external works, including a car park for 55 cars and 3 motorcycles, external play areas, a multi-use-games-area (MUGA) and a single storey eco classroom building located with the soft play area, to the south east of the site.</p> <p>The relocation of the MUGA to the boundary would serve to reinforce the point that it should not be artificially illuminated and we could not find such details on the submitted site plan (plan 53/V006/GSS/00/xx/DR-A-0006 – revision 004).</p>	18.1.19
Land Rear of Park Mill Farm Park Princes Risborough WDC reference 18/07097/OUT EA (500) and 18/07097/OUT EA (150)	PINS	Planning Inspectorate References: APP/K0425/W/18/321796 5 and APP/K0425/W/18/321796 6	Outline application with all matters reserved for the construction of up to 500 + 150 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and sustainable urban drainage features.	Appeal	<p><b>CCB Written Representations</b></p> <p>The appellant in their statement of case (3.28 + 3.29) do respond to points made by CCB and as:</p> <p><b>3.28.</b> <i>The CCB response (undated) does not object to the proposal in principle but requests that it be determined after the Inspector considering the Wycombe District Local Plan has reported following the Public Examination in to the plan. There is no justification for such an approach having regard to the fact that the site is allocated for residential development in both the adopted and emerging development plans.</i></p> <p><b>3.29</b> <i>The response also includes a general commentary on issues that relate to the detailed design of the scheme which are not relevant to the</i></p>	7.2.19

				<p><i>consideration of this outline proposal.</i></p> <p>CCB Response to <b>3.28</b>. In responding to these points it is material that the emerging Local Plan is adopting a far wider remit for the expansion of Princes Risborough than envisaged in the existing Local Plan and that notwithstanding the allocated status of the site that a 2017 planning appeal resulted in a dismissal in any event. The LPA in their own statement of case speculate that the new Local Plan could be adopted as soon as summer 2019 and these appeals are listed for September 2019. With a new NPPF now in place we promote a consideration of AONB impacts, notwithstanding the outline and allocated status of the site. To await the new Local Plan allows full weight to fresh policy, itself consistent with the new NPPF.</p> <p>CCB Response to <b>3.29</b>. CCB agrees that the general commentary relates to matters of detail but these are derived from the applicant's own detailed papers submitted in support of the outline application. Any assessment of impacts here must include an assessment of the residual and cumulative impacts of development on the wider area, including within the nearby Chilterns AONB, such as recreational and vehicular pressures. The holistic nature of assessment is itself tied up with the new growth area around Princes Risborough in the emerging Local Plan. Assessment here will encompass consideration of section 106 matters and detailed reserved matters. The methodology required to complete an Environmental Impact Assessment and Environmental Statement supports this. The LPA's statement of case at 6.2 refers to section 106 matters. The need for a consideration of residual and cumulative impacts and appropriate mitigation would be a matter for careful consideration. The applicant's own Environmental Statement at its ES 8.123 supports</p>
--	--	--	--	--

					a consideration of detailed matters, as appropriate.	
Penn and Tylers Green Football Club, Elm Road, Penn, Bucks :	PINS	Planning Inspectorate reference APP/X0415/W/3203978	Erection of 6 retractable floodlight columns (2.8m rising to 15m) and lamps to light a football pitch plus associated control cabinet.	Appeal	<p><b>CCB Written Representations</b></p> <p>In our comments on the application CCB made the point that 'we cannot see how this application can progress in its current form because of the lack of such necessary technical details, the fact that the lux measure is higher and the need to overcome the previous refusal. We hope that these points may be of assistance in the determination of the application'.</p> <p>The current appeal papers include technical appendices but little further detail on the exact type of light and the radii of light illumination produced. Appendix H (letter from Abacus lighting) provides some details but is difficult to follow and additional precise details are required. ILP Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light (2011) at its page 4 on Environmental Zones places AONBs within the category of intrinsic dark skies.</p> <p>All new lighting should be the minimum required and meet or exceed guidance for the environmental zone it is in. For example, downward pointing, shielded, operated on timer, and with a 'warm white' colour temperature of 2700-Kelvin maximum. Avoid architectural designs that spill light out of large areas of glazing'.</p>	18.1.19
Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 2 x 4 bed and 4 x 5 bed detached dwellinghouses	WDC	18/07701//FUL	Bockmer End at Land North East Of Old Barn Cottage Bockmer End Farm Bockmer Road Bockmer End Bucks	Pending	<p><b>CCB Objection</b> (scale and nature of development in rural location).</p> <p>The key issue here must be the principle of development within the landscape context of the AONB. Consideration must be given to the degree to which such a series of large single family dwellings in this location are deemed both sustainable and appropriate for the AONB, so that their design/layout would conserve and enhance the special qualities and landscape beauty of the AONB. CCB has concluded that this application</p>	18.12.19

					cannot satisfy these key and highly important policy tests.	
Bozedown Farm Hardwick Road Whitchurch On Thames	SODC	P19/S0113/FUL	Five Winter Yurts	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comment</b></p> <p>Further detail and clarification is required in this application and CCB would seek clarification on a number of matters and as:</p> <p>(1) The application is submitted in full but we could not find any detailed drawings, although the Design and Access Statement deals with some design principles, including the desire to source materials locally. The application form identifies certain materials to include vertical larch boarding and tile effect roof covering. To secure a planning permission here would require a locally distinctive treatment and a Chilterns bespoke design treatment of the structures. Materials would need to be informed by the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and supplementary technical notes and a dark stained timber with clay tile treatment would be more appropriate. The materials would need to endure to some degree as a future proofing against weathering and general wear and tear. Further occupancy and the duration of use throughout the year must be strictly controlled. We can see merit in the occupancy being controlled by a legal agreement to establish a clear planning purpose, i.e. for holiday lets only for a short duration.</p> <p>(2) The site is within a Conservation Target Area and Local Wildlife site with priority habitats of calcareous grassland and ancient and semi natural woodland. The applicant's commendably are managing the land within an environmental stewardship scheme. The ecological reports and habitats reports are helpful but we could not find conclusions that addressed the impacts arising from the Yurt uses, for example recreational pressures, dog walking as associated with this use and eutrophication impacts and the implications for protected and priority species. Further commentary here and the</p>	6.2.19

					<p>assessment as to impact would be very beneficial. Clearly the land is being managed for habitats gain and the presence of the Chilterns gentian illustrates that and also demonstrates the ecological sensitivity of the area. The application will need to demonstrate how the introduction of this new use will fit appropriately within this area and in which it will enhance and not detract from the existing priority habitats.</p> <p>(3) The landscape is open and rural in this location and falls within the Landscape Character Area 11- Thames Valley and Fringes. The section here on planning and development states that ‘: • <i>development is generally inappropriate within the unspoilt floodplain pastures, wetlands and parkland/estate landscapes; • development within visually exposed landscapes (eg. along the valley sides) will be highly prominent and is also generally undesirable; • landscapes on the fringes of settlements are particularly vulnerable to change and special attention should be paid to creating strong landscape ‘edges’ to reduce the urbanising influences of development on adjacent countryside and to prevent the coalescence of settlements; • high quality floodplain and parkland landscapes on the fringes of Henley limit the potential for further expansion of the town along the river corridor’.</i></p>	
Land adjacent to The Orchard, Benson at Braze Lane Benson	PINS	APP/Q/3115/W/18/321929 5	Outline application for up to 19 dwellings with all matters reserved with the exception of access on	Appeal	<p><b>CCB Written Representations</b></p> <p>We previously stated that the applicant’s landscape and Visual Impact Assessment made reference to the Position Statement as produced by CCB on the setting of the AONB. This links to the AONB Management Plan 2014-2019 policy D9 that ‘<i>Full account should be taken of the likely impacts of developments on the setting of the AONB</i>’. CCB would identify this as a material consideration in the determination of the appeal and planning practice</p>	1.2.19

					guidance confirms that such an AONB Management Plan may carry weight as a material consideration. National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty management plans do not form part of the statutory development plan, but may contribute to setting the strategic context for development by providing evidence and principles, which should be taken into account in the local planning authorities' Local Plans and any neighbourhood plans in these areas.	
Butterfield Technology Park Great Marlings Luton	LBC	18/01639/FUL	Erection of a commercial unit comprising 6,832sqm of B8 (storage and distribution) floorspace, together with associated car parking, landscaping, access, lighting and other works at	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>This application does contain details of external lighting. To ensure a consistent best practice approach across the entire site and to avoid excessive spill into the countryside, CCB recommends the protection of dark skies at night by only using light where and when needed. All new lighting should be the minimum required and meet or exceed guidance for the environmental zone it is in. For example, downward pointing, shielded, operated on timer, and with a 'warm white' colour temperature of 2700-Kelvin maximum. Best practice guidance here can be found in the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance GN01:2011 Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light.</p> <p>We recommend attention here to ensure that the spill is ground focused and not a wider sky or horizon focus. Writ large across the entire site this could cumulatively amount to a wider impact on the rural surroundings.</p>	20.12.18
Land at Beechwood Lane Wendover Bucks	PINS	APP/J0405/W/18/3210518	Erection of a dwelling	Appeal	<p><b>CCB Written Representations</b></p> <p>CCB disagrees with the conclusion in the appellant's statement of case (at 5.10) that this proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the AONB, due to its physical containment. This site is a consistent part of the AONB landscape and the applicant's place insufficient weight on the duty to</p>	17.12.18

					conserve and enhance these special qualities. Further, their conclusions predate the 2018 NPPF with its additional policy wording that scale and extent of development should be limited. The dwelling would be readily apparent from public vantage points, rising about the hedge line towards the lane and very harmful to the landscape integrity of the AONB.	
Chiltern Gateway Centre, Dunstable Road, Whipsnade,	DBC	CB/18/04799/full	Installation of a new car park machine	Pending	<b>CCB Support</b> The application appears appropriate and would have no material impact on the special qualities of the AONB and supports the secondary duty under section 87 of the CROW Act 2000 to promote an understanding of the AONB.	24.1.19
Site Of Chiltern Pools, Drake Hall, Community Centre, Amersham Library and Associated Car Parks and Part Of King George V Playing Fields Chiltern Avenue and King George V Road Amersham Buckinghamshire HP6 5AH nursery and dedicated external sports equipment including MUGA and play areas alongside associated external car parking, coach drop off, cycling provision, alterations to vehicular	CDC	PL/18/4593/R C	Demolition of existing buildings known as Chiltern Pools, Drake Hall, Chiltern Youth Centre and Amersham Library (excl. Annex and Barn Hall) and construction of a replacement two-storey (plus part-lower ground floor) leisure, sports and community building (Use Classes D1 and D2), including 25m swimming pool, diving pool, multipurpose sports hall, squash courts, climbing walls, spa, library, community hall, fitness and gym studios,	Pending	<b>CCB Comment</b> (i) CCB would recommend that future links to the nearby footpath networks from the urban area into the AONB are promoted. (ii) CCB notes the extensive design review and the various iterations of design treatment following the Design Council review of September 2018. The Design Council review noted the desire to reflect local vernacular colours, palettes and hues (Design and Access 2.5). When considering the final approval of details in the discharge of conditions CCB recommends that consideration is given to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and Supplementary Technical Notes on bricks and roofing materials. The site analysis as set out in the Design and Access at its 4.4 refers to the impact of red and orange bricks in the local vernacular and this influenced the preferred roof cladding in the current application. CCB recommends that a Chilterns multi or similar brick type is used in the brickwork, reflecting the local design detail that prevails in the town and wider area. (iii) CCB notes the lighting strategy as set out in the Design and Access	27.12.18

<p>access and landscaping.</p>					<p>Statement and the Planning Statement. The lighting is confined to the site and its associated car parking and would appear to avoid high level lighting around the upper levels of the buildings. This is welcomed to protect the wider relationship as enjoyed from the AONB landscape when looking back towards Amersham and relates to the points of connection as noted in the Design and Access Statement at its 3.3. To ensure a consistent best practice approach across the entire site and to avoid excessive spill when viewed back from the countryside, CCB recommends the protection of dark skies at night by only using light where and when needed. All new lighting should be the minimum required and meet or exceed guidance for the environmental zone it is in. For example, downward pointing, shielded, operated on timer, and with a 'warm white' colour temperature of 2700-Kelvin maximum. Best practice guidance here can be found in the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance GN01:2011 Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light.</p>	
<p>Sharpenhoe Road Streatley. CBC</p>	<p>CBC</p>	<p>CB/18/04347/</p>	<p>Proposed relocation of Sporting/Recreation facility (Sui Generis use) on behalf of BSSA (Shooting Range) with ancillary areas at land at</p>	<p>Pending</p>	<p><b>CCB Objection</b>                  (AONB impacts – loss of tranquillity and landscape quality and visual impacts)                   The introduction of built structures as well as 50 car parking spaces would erode that open character and result in a discordant development, harmful to the AONB. The papers suggest a somewhat benign effect would follow and this cannot be the case. Further the related noise activity is inappropriate in this location and directly impacts on two well used nearby public rights of way (PROW) in the John Bunyan trail and Chiltern Way. The submitted noise report in its conclusions at 7.1 places the noise impacts at between 55 and 65 dBA and we have taken this to be based around the average (LAeq) figure. This</p>	<p>23.1.19</p>

					<p>would impact upon the PROW network where expectations of walkers would include a lower threshold of nuisance. Attempts to control noise by planning condition are notoriously problematic and unenforceable. Either way, the noise activity is harmful and erodes the special qualities by severely eroding tranquillity. The planning statement and LVIA give much attention to the impact of overhead power cables in vicinity of the site and use the consequential visual impacts here to justify this development (7.85 of the planning statement). CCB submits that this is the wrong approach and great weight must be attributed to the conservation and enhancement duties, by the decision-maker. Proposed policy EE6 (as above) would promote the removal of such intrusive structures when they are due for replacement and/or become obsolete.</p> <p>On balance therefore and set against the important legal and policy tests that apply here CCB raises objection as this application diminishes the AONB and stands in the way of the landscape evidence base that underpins the forthcoming Local Plan.</p>	
Land adjacent allotment gardens Queensway Hazlemere Bucks	WDC	18/08068/FUL	Change of use of land to cemetery including administration building, maintenance storage area, car park and landscaping.	Pending	<p><b>CCB Objection</b> (based on Local Plan due process and design of current proposal)</p> <p>The application fails to deliver the necessary landscape led design approach that would conserve and enhance the nationally protected landscape. In respect of these important tests the design details lay out a traditional and not woodland landscape / design framework. This results in buildings, car parks, lighting and memorials which will present a more civic and traditional cemetery layout. The internal road is urban in design and the reception building takes no design cues from the Chilterns Building Design Guide. The Management Plan, whilst detailed and including a new 132 metres of new native hedge planting, misses</p>	2.1.19

					<p>the opportunity presented here to conserve and enhance the landscape.</p> <p>The relationship between the urban area and the AONB is key. Penn Road provides a natural boundary between the two. Any cemetery design must avoid an erosion of the AONB by virtue of an apparent extension of the urban area. This point is reinforced by the Bucks Landscape Character Assessment in which this land is denoted as Landscape Character Type 18.2 Penn Rolling Farmland and in which the character assessment includes <i>'Large blocks of woodland, are dispersed throughout, interlinked with farmland. The wide variety of woodland types create a rich texture and colour. A significant amount of ancient woodland, such as Penn Wood, The Larches and Common Wood in the north west'</i>. We promote this appraisal as a material planning consideration because it engenders a natural woodland context for the cemetery and one that should link to ecological enhancement.</p> <p>The proposed car park is urban in appearance and the cemetery layout follows a traditional pattern of plot layout. The applicant's propose a comprehensive landscape masterplan and maintenance regime; however, this is intended to soften the traditional layout and not to foster a woodland undeveloped landscape approach. The more landscape led approach denoted in the woodland mix to the north of the site should be a template for the wider wholesale design of the entire site. When attributing great weight to the AONB policy tests, the necessary conservation of the AONB is missed and no enhancements are demonstrated.</p>	
Litmore Shaw Grays Lane Ibstone Bucks	WDC	19/05120/FUL	Retention of an underground store, retaining wall and open fronted lean to store and	Pending	<b>CCB Comment / Objection</b> (inappropriate excavation and structures in a protected landscape – unable to deliver conservation and enhancement duties)	11.2.19

			installation of a ground source heat system (part retrospective)		No appropriate and proportionate landscape assessment is submitted. Remediation of the landscape is required and CCB supports this as a means of maintaining the special qualities evident in this part of the AONB. It is evident that a lot of landscape excavation has been undertaken and the ground source heat pump requires further movement of spoil. A topological plan has been submitted but to progress a resolution of this unauthorised development the applicant needs to demonstrate the extent and nature of landscape excavation and re-contouring / spoil storage. Until this can be clarified the LPA would be unable to determine the application as they would require this to assess the remedy. Such reconfiguration of landscape is generally unacceptable in a nationally protected landscape such as within an AONB and significant improvements must be progressed to return the landscape character to its previous state, to remove incongruous features and to commit to gapping up hedgerows and remediating works to the bridleway.	
Marchmont Farm Hemel Hempstead	DBC	4/00045/19/M OA	Outline application for up to 350 dwellings and 5 gipsy and traveller pitches.	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comment</b> (AONB settings and cumulative impact issues in HRA).</p> <p>CCB would wish to make two key comments here and as:</p> <p>(1). This site is now allocated but sits next to other land that may also be allocated in future Development Plan Documents. Reference is made to a future spine road traversing the north of Hemel and linked to the further northern expansion of the town. The planning statement (5.2) mentions a '<i>future proofing</i>' objective by maintaining a vehicular route to the north in anticipation of further development. The submitted drawings therefore show a roundabout and any spine road would be routed north and closer to the AONB. CCB is aware that this development could set a template for the future development of the</p>	28.1.19

				<p>town. What is approved here in the master-planning details will need to be of an exemplary standard to set an appropriate tone for future expansion plans by the Crown Estate, should that be progressed.</p> <p>CCB recommends that a landscape led series of design codes / principles are set out in a simple format to ensure that any other future development follows this development pattern. Such principles should include treatment of the new spine road in the landscape to engender tranquillity and avoid a traditionally lit layout, especially at roundabouts. The LVIA does accept that in views outwards from within the AONB that the development would be apparent at the edge of the urban area.</p> <p>(2). That the cumulative impacts of this and any anticipated future development must be considered within the scope of the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) work so that additional recreational pressures within the AONB and at SSSI and SAC sites (such as at Ashridge Common and within the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC) can be taken into account. We are aware that Natural England has expressed concern as to potential impacts and the applicants have produced an HRA in response. This concludes that development would have a negligible effect on the SAC and in their cumulative assessment (taking radii of other development) they place weight on SANGs within other sites, to reduce or deflect recreational pressures away from the SAC.</p> <p>As Hemel grows it is understandable that residents will want to access this landscape. The current CIL and section 106 mechanisms are being deployed to manage green infrastructure and open space (9.1 of the planning statement and heads of terms for a section 106 agreement). We consider that this should be extended to deal with recreational pressures.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Old Reservoir Greenmore Woodcote	SODC	P19/S0259/F UL	Change of use of land for siting residential caravans	Pendin 9	<p><b>CCB Objection</b></p> <p>CCB previously commented on the now dismissed appeal (see above for application comments). Our prime point of representation being that Core Strategy CSEN1 Landscape should be given due weight and regard as the site is within the AONB. The Inspector dismissed the appeal, in part, on the basis that <b>(14)</b> <i>'However, the park homes would be sited in regimented rows leading from Greenmore. They would be visible from Greenmore and from the bridleway that runs along the boundary of the site, as well as from nearby housing. This tandem layout would not reflect the frontage development which is a characteristic of the area. Furthermore, the space between the units would be limited and the number of units proposed would appear cramped upon the site. This would jar with the attractive spacious character of nearby development'</i> and <b>(15)</b> that <i>'Given the harm that I have identified above, it follows that the proposal would not conserve or enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the Chilterns AONB. Whilst such harm would be limited and localised, there would be conflict with CS Policy CSEN1 which seeks to protect the district's distinct landscape character'</i>.</p> <p>The contention that the Inspector's conclusions on affordable housing are somehow flawed would require them to challenge the decision and not to re-submit a planning application with a generalised complaint against the decision as raised in the planning supporting statement.</p> <p>CCB raise objection based on an appropriate lack of detail that cannot be resolved by condition.</p>	8.2.19
Land Adjacent Lodge Lane Little Chalfont Bucks	CDC	CDC reference PL/18/4115/F A	Retrospective application for change of use to temporary residence and temporary use of	Pendin 9	<p><b>CCB Objection</b></p> <p>The application site is located within a sensitive part of the Landscape Character Area (LCA) <b>18.3 Little Chalfont Rolling</b></p>	21.12. 18

		CDC reference PL/18/4436/FA	<p>touring caravan (3 year temporary use proposed).</p> <p>Change of use of land to mixed use site for use as a gypsy caravan site for traveller family, the use limited to the stationing of one static caravan, one touring caravan, and for equestrian purposes. Erection of barn, and provision of hardstanding, fencing, septic tank. (Retrospective)</p>	<p><b>Farmland.</b> This reports the landscape and visual sensitivities of the LCA as <i>including the open farmland and woodland cover (large areas of ancient woodland) which provides enclosure, a backdrop to views and biodiversity value</i> and <i>'The rural farmed and wooded character of the landscape occurring between the settlement of Little Chalfont and Chorley Wood/ Rickmansworth'</i>. The landscape character around the application site is also defined by stretches of lanes and roads passing through open farmland or enclosed by woodland. A rural character is maintained, notwithstanding the proximity to the nearby urban edge.</p> <p>The site is sensitively located within this nationally protected landscape. CCB places great weight on a number of important policies for the protection of the special qualities of the AONB. These special qualities include, as listed in the Management Plan (but not exclusively confined to) <i>'the steep chalk escarpment with areas of flower rich downland, woodlands, commons, tranquil valleys, the network of ancient routes and villages'</i>. The Chilterns is also <i>'...a landscape of many hidden quarters, of enclosures and surprise views, of dark beech woods and open downland. It is its variety and timelessness which give it such charm and places such a premium on maintaining those special qualities'</i>. The sensitivity of that landscape can be easily eroded by inappropriate incremental changes within it.</p>	
Great Kimble Church Of England School Church Lane Great Kimble Bucks	BCC	AOC/0097/18	<p>Application for the approval of details pertaining to condition 7 (surface water drainage) and condition 9 (Landscape and Environmental Management plan) of CC/0121/17</p>	<b>CCB - No detailed comments</b>	31.12.18

<p>Land at Holly House Harpsden Bottom Harpsden</p>	<p>PINS</p>	<p>LPA references P18/S3724/D A and P18/S3725/D A PINS references APP/Q3115/C /18/3215490 and APP/Q3115/C /18/3215491</p>	<p>Without Planning permission the erection of various buildings and laying of hard standing areas in the approximate locations own edged blue and hatched orange respectively on the "Topographical Survey" annexed (Enforcement Notice Appeal on grounds a, f and g).</p>	<p>Appeal</p>	<p><b>CCB Written Representations</b></p> <p>The appellant's statement of case essentially makes the point that the unauthorised works materially improve upon what existed previously and will result in no greater effect. CCB is not a party to the anticipated evidence that will demonstrate this point, however the AONB duties here must be given great weight and comparison between consented P15/S3359/FUL and the authorised works do not support the agent's assertion that somehow matters are improved by dint of this development. The south-eastern dwelling is considerably bolder and greater in scale (visible within the AONB and clearly impacting on setting) and the south-western dwelling involves a much larger roof that impacts on the footpath and wider views.</p> <p>The appellant's statement of case concludes that the development would conserve the landscape character and special qualities of this part of the AONB. When walking around the site and viewing from the footpath and road, such a conclusion appears unjustified by the facts. This part of Harpsden contains a mix of residential development, some cut into the rising woodland topography to the north and some straddling the road. Whilst the various residential designs are mixed in character they do share a broad streetscape and land use pattern of modest forms with plentiful use of Chilterns bricks and roof tiles, set back from the road. To the west is Hunts Farm and this typifies the Parish and we invite the Inspector (below) to walk this part of the road.</p>	<p>10.1.1 9</p>
<p>Arla Foods Ltd Aylesbury Dairy, Samian Way, Aston Clinton Bucks</p>	<p>AVDC</p>	<p>19/00399/AP P</p>	<p>Extension to dairy (Final Phase as approved by 11/0962/APP dairy consent - revised scheme) at</p>		<p><b>CCB Holding Objection</b></p> <p>CCB accepts that the panoramic views across the Vale, viewed from Coombe Hill for example, intersperses development within the structured landscape character of landscape character assessment area LCA 11 (chalk escarpment), and LCA 8.10 Southern Vale. That</p>	<p>22.1.1 9</p>

				<p>mix filters the view from Coombe Hill, but that any increase in the scale and bulk of a scheme beyond a previously consented scheme requires careful assessment. Therefore the CCB's primary interest is the extent to which the variations here, above and beyond the scheme as approved under AVDC reference 11/00962/APP will impact upon the special qualities of the Chilterns AONB. Views out from the escarpment into the Vale constitute an important part of those special qualities and are recognised in the Aylesbury Vale District Council &amp; Buckinghamshire County Council Aylesbury Vale Landscape Character Assessment. Landscape Character Type 8 (Northern Vale) denotes a distinctive feature is a sense of remoteness at fringes of the area and the Vale beyond the escarpment adds to the character and identity of the whole landscape here.</p> <p>CCB would therefore seek more information on Phase 3 as compared to 11/0962/APP, which we understand to be the principal alteration as Phase 4 is covered by a non-material amendment as agreed by the planning authority. We would seek further information on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) A measure of clarification on the exact changes to the south east elevation of the proposal, when compared to the existing approval.</li> <li>(2) That weight and attention is given to wider views from within the AONB. The planning statement does not deal with the AONB impacts and no landscape assessment is submitted.</li> <li>(3) Clarification as to external lighting and the promotion of minimum lighting and best practice, as applies</li> <li>(4) That the consented Aylesbury Woodlands expansion (16/01040/OUT) is material here, when assessing cumulative change and mitigation.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Bacombe Warren Bacombe Lane Wendover Bucks</p>	<p>AVDC</p>	<p>19/00328/AP P</p>	<p>Demolition of two existing dwellings and outbuildings and construction of two dwellings, an office/workshop, parking and associated landscaping</p>	<p>Pending</p>	<p><b>CCB Support</b></p> <p>The Chilterns Buildings Design Guide is a relevant material planning consideration and in particular paragraph 3.31 <i>'This guide is intended to help conserve and enhance the Chilterns landscape by promoting locally distinctive building traditions. However, this does not mean that there is no place for contemporary and innovative architecture or more interesting designs which demonstrate adherence to the basic principle of being in harmony with their site and the surrounding buildings and countryside. By their very nature such designs are likely to come forward rarely, though should still be of the highest standard. They should therefore only be built in exceptional circumstances where it can be shown that, whether in the open countryside or a settlement, they enhance the landscape and immediate setting rather than detract from local character. They should also demonstrate the highest principles of sustainability in terms of design, use of materials and renewable energy provision for example and should have the ability to be repaired and renewed when necessary'</i>.</p> <p>This application demonstrably enhances the AONB by reducing the bulk and visual impact of the existing assembly of buildings. The submitted Design and Access statement identifies the constraints imposed by this nationally protected landscape and respects the landscape setting in promoting the removal of a series of existing structures with their replacement by a much more unified and lower impact series of replacements. CCB is able to express support for this application and would only seek clarification that the roofing materials are deemed to result in a low visual impact and that this can be controlled by an appropriate planning condition.</p>	<p>21.2.1 9</p>
---	-------------	--------------------------	--	----------------	--	---------------------

					A lighting condition will need to be discharged and external lighting to be kept to an absolute minimum.	
Horseblock Farm, Heath End, Berkhamsted.	DBC	4/02120/18/FUL	Construction of agricultural livestock building	Granted 13.11.18	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>The application is within a sensitive location within a nationally protected landscape and falls within the Bellingdon and Hawridge Ridges and Valley (Landscape Character Area 109) of the Herts Landscape Character Assessment 109. The landscape character is described as ‘A series of narrow ridges and dry valleys similar in landform to the Markyate Ridges and Valleys, (see Area 126). Pastoral and equestrian fields, small to medium size, comprise the greater part of the character area. To the north east within Hertfordshire there are some larger arable fields. The landscape is well contained by mixed hedgerows and occasional fenced field boundaries, with localized areas of broadleaf and mixed/plantation woodland’. The relevant visual and sensory perception is also described as ‘The distinctive narrow ridges and valleys create a strong sense of character. The presence of mature woodland in some of the valleys adds to the marked sense of containment. From the ridges there are localized views, however tall hedges and settlement both block views and provide visual enclosure. This is a relatively small scale and intimate landscape with few visual or audible detractors’.</p> <p>In this case the proposed building is of a significant scale and CCB would be interested to know if the location can be more nested with the existing farm layout, if the bulk can be reduced and if the materials can reflect, to some degree, the vernacular design approach as advocated in the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide. The submitted Design and Access Statement at its section 7 details a natural grey coloured fibre cement roof with</p>	7.11.18

					green steel profiled cladding. We would recommend a reconsideration of these materials following a review of the Design Guide and especially in the gable ends, which could be timber clad or boarded.	
Down House Ewelme	SODC	P19/S0006/FUL	Construction of a new poolhouse at Ewelme	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>CCB would draw attention to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide as the use of materials and design features will be an important consideration in the application of the decision-making duties as set out previously. The application land is within and part of an existing residential curtilage and the design treatment will be a relevant matter in the assessment of impacts here.</p>	30.1;19
Land at West Hemel (site allocation LA 3)	DBC	4/03266/18/MFA			<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>The site falls within the wider setting of the AONB, which lies to the west and is within the same landscape character areas. Considerations of setting means that weight must be given to the AONB Management Plan policy L7 and the CCB Position Statement on setting.</p> <p>The masterplan in both its vision and in some of the design principles promotes Chilterns design principles to create a high quality and attractive design ethos. This is a commendable planning objective and an important one to deliver in the stated vision for LA3. In light of the hybrid status of the application CCB would therefore recommend that:</p> <p>(1) These design principles are delivered through a design code that itself takes cues on layout / orientation, materials and form from the published Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and the Supplementary Technical Notes on materials. The guide contains a series of checklists that can inform such principles, for example <b>1.14</b> <i>The Objectives of this Design Guide are to: Raise awareness of the quality of the traditional built character of the Chilterns AONB Help identify and protect the</i></p>	15.2.19

				<p><i>distinctive traditional built character of the Chilterns AONB and thereby promote local identity Inspire high quality design in new developments which respect the traditional built character of the AONB Re-establish traditional character in areas of the AONB where it has been damaged or eroded Provide a co-ordinated and integrated approach for design advice throughout the AONB Ensure that appropriate development respects its local context and the wider landscape Promote sustainability in design and use of resources, particularly locally produced building materials.</i></p> <p>(2) That the use of landscaping, green infrastructure and accessible natural greenspace is also informed by the Herts Landscape Assessment study. The AONB and the edge of the site both fall within area 118 'Lower Bulbourne Valley' and the 'Little Heath Uplands' area 120 and we recommend that the design code and its landscape principles embrace the 'Strategy and guidelines for managing change' as contained within area 118 and 120.</p> <p>(3) That a detailed set of lighting principles be published and adhered to, so that a soft edge is promoted and the promotion of a dark sky strategy within the AONB is not compromised by increase in glare as associated with new development. For example, all new lighting should be the minimum required and meet or exceed guidance for the environmental zone it is in.</p> <p>(4) That the design coding for the outline application is part of a reserved matters / condition approval.</p> <p>(5) That in delivery of the design principles the design code refers appropriately to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and Supplementary Technical Notes, as will apply.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX 5**Current Live CCB Planning Application Casework**

Location	LPA	Ref number	Development	Deadline
Springfield Rd Ind Estate	CDC	CH/2018/0240/E	Application for reserved matters following outline planning permission CH/2015/2020/OA for 55 dwellings with associated access, infrastructure and landscaping.	27.2.19
Gomm and Ashwells site, near High Wycombe	WDC	19/05281/OUTEA	Up to 1000 dwellings (Use Class C3); a single form entry primary school and pre-school/nursery (Use Class D1, up to 1200 sqm); retail facilities up to 1800 sqm (Use Class A1, A3, A4, A5); employment facilities up to 2000 sqm (Use Class B1); sheltered housing complex (Use Class C2, up to 4100 sqm); community and leisure facilities up to 1100 sqm (Use Class D1/D2) together with supporting infrastructure, landscaping, sustainable urban drainage, public open space including swimming pond and ecological areas	4.3.19



**APPENDIX 6**

**CCB Responses on Development Plan Consultations:**

Consultation document	Consulted by	Response – summary	CCB response date
<p>Bovingdon Neighbourhood Plan, neighbourhood area designation</p>	<p>DBC</p>	<p>Supporting - Yes</p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board has no objection to the proposed Bovingdon neighbourhood area. We welcome neighbourhood planning as a great way for local communities in the Chilterns to look after their special locally distinctive areas.</p> <p>At this initial stage, we would like to offer some standard advice to the neighbourhood plan group.</p> <p>Bovingdon Parish forms part of the setting of the Chilterns AONB. For advice about the setting of the AONB please see our Position Statement on Development Affecting the Setting of the Chilterns AONB available at <a href="https://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development/position-statements.html">https://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development/position-statements.html</a></p> <p>Bovingdon Parish contains the former Bovingdon Brickworks. The Chilterns Conservation Board supports the retention of the local brick-making industry because they provide high-quality traditional materials for the repair of historic buildings in the Chilterns, and new buildings in keeping with the AONB (see AONB Management Plan policy D4). Two of the three brickworks making Chilterns bricks have closed in recent years; sadly with the recent closure of Bovingdon Brickworks, the number of Chilterns brickworks has now dwindled to one (HG Matthews) which is located outside the AONB. Existing brickworks sites should be safeguarded so they can re-open in future.</p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board will wish to stay involved and assist in the future with plan proposals as they develop, to ensure that full and proper account is taken of the need to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB and its setting.</p>	<p>27.11.18</p>
<p>Statutory Consultation on Proposed 7.5 tonne weight limit restrictions, Naphill</p>	<p>BCC</p>	<p>The Chilterns Conservation Board supports the proposed 75 tonne weight limit on the entire length of Clappins Lane and Stockings Lane, Naphill.</p> <p>The reasons given in the Order could be expanded to include conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB. Clappins Lane and Stockings Lane are both attractive, rural, historic lanes in the Chilterns AONB. Heavy traffic and lorries passing erodes the roadsides and affects the beauty and rural character of these single track lanes. Our guidance note, prepared with the County Councils, Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Highways in the Chilterns <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/uploads/files/ConservationBoard/Environmental_Guidelines_Highways.pdf">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/uploads/files/ConservationBoard/Environmental_Guidelines_Highways.pdf</a> summarises advice on how to manage roads to conserve and enhance the special qualities of the AONB.</p> <p>Furthermore part of the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC a European level biodiversity designations) is</p>	<p>29.11.18</p>

		<p>close by to the west of Naphill and Walters Ash. This SAC is vulnerable to air pollution, and already in exceedance for levels of nitrogen dioxide. The weight limit could help deter through-traffic by HGVs and reduce air pollution.</p>	
<p>Validation requirements for planning applications - Local List of Information Requirements</p>	<p>BCC</p>	<p>Thank you for consulting The Chilterns Conservation Board on the local list update ref CM/9999/18.</p> <p>We offer the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is not explained why the Environmental Impact Assessment category is taken out, so we are unclear of whether this is strengthening or weakening the information requirements.</li> <li>2. In part C many of the documents in the table referred to are out of date and new versions should be referred to eg SFRA for Wycombe</li> <li>3. Part C page 15 please add NNRs: Proposals affecting internationally, nationally and/or locally designated nature conservation sites (e.g. SACs, SPAs, RAMSARs, SSSIs, <b>NNRs</b>, LNRs and/or LWSs).</li> <li>4. Part C page 15 please update to refer to Proposals affecting <b>Priority Habitats and Priority Species</b> (listed under Section 41 of the NERC Act (2006)</li> <li>5. Part C page 16 should also refer to <b>“The MAGIC website provides authoritative geographic information about the natural environment from across government see <a href="https://magic.defra.gov.uk/">https://magic.defra.gov.uk/</a>”</b> this could go before: “As a minimum, applicants will be expected to consult the Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Environmental Records Centre <a href="http://www.bucksmkerc.org.uk">http://www.bucksmkerc.org.uk</a>”</li> <li>6. Part C page 24 lists Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty along with non-statutory local landscape designations. The Chilterns AONB is a nationally designated landscape which should be given ‘great weight’ (NPPF para 172) and BCC has a statutory duty under the <b><a href="#">CRoW Act 2000 Sec 85</a></b> to have regard to conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB. Suggest adding a requirement in the AONB for assessing whether a development is major development in the AONB for which the tests in NPPF para 172 would apply. This could be expressed as <b>“In the Chilterns AONB, application documents must provide a statement explaining whether the development is considered to be major development in the AONB, and if so, including a justification based around the tests in NPPF para 172, regarding the need for the development, the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.”</b></li> <li>7. Part C page 28 we welcome the inclusion of external lighting information, and suggest this is bolstered by adding AONB as follows: “All developments where proposed external lighting may affect the local amenity, a Listed Building or Conservation Area, <b>AONB</b>, open countryside, or where the presence of bats or other nocturnal animals has been identified.” This is because on lighting and dark skies,</li> </ol>	<p>3.12.18</p>

		<p>locations within AONBs are recommended by the Institute of Lighting Professionals as E1 for which the lighting environment is Intrinsically Dark zones, see table on page 5 of <a href="https://www.theilp.org.uk/documents/obtrusive-light">https://www.theilp.org.uk/documents/obtrusive-light</a>. Please also add to column 4: "Details should be provided of proposed external lighting (including types of light, shading, height of fixings, LUX, <b>colour temperature in Kelvin</b>) and the proposed hours of use. These details shall include a layout plan with beam orientation and a schedule of the equipment in the design." And please add to column 5: "<b>Institution of Lighting Professional <a href="#">Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light GN01, 2011</a></b>"</p>	
<p>Changes to planning policy and guidance including the standard method for assessing local housing need</p>	<p>MHCL G</p>	<p>Question 1: Do you agree that planning practice guidance should be amended to specify that 2014-based projections will provide the demographic baseline for the standard method for a time limited period? No. The demographic baseline should be the latest projections, using the up to date evidence. It is not sound to ignore or discard evidence on the basis that it does not match the current policy direction.</p> <p>Question 2: Do you agree with the proposed approach to not allowing 2016-based household projections to be used as a reason to justify lower housing need? No. The demographic baseline should be the latest projections, using the up to date evidence. Rather than delaying local plan making, lower housing numbers would make plan making easier and more palatable for communities. Where local authorities are covered by important designations like National Parks and AONBs, the high housing requirements are impossible to accommodate and the numbers cause alarm and threat to the designation purpose of conserving and enhancing natural beauty.</p> <p>Question 6: Do you agree with the proposed amendment to paragraph 177 of the National Planning Policy Framework? No. The proposed amendment is unacceptable and unwise. The caveat weakens rather than strengthens protection for Habitats Sites like, in our area, the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation. The sites that para 177 protects are of international importance for wildlife. A presumption in favour of sustainable development is inappropriate for such sites, in all cases, even if an Appropriate Assessment has concluded no adverse impact. The proposed change would be in direct opposition to NPPF para 11 which identifies in footnote 6 that Habitats Sites are a strong reason for restricting development. Paragraph 177 should be left unchanged.</p>	<p>6.12.18</p>
<p>CIL Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule</p>	<p>CDC&amp; SB</p>	<p>Question 1. Do you agree with the key assumptions that underlie the Residential Viability Assessment for different land uses? If not, what alternatives would you suggest and why? Yes. The Chilterns Conservation Board queries para 19 of the CIL Infrastructure Funding Gap Analysis, which states: "19. As CIL is not payable on affordable housing, the calculation of anticipated CIL revenues has assumed that all major sites (those of 10 dwellings or more), and sites within the AONB that provide five</p>	<p>14.12.18</p>

	<p>dwelling or more, would provide 40% affordable housing which would exempt from CIL."</p> <p>The NPPF (2018) sets out at para 63 that in designated rural areas (including the AONB), sites of 5 or more homes (rather than the usual 10 or more elsewhere) can be expected to contribute to affordable housing. However, the Planning Practice Guidance on Planning Obligations at Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 23b-031-20161116 explains that this is to be provided through a cash payment, not as on-site affordable housing:</p> <p>"In designated rural areas, local planning authorities may choose to apply a lower threshold of 5-units or less. No affordable housing or tariff-style contributions should then be sought from these developments. In addition, in a rural area where the lower 5-unit or less threshold is applied, affordable housing and tariff style contributions should be sought from developments of between 6 and 10-units in the form of cash payments which are commuted until after completion of units within the development. This applies to rural areas described under section 157(1) of the Housing Act 1985, which includes National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty"</p> <p>The proposed C&amp;SB approach has assumed that affordable housing will be on-site and exempt from CIL, but the PPG currently seeks it off-site, so this may mean that all homes in a 6-10 unit development in the AONB would be market housing and liable for CIL.</p> <p>Question 2 Do you agree with the residential development CIL rates proposed being the same across all areas within the districts? If not, please explain which ones you disagree with and why. The Chilterns Conservation Board suggests a higher rate could be levied in the Chilterns AONB because land values are significantly higher, and this could be used to fund AONB enhancement like conservation work and improved visitor facilities in the AONB. Research by Savills using Land Registry data show that house prices in the Chilterns AONB attract a premium of 75% above the average house price for the counties, and 162% higher house price than the UK average. In the Chilterns AONB, the average second hand sale price of a home in the 12 months to April 2018 was £718,629. This was 75% higher than the county(s) average and 162% higher than the UK average.</p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board would like to suggest additions to the Infrastructure Requirements list (Appendix 1). The 'health and wellbeing' category of infrastructure includes in green infrastructure "Measures to mitigate impacts of additional visitors arising from development within 5km of Burnham Beeches". Another row should be added to include the other Habitats Sites of the same international status as Burnham Beeches: the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Areas of Conservation.</p> <p>Please add two new rows as follows: <b>1. Green Infrastructure Enhancements to facilities / other measures in the Chilterns AONB where related to the growth in the new Local Plan</b></p>	
--	--	--

		<p><b>2. Green Infrastructure</b>  <b>Measures to mitigate impacts of additional visitors arising from development within 5km of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC.</b></p> <p>The reason is that without suitable mitigation and offsetting, the condition of the Chilterns AONB could deteriorate with the growth proposed in the Local Plan. The Councils and all public bodies have a statutory duty to have regard to conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB (Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 sec 85). Natural beauty includes the flora, fauna and geological and physiographical features of the AONB. It covers everything that adds together to make the area distinctive, such as landscape quality, scenic quality, relative wildness, relative tranquillity, natural heritage and cultural heritage. Impacts can be direct (e.g. loss of habitat by building on it) or indirect (e.g. development generating more visitors or more traffic harming air quality and tranquillity in the AONB).</p> <p>It is likely that Chilterns Conservation Board would be interested in applying for CIL funding to deliver ecological and visitor enhancement projects in the Chilterns AONB, including projects to reduce recreation pressure on the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC. The Chilterns Conservation Board queries para 19 of the CIL Infrastructure Funding Gap Analysis, which states: "19. As CIL is not payable on affordable housing, the calculation of anticipated CIL revenues has assumed that all major sites (those of 10 dwellings or more), and sites within the AONB that provide five dwellings or more, would provide 40% affordable housing which would exempt from CIL."</p> <p>The NPPF (2018) sets out at para 63 that in designated rural areas (including the AONB), sites of 5 or more homes (rather than the usual 10 or more elsewhere) can be expected to contribute to affordable housing. However, the Planning Practice Guidance on Planning Obligations at Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 23b-031-20161116 explains that this is to be provided through a cash payment, not as on-site affordable housing.</p> <p>The proposed C&amp;SB approach has assumed that affordable housing will be on-site and exempt from CIL, but the PPG currently seeks it off-site, so this may mean that all homes in a 6-10 unit development in the AONB would be market housing and liable for CIL.</p>	
<p>Ox-Cams exhibition 21st November 2018, CCB follow up response</p>	<p>Highways England</p>	<p>Thank you for inviting the Chilterns Conservation Board to the Exhibition in Milton Keynes on 21 November. I made a number of points as I was being shown around the exhibition, and thought it would be useful if I re-iterated these:</p> <p><u>Principle &amp; justification:</u>                  CCB is still concerned at the incompatible reasons put forward for the proposed Expressway (is it a new strategic route for existing traffic especially freight from A34 to M1, or a new local road to "free up or "unlock" development sites in the possible Oxford-Cambridge Growth Arc)</p> <p><u>Good planning:</u></p>	<p>17.12.18</p>

		<p>The potential Growth Arc of new homes and jobs should be considered with the Expressway as part of the same strategic spatial planning process, rather than separately (and certainly not sequentially). This will entail a full Strategic Environmental Assessment for the development holistically, and looking at all alternatives, cumulative impacts etc.</p> <p><u>Traffic generation and cumulative impacts</u> You acknowledged at the Exhibition the potential for additional traffic movements generated by any new road. We are concerned about possible traffic generated, its impacts in and around the AONB, its volume, noise, disturbance, damage, and impact on air quality including Nitrogen Dioxide (already in exceedance in the Chilterns Beechwood Special Areas of Conservation which are close to existing north-south A roads).</p> <p><u>Mapping of constraints</u> We noticed you had again put a 2km "buffer" around the edge of the Chilterns AONB. We reiterated that the setting of the AONB includes wider views and impacts beyond this</p> <p><u>Recreation potential</u> The Chilterns has immense recreational importance and potential, and we would expect any decision on Growth and new transport routes in the northern Oxfordshire-Buckinghamshire-Bedfordshire Arc to plan for and deliver resources for AONB enhancement projects to improve recreational access (using sustainable modes), well-being and ecology.</p>	
<p>Berrick Salome Reg 14 Neighbourhood Plan</p>	<p>Berrick Salome PC</p>	<p>It has been a pleasure to read your draft neighbourhood plan. I can see the obvious care and thought regarding building design in your different areas that has gone into it.</p> <p>Just one suggestion, regarding the relationship with the AONBs. You state in para 2.1 that "To the east, the foothills of the Chilterns can be seen" and in policy BER9 you have identified important views which help define the relationship between the settlements and their rural hinterland, and mention that "these views are particularly distinctive of the rural landscape setting, the settlements lying low within it, and the context of the two AONBs". We would recommend that you use the terminology that your parish is "within the setting of the Chilterns and North Wessex Downs AONBs". We have further advice about what this means in our Position statement on Development Affecting the Setting of the Chilterns AONB available here <a href="https://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development/position-statements.html">https://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development/position-statements.html</a></p> <p>We note you explain that "The policy does not seek to prevent any development lying within a view, but requires that proposals recognise and take account of these in their design". The Chilterns Conservation Board considers there will be cases when it is more than a design issue and where views to and from the AONBs mean that development should be restricted. Your important views list could explain which are the views important to the setting of the nationally protected landscape of the Chilterns AONB (or to the North Wessex Downs AONB).</p>	<p>10.1.19</p>

		<p>Finally, an observation that the arrows on the important views map all point outwards from the villages to the fields/ hills. Remember there could also be important views from higher land in the Chilterns AONB back towards your settlements, which could be important to retain rural character. I have not had a chance to visit the public rights of way recently to check this but, as an example, if there was a view from a hilltop or National Trail to a rural village surrounded by fields with a church in view. These could including long distance views. You might want to consider using longer wider arrows, perhaps double-headed arrows, to show that there are both views from the AONB and views to the AONB.</p>	
<p>Measuring environmental change – draft indicators framework for the 25 Year Environment Plan</p>	<p>DEFRA</p>	<p>The Chilterns Conservation Board welcomes the proposed indicators. They look ambitious, and suitably broad to include both condition of the environment and people’s enjoyment of it. Many of the indicators will need new resourcing to provide meaningful and robust data.                  If data could be published at a sub-national data it would help local authorities and delivery agencies to track progress and identify trends across the country.                  The proposals include at H11 “extent and condition of National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be considered”; we welcome this as a measure of how well the country is looking after the unique assets of its protected landscapes. We suggest this includes how much development has been permitted in National Parks the Broads and AONBs, to measure against compliance with para 172 of the NPPF, using MHCLG statistics.                  We also welcome the H13 indicator for measuring enhancements delivered through the planning system, which could drive better progress in this area.</p>	<p>24.1.19</p>
<p>Bucks Minerals and Waste Local Plan Proposed Modifications</p>	<p>BCC</p>	<p>MM18                  Chilterns Conservation Board <b>supports</b> the deletion from Table 9 of “<del>High Heavens (Great Marlow)</del>”                  But we think the new paragraph starting “The two main towns are High Wycombe and Aylesbury...” is not very clear, it rightly explains the constraints on High Wycombe then surprisingly goes on to say “Together, these three main settlements form a natural focus for future growth.” Mixed message?</p> <p>MM19                  Chilterns Conservation Board <b>supports</b> in Policy 14 the additions of “within existing general industrial and employment areas along with urban extensions”                  but we <b>object</b> to:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The proposed new word “primarily” because it is superfluous, it already reads “focusing” which means the same thing. Our suggested version would read:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The growth of Buckinghamshire’s sustainable waste management network will be delivered by <del>primarily</del> focusing development of facilities for the preparation of wastes for reuse and recycling and other recovery on the main urban areas and growth locations of High Wycombe, Aylesbury and Buckingham <u>within existing general industrial and employment areas along with urban extensions.</u></p>	<p>4.2.19</p>

		<p>There is a confusing muddle re: the next part of Policy 14 which uses the words “<b>As a secondary focus</b>, facilities for the preparation of wastes for re-use and recycling in key settlements outside of the primary areas of focus (i.e. High Wycombe, Aylesbury and Buckingham), will be supported where located within existing general industrial and employment areas, where appropriate, particularly where involving the re-use of previously developed land and/or the colocation of waste management facilities.”</p> <p>The use of “as a secondary focus” is confusing because it implies this could be anywhere in the county of Bucks outside High Wycombe, Aylesbury and Buckingham. Whereas Table 9 carefully lists the names of the secondary areas of focus (trading estates etc). They are not just anywhere outside High Wycombe, Aylesbury and Buckingham. Suggest change the words “in key settlements outside the primary areas of focus” to say “<b>at the locations listed as secondary areas of focus in Table 9</b>, will be supported where....”</p> <p>In the section “Within rural areas, the development of facilities for the biological treatment of waste will be supported where: (i) associated with existing rural employment uses or farm-based enterprises; and/or (ii) involving the re-use of previously developed land, redundant agricultural and forestry buildings and their curtilages.” Should also say: “<b>and (iii) where compliant with relevant MWLP policies</b>” or “<b>and (iii) where this does not conflict with AONB and Green Belt designations</b>” This is because sites could be in the Chilterns AONB so a blanket yes is not appropriate, sites should also comply with AONB policy.</p> <p>Generally the new wording is wordy and not very clear.</p> <p>MM28 The Chilterns Conservation supports MM28. Thank you for making this accuracy improvement re: Chilterns AONB.</p> <p>MM29 The Chilterns Conservation supports MM29. Thank you for making this accuracy improvement re: Chilterns AONB.</p> <p>MM30 The Chilterns Conservation <b>objects</b> to MM30 because it should use ‘purpose’ not ‘aim’ in order to comply with the terminology in the <a href="#">Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 section 82</a>.</p> <p>The AONB has designation purposes, not aims. There is only one statutory purpose for designating AONBs, it is the “purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area”</p> <p>Suggest instead return to the original wording in the submission version:</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>The AONB Management Plan seeks to deliver on the primary purpose of conserving and enhancing natural beauty, but also recognises that this must be balanced with the need to foster social and economic well-being (where consistent with conservation of natural beauty).”</p> <p>MM32 The Chilterns Conservation supports MM32. Thank you for making this accuracy improvement re: Chilterns AONB</p>	
<p>How to improve the planning system in England to protect the environment (biodiversity net gain) and build places to live and work</p>	<p>DEFRA</p>	<p>1. Should biodiversity net gain be mandated for all housing, commercial and other development within the scope of the Town and County Planning Act? Yes</p> <p>2. What other actions could government take to support the delivery of biodiversity net gain? The Government should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue work on developing a wider environmental net gain approach. Agree net gain standards for all departments of government (local and national) and continue to extend this approach to the non-governmental sector.</li> <li>• Biodiversity net gain needs to apply to national infrastructure projects too. For example projects such as Ox-Cam expressway should deliver 20% net gain too, the vast scale of this one project could contribute towards 25-year environment plan objectives.</li> <li>• Also apply mandatory net gain to categories of permitted development where there is already a requirement for contact with the LPA through the prior notification process eg for large farm buildings (now allowed up to 1000sqm under amendments to GDPO in 2018).</li> </ul> <p>3. Should there be any specific exemptions to any mandatory biodiversity net gain requirement (planning policies on net gain would still apply) for the following types of development? And why?</p> <p>a. House extensions No exemption- these should be included. All development should be part of biodiversity net gain and apply the mitigation hierarchy.</p> <p>Within the Chilterns AONB, there are some very large (and growing) houses. Some ‘house extensions’ cover significant areas and can lead to biodiversity loss. Chilterns Conservation Board suggests all house extensions are included, and also associated works (e.g. driveways, hard standings, outbuildings) combined with a simple test for any specific habitat impacted (e.g. does the work impact on woodland, streams etc.). There is no reason why extensions should not contribute to biodiversity net gain, eg inclusion of green roofs, bird and bat nesting boxes etc. If hedges, trees or other habitats are being lost, the projects should more than replace them. Suggest nothing is exempt to ensure principle is carried forward (e.g. house extension could take down small hedge housing nesting House Sparrows which are in national decline) – on site works or a nominal charge can</p>	<p>7.2.19</p>

		<p>and should be levied and applied in all cases. Could be used for community-based offset projects.</p> <p>b. Small sites          No exemption- these should be included. All development should be part of biodiversity net gain and apply the mitigation hierarchy.</p> <p>Why is a breeding population of 5 pairs of House Sparrows on a small site any less important than one of 50 on a larger site?</p> <p>There is a risk that exemptions for small sites could lead to perverse behaviour like developers sub-dividing a large plot into smaller sites to meet the exemption criteria (which could also have implications for affordable housing delivery)</p> <p>As per 3.a. Issue in biodiversity decline is death by a thousand cuts and is a hidden issue. Principle needs to be applied. For ease of admin. a set fee can be attached for unit size of development but cannot be exempt.</p> <p>“Small sites” are referenced with a footnote as not ‘major’ sites i.e. up to 10 dwellings or less than 1000sqm or 1 hectare of non-residential development. These are a large proportion of the planning applications and are significant. They should certainly be included.</p> <p>c. All brownfield sites          No exemption- these should be included. All development should be part of biodiversity net gain and apply the mitigation hierarchy.</p> <p>There might still be a biodiversity loss, particularly if there is cumulative impact of a number of sites and if considering wider environmental net gain (e.g. light, noise, carbon, water quality).</p> <p>Brownfield sites can be some of our more biodiverse and are great at providing habitat in often urban areas. They should be subject to the same rigour as any other site. Issue here is the net gain focus solely on habitats and not species. Diverse range of colonising invertebrates, (even bird species such as Black Redstart which favour brownfield sites will not be picked up by habitat survey)</p> <p>d. Some brownfield sites (e.g. those listed on brownfield, or other, land registers)          No exemption- these should be included. All development should be part of biodiversity net gain and apply the mitigation hierarchy.</p> <p>4. Are there any other sites that should be granted exemptions, and why? For example, commercial and industrial sites.</p> <p>No exemption- these should be included. All development should be part of biodiversity net gain and apply the mitigation hierarchy.</p> <p>Employment estates and retail parks will all be better if there was less tarmac and more wildlife, better for biodiversity, improving air quality and people’s well-being.</p> <p>The principle must apply to all development, with flexible options for how to comply in the case of small schemes (eg offset payment to community-based project), but all must be covered and all contribute to mandatory net gain.</p> <p>5. As an alternative to an exemption, should any sites instead be subject to a simplified biodiversity assessment process?</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Undecided. A simplified process might be appropriate for some types of application to save process costs and spend money on maximum gain for biodiversity rather than admin/processes.</p> <p>6. Do you agree that the Defra metric should allow for adjustments to reflect important local features such as local sites? Should the Defra metric consider local designations in a different way?</p> <p>Yes, absolutely. A premium should be paid, or increase in % net gain, or increase in tariff for development in protected Landscape (AONB, National Park etc)</p> <p>The DEFRA metric is generic and should allow additional scoring that takes account local importance and local sites. Assessors should be able to give weighting for local sites and designations, and habitat condition scoring. Should add a net gain premium of, for example, 25% for LWS, 30% for SSSI. Since SSSIs are designated only as a representative sample, many sites in our area that merit SSSI designation are 'only' LWS, and are not sufficiently protected. The metric should score all LWS automatically as high value habitats.</p> <p>Key also here is the need for a buffer zone around all sites that are considered in the assessment. Breaking habitat connectivity is a real issue and nowhere in the proposals is this picked up. The buffer could be scaled according to size of development and type of designation.</p> <p>Nowhere in the consultation draft does it explain how best to deal with the cumulative effect of developments on a given area or habitat type. This could be addressed by reference to a body with oversight to look at all proposals together and how best to deal with them (e.g. in our area HS2, plus the expansion of Aylesbury into a Garden Town, plus the Ox-Cams Expressway).</p> <p>It is not clear where Priority Habitats (Habitats of Principal Importance) fall in this, they are not mentioned in the consultation. These should be given weight and protection, we currently have two local authorities in the Chilterns proposing to allocate several Priority Habitats sites which are chalk grassland, deciduous woodland or traditional orchards for development in their emerging local plan. Many of these form part of a larger habitats network surrounding our SACs, SSSIs and LWSs.</p> <p>7. Should local authorities be required to adopt a robust district level licensing approach for great crested newts, where relevant, by 2020?</p> <p>No, too soon, the great crested newts licencing pilot has shown mixed result. It ignores the mitigation hierarchy and allows developers to jump to compensation, with no provision required to accommodate existing GCNs on-site, and no guarantees that replacement habitat will be available in time and near enough.</p> <p>8. For what species is it plausible to use district level or strategic approaches to improve conservation outcomes and streamline planning processes? Please provide evidence.</p> <p>Rather than protected species the focus should be on habitats/ecosystems. There needs to be greater understanding that complex interactions over centuries have shaped</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>ecosystems found today and that biodiversity is not a single exchangeable commodity which can be simply recreated elsewhere. One newt here is not the same as a loss of the rich habitat for one existing newt there.</p> <p>The Government needs to move away from heavy legal emphasis on protecting a small list of S41 species, as it too limiting. Even rare species like for example long-eared owls are not red listed.</p> <p>There is merit in some habitats being designed and managed to support specific rare species in an area. Local and regional expertise – county records centres, wildlife trusts etc.- would be well placed to identify priority species, especially where these are emblematic for a landscape. One example worth considering for the Chilterns AONB is the Duke of Burgundy Butterfly. This species has been the subject of concerted effort to protect and improve habitat by Butterfly Conservation and other local groups.</p> <p>Suggest moving towards a species assemblage approach – suites that have certain number of bird or amphibian or bat species that are not S41 should accrue points – key is in the biodiversity and bioabundance. Recognising the value locally of these sites. Habitats are not the sole indicator of biodiversity value (e.g., Waterstock just been designated as LWS on strength of its bird assemblages – 102 species recorded on site with no breeding S41 species so wouldn't pick this up! The Knepp estate habitats scores would be low but value for cross species groups now high.</p> <p>Species Guild work or a simplified version of it would be even better representation of the cross taxa value of a site – should be policy shift to include species records and aspiration for species guild style approach.</p> <p>9. Are there wider elements of environmental net gain that could be better incentivised? If so, please specify which, and any benefits that such incentives could provide.</p> <p>Yes, definitely. The system should be broadened from biodiversity net gain to environmental net gain, especially in protected landscapes (National Parks and AONBs), which could pilot this. In AONBs like ours we can be especially clear about what that means, we would like to see funding for conservation and enhancement of the Chilterns AONB. This is the single statutory purpose for designating AONBs and we have specific proposals in the AONB Management Plan for what needs to happen, but little or no funding to make it happen. There is an obvious join up. We should not have a system of biodiversity accounting alone. For the protected landscape we should also extract developer contributions for funding the whole range of AONB Management Plan objectives, eg improved public access, better land management, clear flowing chalk streams, cherished cultural heritage and landscape character, as well as richer in nature. Contributions should come from development in and also around the AONB to increase capacity of the AONB as a natural haven and wellbeing resource. In National Parks and AONB, environmental net gain should include funding projects that connect people to the natural environment, and restoring and enhancing natural beauty. This would match the 25yr Environment Plan proposal for environmental net gain. It should</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>involve a “biodiversity PLUS” approach, rather than allowing biodiversity net gain to be exchanged for a visitor or wellbeing project.</p> <p>Also specifically, the text mentions water use and flood risk. Along with water quality (affected by run off and discharge), these factors seriously impact the internationally important Chalk Streams found in the Chilterns. Net gain might be measured in terms of reduced abstraction, measures reducing flood events, improved chalk stream flow and water quality. The latter can be successfully measured by River Fly monitoring (<a href="https://catchmentbasedapproach.org/learn/the-riverfly-partnership/">https://catchmentbasedapproach.org/learn/the-riverfly-partnership/</a> )</p> <p>10. Is the Defra biodiversity metric an appropriate practical tool for measuring changes to biodiversity as a result of development?</p> <p>Yes helpful but not the only tool. The metric is a tool for assessing relative value of a site at a given place in time. Continued review and development of the metric would be supported.</p> <p>Changes in habitat improvement and species presence and abundance are woefully underrepresented in the proposals. Reliance on ERC species data is a major risk at both a strategic and site-based level due to the gaps in recording effort and systematic collection – this gives developers a justification for doing the bare minimum as records for species not showing on searches (e.g. BTO bird records are not shared with ERCs at the moment so massive gaps even in desk based data requests - this needs to also be addressed. Commitment to ongoing and well-designed monitoring is vital, it is under resourced and this needs to be factored into the tariffs to allow for proper, robust and independent monitoring to be carried through the lifespan of an offset project.</p> <p>Having comprehensive habitat and biological records across the country is essential. Concern has been raised that, in some instances, sites have been allowed to deteriorate prior to the initial ecological assessment so that the inherent biodiversity value (number of units) is minimised. Robust habitat mapping will help to minimise this issue.</p> <p>Over recent years, county resources have been stretched, putting pressure on county records centres. Possibly, a percentage of any funds raised from the metric/offsetting system should be allocated to maintaining and improving biological records and their availability across the country.</p> <p>There is little capacity in the system to oversee and fulfil the net gain proposals at the moment. Warwickshire deal with this by top slicing a fee on each site – DEFRA need to recognise that a local accountable body (NEPs, AONBs) need capacity to ensure process works.</p> <p>11. What improvements, if any, could we most usefully make to the Defra metric?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of a wider environmental net gain metric should recognise landscape designations including AONBs and National Parks. A premium should be paid, or increase in % net gain, or</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>increase in tariff for development in protected Landscape (AONB, National Park etc)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjustment for important regional/local habitats or designations.</li> <li>• Habitat connectivity- the Lawton principles for biodiversity improvement need to be applied at a landscape scale. Buffer zones around sites need to be factored into the scoring to avoid/reflect the wider impact of development on habitat connectivity, which can't be solely limited to the footprint of the sites.</li> <li>• The tariffs and costings attached to the DEFRA metric do not represent the true cost of delivering net gain. Bucks NEP estimate the costs for delivery to be only c. 25% of the actual cost and would prohibit net gain to be delivered if applied. A review of true costs should be undertaken and the options for a regionally tailored scale applied to reflect local economics. House and land prices in South East England are high, so will need more funding to deliver net gain. For example the Chilterns is becoming increasingly expensive as a place to live. Research by Savills using Land Registry data shows that the average house price in the Chilterns AONB in 2017-2018 was £718,629, this is a premium of 75% above the average house price for the counties, and 162% above the UK average.</li> <li>• Concerned about scores for condition potentially encouraging habitat destruction or degradation in advance of an application.</li> <li>• It would be better if the metric included assessment of the opportunity costs of developing land. Even land whose current habitat distinctiveness category might be assessed as 'low' will have a potential to contribute to biodiversity and other objectives to a significant degree. For example, arable fields or temporary grassland which would currently be assessed as 'low' habitat distinctiveness could, if managed as part of a regenerative agriculture operation, provide significant gains for biodiversity, soil carbon, food production, local employment and local landscape character. Any net gain method should take account of a site's potential to contribute to multiple planning objectives under a non-development scenario.</li> </ul> <p>12. Would a mandatory 10% increase in biodiversity units be the right level of gain to be required?</p> <p>No. A higher figure will be needed, a minimum of 20%, plus added premiums for designated sites and/or protected landscapes (National Parks and AONBs).</p> <p>Significant and continued loss of habitat decline of species numbers and even species loss in recent decades is regularly reported. If such biodiversity losses are to be reduced or even reversed, then a 10% increase in biodiversity units must be regarded as an absolute minimum. A 20% gain would have a greater chance of meeting the Government's promise <i>'to be the first generation to leave the environment in a better state than we inherited it'</i>.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>13. In clearly defined circumstances, should developers be allowed to pay through the tariff mechanism without fully exhausting on-site and local compensation opportunities?</p> <p>No. Robust safeguards need to be in place to ensure that this is not seen as an option for buying site degradation. Net gain tariffs should not be used as a way of facilitating development in circumstances where existing statutory protection would preclude it. Biodiversity loss must be avoided or minimised in the first place, following the mitigation hierarchy.</p> <p>However, we do recognise that, where there is unavoidable loss, there may be special circumstances where greater biodiversity net gain is achieved by combining off site tariff contributions from a number of developments to achieve more significant environmental gains.</p> <p>14. Would this be an appropriate approach to directing the location of new habitat?</p> <p>A properly applied ‘spatial hierarchy’ approach is supported. Whilst recognising the importance of focused attention on habitats (e.g. through county ‘Biodiversity Opportunity Areas’ or ‘Conservation Target Areas’), the ordinary also needs protecting before it becomes endangered. The once common Water Vole, Tree Sparrow and Hedgehog are now increasingly rare and threatened. Such species and their habitats need protecting but we mustn’t neglect, take for granted or undervalue our ‘common’ species and their habitats.</p> <p>See point 8 above. In 25 years, species such as Starling and Song Thrush will be S41 species so acting now to slow their decline is critical and needs longer term vision.</p> <p>15. How could biodiversity assessments be made more robust without adding to burdens for developers or planning authorities?</p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board recognises and welcomes further development of remote sensing but, at the present time, verifiable site surveying and assessment needs to be relied upon. Local planning authorities need to be confident to uphold standards for site assessment so that communities can be satisfied that existing biodiversity is being properly recognised.</p> <p>The narrative of net gain being a burden is worrying and not consistent with the long term 25-year plan vision. We shouldn’t shy away from recognising the true costs of doing the job properly (and securing ownership/pride of all involved and ensuring resources are made available to offer capacity for local delivery). This would enable more robust and specific habitat and species surveys to ensure net gain is informed by credible evidence as opposed to what is currently available – technology not ready to replace ground truthing.</p> <p>16. Should a baseline map of broad habitats be developed?</p>	
--	---	--

		<p>Comprehensive baseline habitat mapping would be welcome. However, some method of assessing habitat condition needs to be incorporated.</p> <p>This would be a big piece of work but would offer the foundation stone for many other pieces of work locally to deliver 25 Environment Plan. Key point here that to achieve net gain DEFRA need to invest in local capacity to deliver or risk it not happening and/or be a reactive process not strategically delivered for maximum impact.</p> <p>Likewise, gaps in species data need to be plugged with wider countryside baseline survey work and better sharing of data (e.g., BTO data)</p> <p>17. Should this be applied, as a minimum baseline, to:  a. net gain calculations for all development?  Agree as part of the assessment process along with condition assessment, buffer zones and species  b. net gain calculations in cases of suspected intentional habitat degradation?  Definitely.</p> <p>18. What other measures might reduce the risk of incentivising intentional habitat degradation?  Evidence of intentional habitat degradation should be penalised to such an extent that this is not seen as a viable option. A strong national and local government position, with precedent set by test cases, might strengthen this position.  Where 'green field' sites are being considered for development, might the requirement for a 10-year history of land use be helpful?</p> <p>Undertake a baseline habitat assessment ASAP and in the early stage of roll out and see this as the 'doomsday book'. resource local NEPs of other bodies to carry out phase 1 or UK Hab. surveys, massive call to action, step change in approach and safeguard baseline.</p> <p>19. How can the risks of penalising landowners making legitimate land use change decisions before deciding to sell their land for development be mitigated?</p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board is a consultee for Agricultural Environmental Impact Assessments. Unfortunately, this system has its limitations. Lack of recorded evidence, change of land ownership or contractual arrangements, not knowing what has previously been present or has developed, can lead to biodiversity loss or degradation. This might be unintentional though, in some cases, land use change has been paramount and the loss of biodiversity an accepted consequence.  We recommend that DEFRA continue to work with the farming and forestry sector and other stakeholders to develop systems and incentives to manage and protect biodiversity. Both regulation and satisfactory environmental land management schemes are required. Landowners need greater</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>encouragement and support to value and protect biodiversity on the land they manage.</p> <p>Needs to be greater linkages to development of ELMs and to find ways of creating more direct and trusting relationships with landowners (via NEP, farmer clusters etc) better way of creating lasting commitment to deliver net gain. Net gain cannot be seen just as a transactional relationship nor in isolation from other land management schemes.</p> <p>20. The provision of compensatory habitats will need to be guided by habitat opportunity maps. At what scale should these maps be developed?</p> <p>a. Locally (e.g. local authority or National Character Area)  b. Nationally (i.e. England) as a national framework to be refined, updated and amended locally</p> <p>Both local and national habitat mapping have their place. However, local habitat mapping is essential. This enables detailed recognition of local habitat areas and specific locations which may, for example, be found in valley systems within wider landscapes. Local mapping helps local communities to value their important local habitats.</p> <p>Within the Chilterns, we have good examples of habitat opportunity mapping, for example, the Chilterns Conservation Target areas (some of the Oxfordshire CTAs mapped by the Thames Valley Environmental Record Centre - TVERC) and Chilterns Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (some of Buckinghamshire's BOAs mapped by the Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Record Centre – BMERC). Local record centres need adequate resources to ensure habitat mapping is kept up to date.</p> <p>Sub regional bodies (e.g., AONB, NEP) should be challenged and supported to produce 'strategy maps' for their areas that identify suitable habitat project types, locations and where possible sites to help support net gain delivery. These need to be on a wide enough spatial scale to ensure Lawton principles can be applied but local enough for site specific planning to be supported. This is not possible at National level and Local Authority boundaries do not reflect geological and/or habitat/landscape connections. E.g., river catchments.</p> <p>Common theme point here but here needs to be a single, locally approved body charged with overseeing net gain to give oversight and to make connections outside of net gain projects (NGO work, funded landscape scale projects, Agri Environment schemes etc).</p> <p>21. What other measures should be considered to identify biodiversity and natural capital priorities?</p> <p>Priority species and any associated projects might help inform priorities. For example, Duke of Burgundy Butterfly and Water Vole projects are already informing habitat management within the Chilterns.</p> <p>Whilst all natural capital resources are important, stakeholders will be able to identify priority actions. For example, improving water quality and reducing use will benefit the Chilterns aquifer</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>which supplies water for our internationally important chalk streams and is regionally important for public drinking water.</p> <p>See points raised above in question 8 about integrated species assemblages in to site assessment and scoring as this applies to this question. Water Framework Directive condition data should also be used and applied on a catchment basis to give a wider indication of water quality and the biodiversity water courses do/could hold. Likewise, soil analysis could/should be factored into analyses.</p> <p>22. Would mandating net gain through the planning system be enough to stimulate the growth of a market for biodiversity units?</p> <p>Tariff levels would have to be set at levels high enough to resource both the purchase of units and administration of the chosen system to oversee the offset unit provider(s) – contracts, monitoring etc.</p> <p>We are concerned with the suggestion that developers might be able to trade surplus biodiversity units. Similar examples of market trading in the past (e.g. milk quotas) have had detrimental effects on new entrants and innovation. Surplus units should be traded/allocated by independent bodies. Likewise, a system of accreditation of unit providers might have benefits but may also narrow the base of providers and exclude a wide range of landowners, e.g. farmers and foresters.</p> <p>The scheme needs an approved body with capacity to manage, provide expertise and independence to the process, enforce commitments and to make sure maximum benefit is delivered and at strategically important sites – this would help mitigate risks in this instance.</p> <p>23. What further measures would help to ensure that the market provides:</p> <p>a. Sufficient biodiversity units for development?</p> <p>Clear guidance, local advice and targeted/strategic ‘marketing’ to a wide base of potential providers – focusing, for example, on land managers and land owners within habitat opportunity areas (e.g. BOAs and CTAs – see 20 above). This would ensure ecological connectivity could be driven to achieve net gain where it matters most. This would also offer a network of committed landowners more likely to carry out work and deliver in the long term.</p> <p>b. Cost-effective biodiversity units?</p> <p>A robust and fully funded system of monitoring, potentially linked to a form of payment by results, might ensure good value units are provided as explained in question 10</p> <p>24. Should there be a minimum duration for the maintenance of created or enhanced habitats? Yes</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>25. If so, what should the minimum duration be?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Less than 25 years</li> <li>b. 25 to 30 years</li> <li>c. Longer than 25-30 years</li> <li>d. Permanent</li> </ul> <p>Permanent. The habitat lost to development will be permanently lost so it should have a permanent replacement.</p> <p>26. Would conservation covenants be useful for securing long term benefits from biodiversity net gain or reducing process and legal costs?</p> <p>Yes, although we would like to see this option fully explored and different models considered. It is doubtful that one model will fit all unit providing proposals. A range of tools/options could/should be used and local agencies overseeing net gain should be empowered to negotiate solutions that best fit each site/landowner. Key to any solution is the power in the agreements to enforce delivery over the course of the length of agreement and beyond and for this to be robust and meaningful.</p> <p>27. What safeguards might be needed in the implementation of conservation covenants?</p> <p>Mechanism to ensure the covenant stays with the land if land ownership is changed.</p> <p>A robust and fully funded system of monitoring. This should involve regular ongoing surveys, remote sensing and working to agreed management plans. This could potentially link to a form of payment by results, to ensure good value units are provided and maintained.</p> <p>The power to enforce should stay with local delivery agency and any successor body and they are accountable for enforcing</p> <p>28. Does this proposed range for tariff costs fit with the principles set out in this section?</p> <p>Tariffs should be set locally because land prices differ widely across the country.</p> <p>Work carried out by the Buckinghamshire NEP suggests that this tariff range will be too low for this region of the UK – land costs, contractor and management rates in the south east being more expensive than elsewhere in the country. The proposed tariff rate is too low to secure permanent net gains. Also - if a national tariff was in place, at these rates it risks under-cutting locally-derived biodiversity unit costs. Unless biodiversity unit costs are priced at a realistic (higher) level, some players would be priced out of the market in delivering long-term gains, as the associated costs around good quality long-term management and particularly with possible land purchase to secure permanent gains would be much higher than the proposed range.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>29. Would this proposed range for tariff costs provide opportunities for cost-effective habitat banks and compensation providers to compete?</p> <p>No, unless biodiversity unit costs are priced at a realistic (higher) level, some players would be priced out of the market in delivering long-term gains. For NGOs (Woodland Trust, Wildlife Trust, RSPB etc) land purchase to secure habitats in perpetuity might be impossible in the South East of England.</p> <p>It might mean that habitat banks are the only options as other providers can't afford to deliver and we lose the ability to work on important sites – only those sites that are part of a bank. This would be a wrong step and cause compromise in the quality/breadth and depth of work delivered and net gain achieved. Costs need to be reviewed and both into line with industry norms and allow for regional variation.</p> <p>We question why it is an intention to generate competition – surely net gain needs to be focused on investing in the right sites to achieve the right results for biodiversity, competition may well not trigger this approach and by taking resources out of the conservation networks and compromise the standards of delivery/expertise. This could have hidden consequences on the capacity of NGOs and actually achieve net loss in the wider landscape.</p> <p>30. Do you agree with the proposed principles for setting the tariff rate, as set out in this section? Please suggest any other factors that should be taken in to account.</p> <p>'Delivery and monitoring costs of the compensation scheme' needs to cover the full costs, including on-going monitoring and recording (local record centres), legal contractual arrangements, assessing progress towards delivery of units, seeking new projects and providers (brokering).</p> <p>Key theme here that net gain needs to be delivered through a single body locally who are given the capacity to oversee the project (suggest this is at a sub-regional level – Local Nature Partnership, NEPs or AONB partnerships or AONB Conservation Boards) and independent of LPAs and developers and needs to be empowered to deliver, enforce and join up with their opportunities available locally to deliver against the 25-year environment plan.</p> <p>31. How should the tariff revenue be collected?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Locally (e.g. through a local authority)</li> <li>b. Nationally (e.g. through Natural England or another national body)</li> <li>c. Other, please specify</li> </ul> <p>a) Locally through local planning authorities who are processing the planning applications or through Local Nature Partnerships.</p> <p>32. How should the tariff revenue be spent?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Locally (e.g. through a local authority)</li> <li>b. Nationally (e.g. through Natural England or another national body)</li> <li>c. Through a blended model, allowing spending at both levels</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

		<p>d. Other, please specify</p> <p>d) In protected landscapes like National Parks and AONBs, the National Park Authorities or AONB Partnerships or AONB Conservation Boards should deliver the spend. In wider areas local nature partnerships or environmental trusts might be better placed to administer such revenues and offer a degree of independence from the planning system.</p> <p>33. If tariff revenue is collected and spent nationally, should spending prioritise areas which have contributed the most through biodiversity net gain tariff payments?</p> <p>No – these should be decoupled, and a more strategic view be taken. There could be an argument for spending to be prioritised on like for like habitat (calcareous grassland in the Chilterns linked with Hampshire or Lincolnshire) bit otherwise no – especially if habitat banking takes a grip then this would distort the focus of net gain.</p> <p>34. What further measures will help to prevent burdens on local authorities increasing?</p> <p>We are concerned about the narrative here of net gain being a burden on Local Authorities.</p> <p>A key theme here is that net gain needs to be delivered through a single body locally who are given the capacity to oversee the project. Best to take this out of the hands of developers and LPAs, pool resources and deliver a centralised support service – akin to the model being delivered in Warwickshire or at a sub-regional level – Local Nature Partnership, NEPs or AONB partnerships or AONB Conservation Boards). They should be independent of LPAs and developers and empowered to deliver, enforce and join up with their opportunities available locally to deliver against the 25-year environment plan.</p> <p>35. How could the proposals be refined to manage any negative impacts on the scale and delivery of other developer contributions (e.g. through Section 106 or Community Infrastructure Levy payments)?</p> <p>As per question 30 - a body positioned strategically can make the connections between all opportunities across the stakeholders and funding streams and be held accountable for delivery. In the bigger picture net gain is one of a number of opportunities to deliver the 25-year environment plan and capacity needs to be offered to make this happen at a sub regional level (Bucks NEP for example)</p> <p>36. Would you, as a planning authority stakeholder, prefer any net gain tariff revenue to be paid through:</p> <p>a. local authority administration?</p> <p>b. a nationally managed funding scheme (which could then</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>reinvest in local habitat schemes best aligned with national strategic environmental priorities)?</p> <p>None of the above, at local or sub-regional level, but not necessarily the local authority eg Local Nature Partnership, NEPs or AONB partnerships/ AONB Conservation Boards</p> <p>37. How could the proposed net gain process be improved for developers?</p> <p>A single body to run the process, access and deploy ecological expertise and to support landowners engage and develop site specific plans and to oversee long term monitoring.</p> <p>38. What other steps, considerations or processes in environmental planning could be integrated within a net gain approach?</p> <p>See question 30 – a single body to provide economies of scale and make connections and generate added value. In Buckinghamshire combine with HLF funded schemes, HS2 mitigation schemes, EWR schemes, LEI schemes – all disjointed and struggling with same issues of access to landowners, expertise and capacity to manage.</p> <p>On large landed estates, we suggest using a model like the Whole Estate Plan model being piloted by the South Downs National Park Authority (see their website). In return for support for some limited development on an estate, this delivers net gain on the wider estate. Not just biodiversity but it is a good example of natural capital net gain, which can deliver additional access to the countryside, restoration of natural beauty as well as wildlife gains. We have also been trialling this in the Chilterns AONB with the Mapledurham Estate. If DEFRA would like to engagement further with stakeholders and trial new methods, we would like to volunteer for this.</p> <p>39. Would any particular types of development (e.g. commercial, industrial, public sector, local infrastructure) be disproportionately affected by a mandatory biodiversity net gain requirement?</p> <p>Cannot see a reason why they would, why would you legislate differently net gain as a principle should remain regardless</p> <p>40. Do you agree that the proposal for staggered transitional arrangements would help to ensure smooth implementation of biodiversity net gain policy?</p> <p>Yes, need time to test and bed down process and build capacity as per question 30</p> <p>41. Would the existing dispute resolution process provide the best way to overcome any disagreement over whether net gain is achieved?</p> <p>If go down our suggested route of delivery through a single body locally who are given the capacity to oversee the project (suggest this is at a sub-regional level – Local Nature Partnership, NEPs or AONB partnerships or AONB Conservation Boards) then take this out of the hands of LPA and developer and create independent body to manage and arbitrate</p> <p>42. Would an additional arbitration or approval process be necessary? If so, please specify why.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>It may need an arbitration or appeals process.</p> <p>43. Are there any issues or measures, other than those outlined, that we should consider when considering how to monitor biodiversity net gain?</p> <p>Monitoring needs to be robust and ongoing through the life of a project but also needs to be part of an ongoing management review process and locally empowerment to change plans in response to monitoring results – can't be so fixed (as current Countryside Stewardship) that doesn't allow for local management tweaks to allow outcomes to be delivered</p> <p>44. Should local authorities be required to provide information about habitat losses and gains?</p> <p>Yes. Freely accessible data will help stakeholders (location, habitat, species specific) to assess progress for their particular area of interest. Publishing documents such as Oxfordshire State of the Countryside reports should be part of the accountability attached to the delivery model.</p> <p>45. What technological or other innovative mechanisms could facilitate the delivery and monitoring of biodiversity net gain?</p> <p>Remote sensing and aerial photography could be used to check habitat extent, both habitats lost and gained. A record of aerial photographs could be kept to monitor change over time. This record could be used to make sure landowners are sticking to their commitments to provide the replacement habitat.</p>	
<p>South Oxfordshire Local Plan, Publication version</p>	<p>SODC</p>	<p><u>Our Vision for 2034</u></p> <p>The vision including maintaining the beauty of the district (good) but there is nothing about health and wellbeing or improving the condition of the environment. It should include thriving wildlife, health and wellbeing and the ecosystems services that the natural environment provides.</p> <p>For contrast this is the vision of the South Downs National Park Local plan (note that AONB and National Parks have equal and highest level of protection in NPPF para 172):</p> <p>"By 2050 in the South Downs National Park: The iconic English lowland landscapes and heritage will have been conserved and greatly enhanced. These inspirational and distinctive places, where people live, work, farm and relax, are adapting well to the impacts of climate change and other pressures. People will understand, value, and look after the vital natural services that the National Park provides. Large areas of high-quality and well-managed habitat will form a network supporting wildlife throughout the landscape. Opportunities will exist for everyone to discover, enjoy, understand and value the National Park and its special qualities. The relationship between people and landscape will enhance their lives and inspire them to become actively involved in caring for it and using its resources more responsibly. Its special qualities will underpin the economic and social wellbeing of the communities in and around it, which will be more self-sustaining and empowered to shape their own future. Its villages and market towns will be thriving</p>	<p>14.2.19</p>

	<p>centres for residents, visitors and businesses and supporting the wider rural community.                  Successful farming, forestry, tourism and other business activities within the National Park will actively contribute to, and derive economic benefit from, its unique identity and special qualities."</p> <p>Add to the end of the vision: "with a thriving natural environment, protected both for its own sake and the ecosystems services it provides for residents and visitors"</p> <p><u>Photo under para 3.7</u>                  Poor choice of photo for caption " The North Wessex Downs and Chilterns Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be protected and enhanced". Not sure whether to laugh or cry? This is the only photo in the Local Plan about the AONBs and it is a photo of a modern housing estate. It shows Great Western Park, which is not even in AONB.. Furthermore this design and massing of development would not be appropriate for the AONB. The photo shows hard landscaping with expanses of tarmac and metal fencing, with no trees, no hedges, no local distinctiveness, no local materials, no green infrastructure.</p> <p>Suggest replace with a photo which conveys the beauty and quality of the AONB in South Oxfordshire.</p> <p><u>Para 3.1</u>                  This is the first proper introductory paragraph of the Local Plan, painting a portrait of the district. It would be helpful and informative if the plan explained how many people live in South Oxfordshire and how many homes there are. The omission of this obvious introductory materials makes it difficult to understand the scale of growth proposed in the local plan.</p> <p>Suggest adding:                  "As of March 2011, there were 134,300 people living in South Oxfordshire district in 54,100 homes. (Source Census 2011 Summary South Oxfordshire, SODC 2014)"</p> <p><u>Para 3.7</u>                  It would be helpful if the total area of the district, and the percentage covered by Green Belt and AONB, is explained to give a spatial portrait of the district and the extent of some key constraints. This was done in the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and the Core Strategy and forms useful reference data for a local plan.</p> <p>Suggest add further information:                  "South Oxfordshire is a mainly rural district in South East England covering an area of 65,521 hectares or 253 square miles. 42% of the district is covered by two Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty – the North Wessex Downs and the Chilterns AONBs. In the north of the district a further 23% of the district forms part of the designated Oxford Green Belt*" (*The GB figure will need checking post boundary changes proposed in the plan)</p> <p><u>Objective 7.1</u></p>	
--	---	--

	<p>The current objective 7.1 "Protect and enhance the natural environment, including biodiversity, the landscape, green infrastructure and our waterways, placing particular importance on the value of the Oxford Green Belt, our two Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the River Thames."</p> <p>is flawed in that it fails to reflect the designations hierarchy (NPPF para 171), or give great weight to the AONB (NPPF para 172). It mentions the whole of the natural environment before the AONB, and places the value of the Green Belt, AONBs and River Thames on an equal footing.</p> <p>The plan should also refer to natural capital and ecosystems services here, see NPPF para 170</p> <p>"170. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:</p> <p>b) recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland;"</p> <p>Re-order, so that AONBs are given great weight:</p> <p>"Protect and enhance the natural environment, including biodiversity, the landscape, green infrastructure and our waterways, placing great weight on the importance of our two Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and valuing the River Thames and the Oxford Green Belt" and add objective about ecosystems services.</p> <p><u>STRAT1</u></p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board would like to see more emphasis on the AONB in the overall strategy.</p> <p>The wording muddles the undesignated countryside, the AONBs and the Green Belt. Conserving and enhancing the AONB should be promoted the first bullet point in the strategy. This would be consistent with the Council's saved South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 which put 'protecting and enhancing the natural and built environment' as its first key objective. The current overall strategy doesn't get to the countryside until the ninth bullet point (these bullet would be easier to reference if numbered) 'protecting and enhancing the countryside and particularly those areas within the two AONBs and Oxford Green Belt by ensuring that outside of the towns and villages any change relates to very specific needs such as those of the agricultural industry or enhancement of the environment.' This is a muddle in that it fails to reflect the designations hierarchy (NPPF para 170) or give great weight to the AONB (as required by the NPPF para 172). It puts the general countryside before the AONB, and the AONB and Green Belt on an equal footing. AONBs are a national designation, protected for the nation, and designated by Government through legislation. Green Belt is a local designation which does not require land to have intrinsic environmental or landscape value. Green Belt boundaries can be amended through local plan reviews. Put AONBs first to reflect the designation hierarchy and comply with the NPPF para 171 that "Plans should: distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites; allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value."</p> <p>Around half of South Oxfordshire is covered by AONB, which is a nationally protected landscape. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) are designated by the Government for the</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>purpose of ensuring that the special qualities of the finest landscapes in England and Wales are conserved and enhanced. In policy terms they have the same planning status as National Parks (NPPF para 172). The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 section 85 places a statutory duty on local authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of AONBs when coming to decisions or carrying out their activities relating to, or affecting, land within these areas.</p> <p>South Oxfordshire is the largest of the ten local authorities with land in the Chilterns AONB, with 27.9% of the Chilterns AONB falling within South Oxfordshire. Having a good development plan strategy and set of policies in South Oxfordshire is essential for the long term future of the Chilterns AONB, and SODC holds a very significant responsibility to cherish it. This plan does not adequately provide vision, strategy or policy for the AONBs. The AONBs are hardly mentioned.</p> <p>Promote conserving and enhancing the AONB to the first bullet point in the strategy, in order to give it the great weight set out in NPPF para 172. Disentangle AONB from Green Belt and the wider countryside. Re-word 'protecting' to 'conserving' to match NPPF para 172, and the words used in AONB legislation in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 section 85.</p> <p><u>STRAT2</u></p> <p>The housing figures are excessively high. They do not show regard to policies in the Framework that protect areas of assets of particular importance. South Oxfordshire is especially blessed with such assets which are numerous in South Oxfordshire, including nationally designated landscapes for which there is a legal duty of regard.</p> <p>The draft plan at para 4.15 correctly explains that “National Planning Policy is clear that local planning authorities should, as a minimum provide for the objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in their area” but it fails to mention that para 11 of the NPPF goes on to set out an important caveat: "unless: i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area;"</p> <p>The NPPF footnote then lists assets that provide a strong reason for restricting development as: "habitats sites (and those sites listed in paragraph 176) and/or designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, a National Park (or within the Broads Authority) or defined as Heritage Coast; irreplaceable habitats; designated heritage assets (and other heritage assets of archaeological interest referred to in footnote 63); and areas at risk of flooding or coastal change." South Oxfordshire is rich in most of these categories.</p> <p>SODC's approach of not just meeting OAN but setting a much higher figure is inappropriate for a LPA with a total of 65% of the district either in the AONB or Green Belt. It would be fine if the Council was managing to accommodate the growth outside the AONB (or Green Belt) and not affecting it, but that is not the case with this plan. The spatial strategy in the plan involves development at AONB settlements, which in practice means housing development on AONB green field sites at the edge of settlements.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>The cumulative impacts have not been properly assessed. The plan fails to balance the different priorities. In order to meet the requirements for sustainable development, proposals should not result in significantly adverse impacts on the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole. This includes the NPPF para 172 on the AONB.</p> <p>The Council has a statutory duty to have regard to conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB (Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 sec 85) as well as statutory duties towards conserving biodiversity (NERC Act 2006 sec 40) and conserving the historic environment (Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sections 16, 66 and 72). These legislative duties are of higher importance than the NPPF, which as national policy has the status of a material consideration. Para 4.16 of the draft plan says the standard OAN method “does not automatically translate into the housing requirement for the Local Plan that will need to take into account other factors when determining the homes to plan for” but it goes on in para 4.17 to take the approach that these will only be uplift factors, there is no mention of constraints listed under NPPF para 11 footnote 6 which mean that a lower than OAN figure could be appropriate.</p> <p>To put the housing figures into perspective, looking back at the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 this planned for a total of 8,791 homes over the 15 year period, based on the Oxfordshire Structure Plan requirement of 8,000 dwellings in the SODC between 1996 and 2011. It focussed on brownfield sites in the market towns and needed greenfield sites only at Didcot. Even this was hard to achieve, with slow delivery at Didcot.</p> <p>The standard methodology OAN figure for South Oxfordshire is 556 homes a year. Over a 15 year plan period this equates to 15 x 556= 8,340. The new plan proposes a much higher requirement of 22,775 homes, and proposed a higher still supply of 28,465. The plan is over allocating housing by at least 5,690 homes. It seems highly ambitious and raises deliverability questions. The pace and scale of change on the nature and character of South Oxfordshire has not been addressed, for instance reflecting on the existing number of homes in South Oxfordshire and what proportion of an increase this is. As of March 2011, there were 134,300 people living in South Oxfordshire district and 54,100 households with at least one resident in South Oxfordshire district. (Source Census 2011 Summary South Oxfordshire, SODC 2014 accessed online). The draft plan proposes a supply of 28,465 homes in 15 years. That would take it to 82,565 homes. It represents an increase of 52% in the district's housing stock in just 15 years. The current housing stock has developed through gradual incremental growth of rural settlements over the last 500 years.</p> <p>The plan fails to have regard to the role of South Oxfordshire as a historic and rural district in the wider region. Covered in large area by nationally protected landscape and several SACs, South Oxfordshire is the largest authority in the Chilterns AONB. Such a vast inflation of the housing figures in a district covered 42% by Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a further 23% constrained by the Oxford Green Belt, must raise major questions of the council's strategy. We ask that the soundness of this</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>approach is rigorously tested during the examination. Also legal compliance in the light of the statutory duty of regard towards conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB (Section 85 of CRoW Act 2000).</p> <p>Lower the housing requirements to a more realistic scale and pace of change, because South Oxfordshire is rich in assets that provide a strong reason for restricting development as listed in NPPF para 11 and footnote 6.</p> <p>Complete the wording in para 4.16 to include the NPPF's important caveat: "unless: i. the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development in the plan area;"</p> <p>Have regard to policies in the Framework that protect areas of assets of particular importance such as the AONBs, and to statutory duties.</p> <p><u>STRAT5</u> Residential densities are too high for AONB villages and market towns. The asterisk explains this, but puts the onus on the developer to show why they cannot achieve densities of 45 dph (larger villages), 40dph (smaller villages) and 35dph (other locations). Instead why not list the AONB towns and villages and set an appropriate density eg 25dph, with the onus on developers to make the case for site accommodating higher densities where this is appropriate? The asterisk should be deleted because it implies that land in habitats sites (eg Special Areas of Conservation), SSSIs, irreplaceable habitats etc are potentially acceptable locations for building housing, which they are clearly not. To stop overcrowding of sites and insufficient space for planting trees which can reach maturity, suggest a housing size policy limiting the size of new dwellings. In the Chilterns AONB we support small scale homes like traditional Chilterns cottages, and terraces of cottages, but too often see oversized homes on rural plots that do not meet the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide.</p> <p>Delete asterisk and instead insert row setting a lower density for AONB settlements of 25dph, with the onus on developers to make the case for a site accommodating higher densities where this is appropriate.</p> <p><u>STRAT7</u> We support 3 (iv) the requirement for the masterplan to show how "(iv) long distance views from the AONB have been considered" This is important because the airfield site is visible in long distance panoramic views from National Trust open access land at Watlington Hill.</p> <p><u>Para 5.5 and Table 5c</u> Windfall projections are too conservative, why only count 100 a year when since 2011 South Oxfordshire has had on average 145 dwellings per annum from windfall sites? This is leading to over-allocation of greenfield land. The plan lacks a brownfield first focus in its strategy. Windfalls (often brownfield) will contribute more. Count 145 dwellings per annum from windfall sites.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p><u>Policy H3</u></p> <p>The allocation at Henley-on-Thames is too high. Henley-on-Thames is constrained by the AONB and the setting of the AONB. The first neighbourhood plan has already allocated the most suitable sites. The Council has a statutory duty under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (section 85) to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty. The NPPF para 172 instructs that "Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues" and "The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited". Very little weight appears to have been given to the AONB in the distribution decision.</p> <p>The numbers for Henley could easily be lowered by reducing the over-supply provided for in the plan. The 15% allocation, on top of Core Strategy allocations, could involve major development in the AONB, which is specifically prohibited by paragraph 172 of the NPPF unless in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest. Accommodating a mathematically-derived proportion of housing growth is unlikely to meet that test, it is not exceptional, there are no national considerations, and alternative sites outside the AONB exist in the district (and wider housing market area). It is unsatisfactory to park the issue of what is acceptable until the neighbourhood plan process, as proposed by para 5.16 "Ultimately the detailed evidence base will need to be provided to support each NDP and its assessment of capacity, whether this is to support a higher or lower number than that provided in Table 5d". It runs counter to the requirement for strategic environmental assessment to ensure that options and their effects are explored and understood.</p> <p>Para 5.16 suggesting a case of a lower number could be made through the NDP process is also inconsistent with Policy H3 which takes a tougher stance, referring to the numbers as "requirements" and stepping in with a presumption in favour for planning applications if NDP's have failed to meet these "requirements".</p> <p>The sanction of a presumption in favour is directly inconsistent with para 5.15 which states that the sanction would be that the local planning authority would step in to make allocations in those towns. Clarity is needed: is it allocations or speculative applications? Establishing a local presumption in favour is contrary to the NPPF para 11 footnote 6 which clearly establishes that a presumption in favour is not to be applied in AONBs.</p> <p>The housing numbers for Henley-on-Thames should be reduced to take into account the constraint of the AONB. The Council needs to demonstrate it is meeting its statutory duty of regard towards conserving and enhancing the AONB. This is likely to mean lower numbers for Henley-on-Thames, which is highly constrained and should again be capped as in the Core Strategy, and potentially for Wallingford which is in the setting of both the Chilterns AONB and North Wessex Downs AONB.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>The sanction establishing a presumption in favour should be amended as follows:                  "If a Neighbourhood Development Plan has not adequately progressed with allocating sites* and numbers have not been met otherwise through completions and commitments to meet these requirements within 12 months of adoption of this Local Plan, planning applications for housing in the market towns will be supported provided that proposals comply with the overall housing distribution strategy as set out in policy STRAT1 and unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted**.                  **see footnote 6 of the NPPF."</p> <p><u>Policy H4</u></p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board does not support applying a proportional growth figure of 15% growth, on top of Core Strategy numbers, to the larger villages. Since 15% on top of Core Strategy numbers is the same percentage as the market towns, this is no kind of a spatial planning hierarchy. The numbers could easily be lowered by reducing the over-supply provided for in the plan. The Council has a statutory duty under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (section 85) to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty. The NPPF para 172 instructs that "Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. " It goes on with the new sentence, added in the 2018 update of the NPPF: "The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited." Very little weight appears to have been given in the distribution decision. The larger villages policy H4 does not mention the AONB. The 15% allocation could involve major development in the AONB, which is specifically prohibited by paragraph 172 of the NPPF unless in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest. Accommodating a mathematically-derived village growth percentage is unlikely to meet that test; it is not exceptional, there are no national considerations, and alternative sites exist. It is unreasonable to defer to neighbourhood plans the responsibility for carrying out a major development assessment which should be done at the point of split between the larger villages, because neighbourhood plans are the wrong spatial scale to carry out the assessment of whether there are alternatives sites not in the AONB (NPPF para 172 major development test second bullet).</p> <p>Settlements in or in the setting of the AONB should have special consideration. This national landscape designation will clearly constrain the ability to accommodate further development in the AONB and to a lesser extent in the setting of the AONB. The NPPF is clear that LPAs should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value (para 171), which will mean avoiding land in the AONB or its setting. The Chilterns Conservation Board considers that the Council should focus development on sites outside, and which do not affect the setting or appreciation of, the AONBs. It will require a spatial distribution which avoids AONB land and involves care in the setting of the AONB. In the AONB development should invariably be small in scale and to meet identified needs. The</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>cumulative effects on the AONB need consideration, where multiple sites around a settlement are to be developed, where development will increase traffic levels and impact on air quality on roads through the AONB, or where recreation pressures on the AONB will increase. It is unsatisfactory to park the issue of what is acceptable until the neighbourhood plan process, as proposed by para 5.30 "Ultimately the detailed evidence base will need to be provided to support each NDP and its assessment of capacity, whether this is to support a higher or lower number than that provided in Table 5f". It runs counter to the requirement for strategic environmental assessment to ensure that options and their effects are explored and understood.</p> <p>Para 5.30 suggesting a case of a lower number could be made through the NDP process is also inconsistent with Policy H4 which takes a tougher stance, referring to the numbers as "requirements" and stepping in with a presumption in favour for planning applications if NDP's have failed to meet these "requirements".</p> <p>The sanction of a presumption in favour is directly inconsistent with para 5.21 which states that the sanction would be that the local planning authority would step in to make allocations in those larger villages. Clarity is needed: is it allocations or speculative applications? Also, if speculative applications are granted permission, these should be deducted on an on-going basis from that village's figure, reducing the need for allocations. Establishing a local presumption in favour is contrary to the NPPF para 11 footnote 6 which clearly establishes that a presumption in favour is not to be applied in AONBs. Table 5f and Policy H4 also lack clarity that the targets for NDPs are on top of Core Strategy numbers for the larger villages.</p> <p>The housing numbers for the larger villages should be reduced to take into account the constraint of the AONB. The District Council needs to demonstrate it is meeting its statutory duty of regard towards conserving and enhancing the AONB (Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 sec 85), and the Parish Council's preparing neighbourhood plans will also have to demonstrate AONB regard. This is likely to mean lower numbers for Goring, Nettlebed, Woodcote (all washed over by Chilterns AONB) and Chinnor, Cholsey, Crowmarsh Gifford, Sonning Common and Watlington (part in AONB). Development in these villages should be landscape-led. The sanction establishing a presumption in favour should be amended as follows: "If a Neighbourhood Development Plan has not adequately progressed with allocating sites* and numbers have not been met otherwise through planning applications to meet these requirements within 12 months of adoption of this Local Plan, planning applications for housing in the larger villages will be supported provided that proposals comply with the overall housing distribution strategy as set out in policy STRAT1 and unless specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted**.</p> <p>**see footnote 6 of the NPPF."</p> <p><u>Policy H5</u> This is a greenfield site in the Chilterns AONB on the edge of a rural village. It is within the wooded dip slope in an area with a sense of unspoilt ancient countryside. The site is not well located to</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>the village, being beyond Priests Close, a former council estate which is itself a separate wing detached from the main part of the medieval settlement. Infill or brownfield sites within the village would generally be a better approach than allocating sites beyond the edge of the village than encroach into the countryside. The site has an access problem. The land between the site and the B431 road is common land, part of Nettlebed Common. Any new access across the common would require the completion of a separate legal process under Section 38 of the Commons Act 2006. This requires common land consent for restricted works from the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. Details on the process here <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/carrying-out-works-on-common-land">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/carrying-out-works-on-common-land</a>. Applications are determined against criteria set out in Section 39 of the Act including nature conservation and the conservation of the landscape. There is no certainty that consent would be forthcoming. Looking at alternative accesses, Bushes Lane on the southern boundary of the site is an attractive winding holloway with an earth bank and hedgerow on top, it would be entirely unsuitable to upgrade this to provide vehicular access. It is a restricted byway so a right of way for walkers, horse riders, cyclists and non-mechanically propelled vehicles. The only acceptable access option from an AONB point of view would be to acquire and demolish a house on the western side of Priest's Close to provide access. In the absence of such an agreement, this allocation is not effective, and the site should not be assessed as available or achievable. The suitability of the site is also in question. There is also a need for ecological assessment for this site. The land is pastureland in the AONB next to Common, and within the impact zone for Priests Hill geological SSSI. On a site visit we noted habitats including a thick hedgerow with mature coppiced hazel (potentially suitable for mammals such as dormice), and a historic looking pond (which could be suitable for amphibians including newts) within the site at the north eastern corner. The Common Land between the site and the B431 road is Woodpasture and Parkland BAP Priority Habitat. The site does not feature in the detailed settlement reports in the Council's Landscape Capacity Assessment: Sites on the Edge of the Larger Villages of South Oxfordshire: Main Report 2015 Prepared on behalf of South Oxfordshire District Council by: Kirkham Landscape Planning Ltd and Terra Firma Consultancy. This is because the site (known as NET1) failed at the first stage; because it had "potential for harm to landscape setting of Nettlebed and AONB as a result of settlement expansion into wider landscape". The report recommended that the site did not proceed to Phase 2. There is therefore no detailed landscape capacity assessment or layout advice for this site. There appears to be gaps in the evidence base regarding landscape and biodiversity which make this allocation not properly explored or justified. Para 172 of the NPPF requires great weight to be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs. Proceeding with an allocation against the advice of the Council's own landscape capacity assessment does not demonstrate that great weight has been applied. The HELAA 2016 incorrectly identifies the site as 0% AONB (should state 100%), and answers the question 'Within/adjoining common land' with "No". The SHELAA by Arup (Oct 2017) again incorrectly identifies the site as 0% AONB and comments "Access required across Common Land but expected to deliver in first five years owing to small size of site". Both HELAA</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>and SHELAA conclude that this site is suitable, available and achievable. If the AONB and Common Land status had been correctly recorded, this may have changed the suitability to “No”. There is no assessment of whether this allocation would constitute major development in the AONB, which should be refused under NPPF para 172 unless important tests of exceptional circumstances and public interest are met.</p> <p>There are gaps in the evidence base, errors in the site assessment, and too much uncertainty about the suitability and availability of this site (especially given the access over Common Land issue) to proceed with this allocation.</p> <p><u>Policy H7</u>          This is a greenfield site in the Chilterns AONB. It is located on the top of the plateau in Nettlebed in the character area LCA 10 Chilterns Plateau with Valleys/ LCT Semi-enclosed dipslope. It is adjacent to a petrol station (Nettlebed Service Station) and a brownfield area comprising a motor vehicle repair garage (Hillcrest Specialist Cars), and associated storage/ parking of vehicles, most of which appear to have been stored there for the long term. It would potentially visually enhance the AONB to remove and redevelop this rear brownfield area, but instead the allocation is for the greenfield site to the south and west of the site. Although it has a fairly good level of screening with trees, more structural planting screening would be needed to conserve long and short distance views. The fieldwork for the Council’s landscape capacity assessment (Landscape Capacity Assessment: Sites on the Edge of the Larger Villages of South Oxfordshire: Main Report 2015 Prepared on behalf of South Oxfordshire District Council by: Kirkham Landscape Planning Ltd and Terra Firma Consultancy) was carried out in 2014, when young recently planted trees were shown within the site (Photo 1 in the LCA). These have now grown, and the land contains young trees below which low intensive outdoor pigs are run, given the land a positive and attractive use which would be lost to development if the allocation proceeds. The allocation as it stands would undesirably extend the settlement of Nettlebed westwards along the road. The Council’s South Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment by Atlantic Consultants, adopted as SPG, concludes for the Chilterns Plateau and Valleys that: “special attention should be paid to creating strong landscape ‘edges’ to settlements to reduce the urbanising influences of development on adjacent countryside and to prevent ribbon development along roads and the coalescence of settlements.” (p63). Expanding the village westwards risks doing exactly this. It would raise pressure for future development on site NET4 on the opposite side of the A4130 Port Hill.</p> <p>The portion of the site to the west of the petrol station should be kept for structural planting and for the continuation of the agricultural enterprise. The car parking/ car storage in the western area should also be removed as an AONB enhancement. An additional policy criterion should be added should include the advice from the Council’s landscape assessment (Landscape Capacity Assessment: Sites on the Edge of the Larger Villages of South Oxfordshire: Main Report 2015 Prepared on behalf of South Oxfordshire District Council by: Kirkham Landscape Planning Ltd and Terra Firma Consultancy “Substantial green infrastructure link</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>and landscape buffer to be created between the open landscape of the AONB and the village edge”.</p> <p><u>Policy H8</u>                  The smaller villages of South Oxfordshire include some picturesque and historic villages in the Chilterns AONB.                  A 5% - 10% increase for smaller village in the AONB could be too large a scale of development. Caveats are needed and cross references to other policies. The policy should draw across the size limit of 5-6 dwellings per development in Policy H16 on infill development. A size limit should be applied to greenfield sites so that at no smaller village is dominated by a large new bolt-on estate. The updated NPPF 2018 introduced a new sentence to Government policy for national parks and AONB's explaining that "The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited." (NPPF para 172). A blanket approach for non-AONB and AONB smaller villages is unsound.</p> <p>Amend bullet point 2 to exempt AONB smaller villages from the requirement for 5 to 10% growth if preparing neighbourhood plans.</p> <p><u>Policy H9</u>                  The Chilterns Conservation Board welcomes the provision for affordable housing on sites of 5 or more in the AONB. The Chilterns AONB is becoming increasingly expensive as a place to live. Research by Savills using Land Registry data shows that the average house price in the Chilterns AONB in 2017-2018 was £718,629, this is a premium of 75% above the average house price for the counties the AONB is in, and 162% above the UK average.</p> <p>We do have some questions however. Where and how will off-site contributions collected in AONB on sites of 5 to 10 homes be spent please? Chilterns Conservation Board would like to be involved to ensure delivery within the AONB. The policy reads: “For proposals of less than 10 homes in the AONB, this will be sought as a financial contribution.” Is this a mistake? It is inconsistent with the Council’s South Oxfordshire Local Plan update January 2019 reads on page 4: “On-site contributions for affordable housing from developments in the area of outstanding natural beauty will now be sought on developments with a net gain of five or more dwellings. Previously only financial contribution sought.” Is a financial contribution or on-site delivery going to be sought on site of 5-10 dwellings in the AONBs?</p> <p><u>Para 5.42</u>                  This section on other villages needs a policy, not just supporting text. It should explain that housing in other villages and wider countryside is strictly controlled and that planning permission for new housing will not be granted. There should be no requirement for 5-10% growth for other villages preparing neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>Add new policy explaining that housing in other villages and wider countryside is strictly controlled and that planning permission for new housing will not be granted unless it meets NPPF para 55.                  Amend para 5.42 to say: "Some of the other villages may wish to prepare neighbourhood Development Plans and we will support them to bring these forward in the same way that the council would support their preparation in smaller villages, although there is no</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>expectation of 5-10% growth in other villages and greenfield land on the edge of other villages should not be developed"</p> <p><u>Policy H18</u>                  Replacement dwellings of inappropriate design are one the more insidious features of the last few years, with some controversial developments which have harmed the Chilterns AONB in their scale, materials, light spill and residential paraphernalia. There are some high budget 'grand designs' with huge glazed elevations, swimming pools, security lodges etc. The policy should contain design advice as it did in the Preferred Options version, it is not clear why this has been deleted. The size of replacement dwellings should be limited in the AONB as well as in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Add AONB to criterion (iv) as well as Green Belt in order to retain smaller more affordable housing stock and protect the AONB from over-sized replacement dwellings. Reinstate the policy criterion which was in the Preferred Options (amended to refer with nationally designated landscape) as follows:                  vi) The proposed replacement dwelling is in accordance with the relevant policies of the adopted development plan including in relation to providing high quality and inclusive design, SuDS, protected species, nationally designated and local landscape features, and protects the amenity of occupants of nearby properties; and</p> <p><u>Policy TRANS1b</u></p> <p>The provision in bullet point (vi) for improvements in the Reading area including a new River Thames Crossing should be removed. The Chilterns Conservation Board would object to any proposal that would increase vehicular traffic through the Chilterns AONB or affect the rural character of its roads and villages. A new crossing or park and ride would increase traffic, noise and air pollution in the AONB, reducing tranquillity and affecting habitats (see Plantlife report on effects on nitrogen pollution on flora <a href="http://www.plantlife.org.uk/uk/our-work/policy/nitrogen">http://www.plantlife.org.uk/uk/our-work/policy/nitrogen</a>). As well as volume, changes to the type of traffic (e.g. more HGVs or more through traffic cutting between motorways) would be of concern. A bus-only bridge would be likely to attract nuisance parking in AONB villages by commuters leaving their cars and catching bus across a new bridge into Reading, affecting the character and peace of villages</p> <p>Delete (vi) since adverse impacts on the AONB are inevitable.</p> <p><u>Policy ENV1</u>                  There is no standalone policy for the AONB. As it stand the policy is muddled and fails to reflect the hierarchy that is required under NPPF para 171. The plan has good well constructed policies on biodiversity and watercourses, but just one part of a landscape and countryside policy on the AONB. The AONB covers 42% of South Oxfordshire district. Other areas have entire DPDs specifically on planning in an AONB (eg Arnside and Silverdale AONB), at the moment we have part of one policy. The policy on AONBs should be locally specific and not just repeat national guidance. It is good that it mentions AONB Management Plan, but this should be a separate bullet point.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>The Chilterns Conservation Board would like to offer assistance with the wording for a standalone policy on the AONB. One of the outcomes of a meeting of policy planners in January 2016 was a request to the Chilterns Conservation Board to propose a model Chilterns AONB policy, drawing on good practice and experience locally and from others AONBs. This model policy was refined at an AONB Planning Forum workshop of policy planners from across the 13 local authorities of the Chilterns AONB, and adopted by the Chilterns Conservation Board in October 2016 as the policy CCB would recommend to be incorporated in all the emerging Local Plans that cover the Chilterns AONB. This would provide consistency, save officer time, and represent a positive example of the duty to cooperate, with the local authorities working together to safeguard the future of a shared nationally protected landscape area. To achieve strong compliance with the purpose of the AONB, national planning policy and AONB management plan objectives, it was agreed at the Chilterns AONB Planning Forum a local plan should cover:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Weight given to AONB</li> <li>2 Conserving and enhancing</li> <li>3 AONB Setting</li> <li>4 Tranquillity and remoteness</li> <li>5 Cumulative impacts</li> <li>6 AONB Management Plan*</li> <li>7 AONB supporting guidance eg Design Guide*</li> <li>8 Local descriptive material e.g. special qualities of Chilterns*</li> </ol> <p>*Some LPAs may prefer to cover the final three in the supporting text to the policy</p> <p>The SOLP draft policy fails to achieve 2, 4, 5, 7, 8. The policy should not use the word 'where possible" enhancing - the NPPF 2012 referred to just 'conserving' but the NPPF 2018 inserted the words 'and enhancing' as a requirement. Both have equal policy weight: conserving and enhancing, and this matches the CRoW Act 2000 sec 85 which also uses the words conserving and enhancing in the AONB duty. The plan fails to list the special qualities of the Chilterns AONB or refer to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide, a well respected guide which SODC has adopted as SPG.</p> <p>Include a new standalone policy in on the AONB, using the model policy developed by the Chilterns Conservation Board working with planners from across the AONB local authorities (attached as a word doc)</p> <p><u>Appendix 9</u> Why does this appendix only identify priority habitat that is also within SSSIs? This is only partial. Include the full list of Priority Habitats in South Oxfordshire. Alternatively show on a map or cross refer to the DEFRA mapping at <a href="https://magic.defra.gov.uk">https://magic.defra.gov.uk</a></p> <p><u>Appendix 1 Glossary</u> Major development (large-scale) definition refers to paragraph numbers in old NPPF, update NPPF para 116 to para 172.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p><u>Appendix 15</u>                  This does not appear to be a full list of the Article 4 Directions in South Oxfordshire. For example there are three Article 4 Directions between Goring and South Stoke which are not listed. See the Policies Map for more pink hatched Article 4 areas</p> <p><u>Habitat Regulations Assessment</u>                  Given the scale of growth proposed in the plan, with a growth in the housing stock of 52% in 15 years, the conclusions of the HRA seem unlikely to be robust. There will be very significant increases in recreation pressure, water usage and air pollution from additional vehicular traffic.</p> <p>The HRA should clearly identify that nitrogen deposition from air pollution is already in exceedance for all three Special Areas of Conservation in the Chilterns AONB.</p> <p>The screening report by LUC dismisses too lightly in-combination effects with other plans. It gives for each plan standard text like: "HRA The (Wycombe DC) July 2018 HRA Report concluded that the Local Plan is unlikely to have significant effects, either individually or in combination with other plans or projects, on the integrity of European sites. Therefore, there are no likely in-combination effects of the submitted South Oxon Local Plan 2034"</p> <p>But since the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2034 publication version is a new plan, it cannot be assumed because other plans have in the past looked at the last version SOLP plan and decided no in combination effects that that is the case now. Especially since the housing numbers are significantly higher than in the last draft. The cumulative effects of this plan with others e.g. bypass and new housing at Watlington (Watlington NDP), proposed major housing and employment development at Stokenchurch and High Wycombe (Wycombe Local Plan), Chalgrove Airfield (SOLP), Chinnor housing (Chinnor NDP) and Princes Risborough expansion (Wycombe LP), Heathrow Third runway, Ox-Cams expressway and growth arc (National Infrastructure Commission), will all add to traffic using the M40 and other roads in or near the Aston Rowant Special Area of Conservation (M40, A40, Christmas Common Road etc). The Aston Rowant SAC is within 200m of a trunk road, the M40 motorway cuts through the Aston Rowant SAC. The Aston Rowant SAC Site Improvement Plan identifies the risks of atmospheric nitrogen deposition upon juniper. The conclusion that it is likely to be ok because the Aston Rowant SAC is surviving despite existing pollution in exceedance is dubious logic and not giving sufficient weight to the SACs.</p> <p>This work needs full scrutiny before conclusions can be reached at examination that the local plan will not have significant effects on the Special Areas of Conservation.</p>	
--	---	--

**APPENDIX 7****Current Development Plan Consultations:**

Consultation document	Consulted by	Stage	Deadline for CCB responses
North Herts Local Plan Main Mods	NHDC	<a href="#">Main modifications</a>	4.3.19
Heathrow Airspace and Future Operations consultation	Heathrow Airport	<a href="#">Heathrow Airspace and Future Operations consultation</a>	4.3.19
Heathrow Western Hub	PINS	EIA Scoping for DCO	15.3.19
Hertfordshire Minerals Local Plan	HCC	<a href="#">Reg 19 publication local plan and omission sites consultation</a>	22.3.19
Oxfordshire 2050	OCC	<a href="#">SA Scoping Report</a>	25.3.19
Oxfordshire 2050	OCC	<a href="#">Introducing the Oxfordshire Plan 2050</a>	25.3.19