



## Board Meeting

10.30 a.m. 19<sup>th</sup> October 2011  
Naphill Village Hall  
Main Road, Naphill  
Nr.High Wycombe HP14 4SX

### Agenda

- |     |   |               |
|-----|---|---------------|
| 1.  | Apologies   | 10.30 - 10.31 |
| 2.  | Declarations of Interest                                | 10.32 - 10.33 |
| 3.  | Minutes of Previous Meeting                             | 10.33 - 10.36 |
| 4.  | Matters Arising   | 10.36 - 10.40 |
| 5.  | Public Question Time                                    | 10.40 - 10.43 |
| 6.  | Report from the Executive Committee                     | 10.43 - 10.53 |
| 7.  | Report from the Planning Committee                      | 10.53 - 11.03 |
| 8.  | Annual Audit Return                                     | 11.03 - 11.08 |
| 9.  | Review of Members' Allowances                           | 11.08 - 11.20 |
| 10. | Submission - National Planning Policy Framework         | 11.20 - 11.40 |
| 11. | A Sustainable Framework of UK Aviation                  | 11.40 - 11.50 |
| 12. | Report on Natural Environment White Paper               | 11.50 - 12.05 |
| 13. | Review of Sustainable Development Fund grants 2010-2011 | 12.05 - 12.25 |
| 14. | High Speed 2  | 12.25 - 12.40 |
| 15. | Promoting Wood Fuel                                     | 12.40 - 12.50 |
| 16. | Work Programme Update to Sept 2011                      | 12.50 - 1.00  |
| 17. | Date of Future Meetings                                 |               |



**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CHILTERN CONSERVATION BOARD HELD ON WEDNESDAY 16<sup>th</sup> June 2011 at St. Giles Church Hall, Totternhoe LU6 1RH COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM AND CONCLUDING AT 13.00PM**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Appointing Body</b>
<b>Appointed by Local Authorities</b>	
Cllr David Barnard	North Herts District Council
Cllr Marion Mustoe	Central Bedfordshire Council
Cllr David Nimmo Smith	Oxfordshire County Council
Cllr Brian Norman	Three Rivers District Council
Cllr Richard Pushman	Buckinghamshire County Council
Cllr Ian Reay	Dacorum Borough Council
Cllr Chris Richards	Aylesbury Vale District Council
Cllr Jeremy Ryman	Chiltern District Council
Cllr Bill Storey	Hertfordshire County Council
Cllr Dave Taylor	Luton Borough Council
Cllr Alan Walters	South Buckinghamshire District Council

<b>Appointed by the Secretary of State</b>	
Mike Fox (Chairman)	Secretary of State
Dr Heather Barrett-Mold	Secretary of State
Bettina Kirkham	Secretary of State
Kevin Mayne	Secretary of State
Dr Simon Mortimer	Secretary of State
Ray Payne	Secretary of State
Helen Tuffs	Secretary of State

<b>Elected by Parish Councils</b>	
Cllr Mary Goldsmith	Bedfordshire
Cllr John Griffin	Oxfordshire
Cllr Margaret Jarrett	Hertfordshire
Cllr Shirley Judges	Buckinghamshire
Cllr Barbara Wallis	Buckinghamshire
Cllr Julia Wells	Oxfordshire

<b>Officers</b>	
Deirdre Hansen	Clerk to the Board
Neil Jackson	CCB Conservation and Landscape Officer
Steve Rodrick	CCB Chief Officer
Chris Smith	CCB Finance Officer
Colin White	CCB Planning Officer

## **15. Apologies**

Apologies were received from: John Wilson, Cllr Roger Emmett and Cllr Geoff Andrews.

## **16. Declarations of interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

## **17. Minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes were approved and signed by the Chairman

## **18. Matters Arising**

Members' allowances: the Chief Officer asked for assistance to commence the creation of an independent review mechanism for members allowance for 2012/13.

## **19. Public Question time**

No members of the public were present.

## **20. Report from the Executive Committee**

1. The members received the report of the Chief Officer
2. At its meeting on 18th May the Executive Committee received a report on the provisional outturn of 2010-2011.
3. The performance of the internal auditor was approved.
4. The medium term financial Plan was discussed and significant reductions in grant aid from local authorities is anticipated in the next 3 financial years.
5. The option of Financial Memorandum of Agreement with local authorities covering their financial contribution for the period 2012-2015 was discussed. The Chief Officer had been instructed to contact all authorities to investigate the need for a MOA. The members of the Board were asked for advice. The other items in the Chief Officer's report were covered elsewhere in the minutes.

**The Board NOTED the matters discussed by the Executive Committee and the decisions made under delegated authority.**

## **21. Report from the Planning Committee**

1. Members received the report from the Planning officer, the purpose of which was to bring to the attention of the Board the items considered by the Planning Committee and the decisions taken under delegated powers. The following was noted:
2. Position Statement on Development Affecting the Setting of the AONB. Following the consultation exercise changes had been approved and were incorporated in the statement circulated.
3. The Chilterns AONB Planning Conference will take place 5th October 2011. The event will focus on renewable energy. Members to inform the planning officer if they wish to attend. Details to be circulated nearer the event.

4. Core Strategy soundness concerns. The Committee was informed about two Core Strategy exploratory meetings which had taken place to discuss the inspector's concerns about various issues of soundness. The inspector had suggested in both cases to delay the examination procedure.

5. The Committee was informed that four Planning applications had been submitted for the development of the Arla milk processing plant in Aston Clinton. The size of the development is significant. The social and economic well being of the local community will be taken into consideration, but the Board's purpose is to enhance and conserve the natural environment.

**1. The Board NOTED the report from the Planning Committee.**

**2. The Board ADOPTED the Position Statement on Development Affecting the Setting of the AONB.**

**22. The members received the Statement of Accounts 2010-11 from the Finance Officer.**

The Finance Officer gave a summary of the accounts and answered questions from the members.

1. An overall net surplus for the year of £27,835 was recorded.
2. The General Reserve remains unchanged at £170,000 of which £21,000 was related to core activities.
3. Restricted reserves were reduced by £1,217 to £23,781.
4. Earmarked reserves were increased by £29,052 to £328,612
5. The Pensions Liability had decreased by £348,000 to £274,000. The decrease is due to volatility in financial markets and the impact of the valuation methodology and the derivation of the main financial assumptions required by Financial Reporting standard (FRS) 17.

The Heritage Lottery Fund bid of £403,000 for the Commons project was successful.

The Chairman thanked all the staff for their efforts during a difficult year.

**The Board APPROVED the Statement of Accounts and the Annual Audit return for 2010-11.**

**23. Proposal to create a "Caring for the Chilterns" Fund.**

The Chief Executive Officer laid before the Board the option to secure donations from all parts of the community to create a special fund- Caring for the Chilterns Fund\_ which would be used for projects to conserve natural beauty and promote enjoyment of the AONB. The fund would not be used to meet operating costs of the Board itself. The current high levels of public concern for the Chilterns arising from the HS2 proposals have raised the public profile of the CCB. This would be a clear way for locals and businesses to support small scale projects. The Board has to generate new forms of income. The aim would be to generate £10,000 net per annum within 3 years of its launch. The Chief Executive Officer invited comment and views from members.

The Board discussed the proposal and made a number of suggestions.

- 1. The Board DECIDED to set up a "Caring for the Chilterns" Fund**
- 2. The Board DECIDED to launch the Fund by the end of 2011.**

- 3. It was DECIDED to set up a sub group of staff and volunteers to set up the fund.**

#### **24. Funding from Parish Councils.**

The Chief Executive Officer put the proposal to the Board that it should seek financial contributions from Parish Councils. Even though cost savings have been made the Board is still facing a deficit.

The Board discussed the matter at length

- 1. The Board DECIDED that financial contributions would be requested from Parish and Town Councils from the financial year 2013-13 onwards.**
- 2. The Board DECIDED to set up a working group with delegated powers to work out and agree a mechanism for charging. Cllr Wallis would chair this working group and the Chief Executive Officer would be a member.**
- 3. The Board DECIDED to conduct a review to determine the optimum methods of communication with Town and Parish Councils.**

#### **25. Report on HS2**

1. The Chief Officer reported that the Board had been heavily involved in the anti HS2 campaign. The level of activity had increased markedly since the public consultation began on 28<sup>th</sup> February. In addition to responding to the formal consultation a submission has been made to the Transport Select Committee. The Board is also committing staff time and resources to preparing a technical analysis of the environmental impact along the route in the AONB.

2. There is widespread concern over the way the public consultation is being handled and legal advisors retained by a number of anti HS2 groups are assembling a possible legal challenge. The Board has been asked to endorse a letter of concern sent the Dept for Transport.

3. At the moment the Boards officers are working on the Board's response to the consultation. When available in draft this will be added to the AONB web-site to enable its use by others interested in HS2.

The Planning Officer and the Landscape and Conservation Officer gave presentations on the appraisal of sustainability and the Impact assessments.

The members debated the issues.

- 1. The activities of the Board were NOTED.**
- 2. The Board NOTED that a written submission had been made to the Transport Select committee**
- 3. The Board DECIDED to request the Government to review the business case for HS2 based on the principles in the UK National Ecosystem Assessment and the White Paper on the Natural environment.**
- 4. The Board DECIDED to write to the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change highlighting the likelihood of HS2 increasing carbon dioxide emissions.**

#### **26. Tring Park.**

The Chief Officer asked for comments on the proposal to work closely with the Woodland Trust on the future management of Tring Park. Tring Park is important as historic parkland, for its chalk grassland and woodland, and as a place for quiet enjoyment. The management of the parkland has been neglected for decades. The Chief Officer explained the significance that the site has to the AONB and the benefits the CCB could enjoy with greater involvement.

1. **The Board NOTED that a significant opportunity has arisen to enhance the management and enjoyment of Tring Park.**
2. **The Board AGREED to actively seek a close working relationship with the Woodland Trust, the Chiltern Society and local community groups.**
3. **It was AGREED that the Board should be prepared to provide support in the form of staff time and possibly grant aid.**

#### **27. Box Wood.**

The Chief Officer reported that the Chilterns is important for Box woodland, but local knowledge of its ecology and silviculture is very limited. He proposed to develop a programme to raise awareness and understanding of Box Wood.

**The Board APPROVED the creation of a Chiltern Box Wood project.**

#### **28. Education Programme- Aston Rowant Natural Nature Reserve.**

The Chief Officer reported that Natural England has indicated that it would like to hand over the role of promoting educational use of the Aston Rowant National Nature Reserve to the Board. The main commitment would be staff time as little cost is involved. Involvement would benefit the good profile of the Board.

**The Board APPROVED the proposal to take over the education programme for Aston Rowant National Nature Reserve from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011.**

#### **29. Education Resource Pack.**

The Chief Officer reported that the Board has been working with the education department of BCC to produce a Chilterns-wide, cross-curricular education pack which is aimed at local studies in history and geography at key stage 2. The pack will shortly be available.

**The Board NOTED the publication of the Education Resource Pack.**

#### **30. Report on the Natural Environment White Paper.**

The Chief Officer reported that the government has published the White Paper on the Natural Environment on 7<sup>th</sup> June. A full assessment of the implications of the White Paper for the Board and the AONB will be prepared over the summer months. The White Paper is unlikely to lead to additional legislation or provision of significant new government funding.

1. **The Board NOTED the publication of the Government's White Paper on the Environment.**
2. **The Board NOTED that a full assessment of the implications of the White Paper will be prepared and circulated to the members before the next Board meeting.**
3. **The Board NOTED that in general it responds positively to opportunities to work at a Chilterns scale.**
4. **The Board would provide feedback on the proposal to encourage "offsetting"**

**31. Urgent Business:**

Chilterns Gateways Project

Kevin Mayne declared an interest in this item because his employer is also a possible beneficiary of the project.

Working with CTC, the national cyclists' organisation the Board has brought together a consortium to submit an expression of interest for the government's Local Sustainable Transport Fund.

The expression of interest will lead to an £800,000 bid to extend use of the Chilterns Cycleway as a way of getting tourists in and commuters out of the Chilterns in a more sustainable manner. The Board will host a development officer at Chinnor as its contribution and will receive a contribution to its own costs if the bid is successful.

As the local authorities who have supported the Cycleway to date were committed to other LSTF bids the Expression of Interest was submitted by Wokingham Borough Council of behalf of the consortium. Their specific interest is in improving congestion on routes to the AONB at Henley and Sonning.

**32. Date of next meeting**

**Wednesday 19 October including the AGM, location tbc.**

The meeting closed 13.00

The Chairman..... Date.....

## **Item 6**                      **Report from Executive Committee**

**Author:**                      Steve Rodrick

**Summary:**                      At its meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> September, the Executive Committee;

1.        Received a report on the financial position to the end of August 2011.
2.        Discussed the Medium Term Financial Plan.
3.        Reviewed the half year the Risk Register
4.        Approved a revision to the Reserves Strategy
6.        Reinstated allowances for members of the Sustainable Development Fund panel
7.        Discussed a potential mechanism for reviewing members' allowances
8.        Received a report on requests to parish and town councils' to support the Board's work.
9.        Considered the Board's work on High Speed 2.
10.      Received the Chief Officer's report.

### **Financial Position to the end of August 2011-09-26**

1.        There were no exceptional items to report. Performance was in line with forecast.

### **Medium Term financial forecast**

2.        Due to a higher than anticipated income from local authorities in 2011-2012 the projected deficit for 2014-15 is lower than originally forecast. Whilst income from local authorities is expected to fall further the net effect over the next three financial years is to lessen the pressure to cut costs slightly. However there is still a need to cut operating costs, consider reducing the cost of the members' allowances scheme and raise additional income. A reduction in the allocation to the Sustainable Development Fund is still likely but can possibly be delayed until 2012-13



### **Review of Risk Register**

3. In compliance with good practice the Board prepares an annual risk register which is reviewed half yearly. The main risk remains that of financial uncertainty, but the Board has taken all reasonable measures to reduce the likelihood and impact of such risks.

### **Amendment to Reserves Strategy**

4. The Executive Committee approved and the strategy for managing its reserves. It decided to restructure the reserves to create a development reserve.

Previously the Board held:

A General Reserve equal to approximately 4 months core management activity. This reserve stood at £170,000.

Restricted Reserves created by donations and grants provided for specific purposes - total £23,781.

Earmarked Reserves, created by the Board for particular future uses. These reserves stood at £328,612 and including a budget equalisation reserve of £228,466

5. The Executive Committee decided to amend the reserves to the following:

General Reserve is reduced by 21.5% to £135,000 to reflect the lower operating costs

Restricted Reserves - any funds which are held for a defined purpose

Budget Equalisation Reserve is reduced to £150,000

Development Reserve of £113,466 to be created, intended to fund one-off activity that has been subject to a Business Case approved by the Board.

### **Allowances of Members of Sustainable Development Fund**

5. The Committee decided to reinstate the full annual allowance. It was an oversight that this was not presented to an earlier meeting following the Board's decision to retain the scheme as it operated in 2010-0211 when a full allowance was payable. Earlier it had been by the Board decided to withdraw the SDF panel member's allowance when the allocation to the SDF had been cut by 50% and it was decided the meetings of the panel were no longer necessary and all matters could be dealt with by E mail. With restoration of the full SDF budget the

panel has been operating as it has done in recent years with regular meetings and site visits.

6. Restoration of the allowances does not increase costs as they are paid from the existing budget. The rule of thumb which as always been applied is that the cost of administering the grant scheme should not exceed 10% of the funds available.

### **Review of Members' Allowances**

7. The last meeting of the Board instructed that the Executive Committee investigate options for the creation of a mechanism for reviewing all members' allowances. The Committee approved a proposal that such a review body be made of up three members (the Board's Finance officer, HR advisor and one independent member).
8. The Committee felt that the current policy of matching adjustments to members' allowances with the cost of living award given to staff was sound and there was no need for an immediate review to enable recommendations to be implemented for the financial year 2012-13. However, it did resolve to recommend to the proposed structure of the Review Group to the AGM and that a review be undertaken in 2012 and the recommendations reported to the Board in time for any decisions to be implemented in 2013-2014. In practice this is likely to mean a report being made to the Board in October 2012 or Jan 2013.

### **Funding Support from Parish and town Councils**

9. All 117 town and parish councils which are eligible to elect members to the Board were contacted in early September and requested to provide funding to the Board. No specified sum was requested but instead a contribution in the range of £25- £500. At the time of writing 2 councils had responded, each offering £50.

### **High Speed 2**

10. The Chief Officer gave a report on HS2 matters and proposed strategy until the end of 2012. This is covered further under Item 12.

### **Chief Officer's report**

11. The Chief Officer's report has been circulated to all members by E Mail.

### **Recommendations**

1. **To note the matters discussed by the Executive Committee and the decision made under delegated authority.**

- 2. To instruct the Members' Allowance Review Panel to undertake a review and present recommendations to the Executive Committee and full Board in time for implementation in financial year 2013-2014.**

## **Item 7**                      **Report from the Planning Committee**

**Author:**                      Colin White - Planning Officer

**Summary:**                      The Planning Committee met on 7<sup>th</sup> September. The following items were discussed:

1.        Draft National Planning Policy Framework
2.        High Speed 2 update
3.        AONB Planning Forum
4.        Chilterns AONB Planning Conference 2011
5.        Proposed student research project – implications of internet land sales
6.        Responses to Development Plans
7.        Responses to planning applications

**Purpose of Report:**              To bring to the attention of the Board the items considered by the Planning Committee and decisions taken under delegated powers.

### **Draft National Planning Policy Framework**

1.        The Committee discussed a draft response in connection with the public consultation on the Draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This was approved and has been amended following those discussions, and is the subject of a separate agenda item. Also discussed and approved was the setting up of a sub-group of the Board to assess the likely implications arising from the NPPF and any potential AONB boundary review.

### **High Speed 2 update**

2.        The recent activity in connection with HS2 was noted and the Committee was given an update on the Chief Officer's appearance at the Transport Select Committee on 6<sup>th</sup> September. The Committee was encouraged to sign a new e-petition (see <http://epetitions.direct.gov.uk/petitions/353>) and to encourage others to send letters to MPs via a new website (see <http://www.highspeedrail.org.uk/>).

### **AONB Planning Forum**

3.        It was agreed that the next Planning Forum will take place on 18<sup>th</sup> November at Aylesbury Vale DC's Gateway offices and will discuss the NPPF, Localism Bill, neighbourhood planning, new green spaces designation and the role of the Design Guide. It was agreed that in order to encourage as many key local authority officers as possible to attend the Chairman of the Committee and the Planning Officer will visit authorities to re-invigorate the Forum.

## **Chilterns AONB Planning Conference 2011**

4. Since the Committee meeting the Planning Conference has taken place in Berkhamsted and the event focussed on renewable energy and the implications for protected landscapes. Over 40 delegates attended from a variety of organisations many of whom also attended the visit to Matthews Brick Yard near Bellingdon to see a variety of environmentally sensitive practices in operation..

## **Proposed student research project – implications of internet land sales**

5. The Committee was informed about a number of sites where land has been sold off in small plots in the past. The implications are varied and the Committee approved the setting up of a student project to assess what these may be and how they might be addressed. This will be reported on at a later meeting.

## **Development Plan Responses**

6. The development plans response detailed below was approved by the Committee.

## **DCLG consultation – Planning for Traveller Sites**

7. One policy deals with rural areas and the countryside. This was considered to be worded in such a way as to be very weak and alterations were suggested to overcome this.

Further details of the development plans response and all other papers can be viewed at:

[http://www.chilternsaonb.org/uploads/files/ConservationBoard/Board\\_Meeting\\_s/PI\\_agenda\\_070911.pdf](http://www.chilternsaonb.org/uploads/files/ConservationBoard/Board_Meeting_s/PI_agenda_070911.pdf)

## **Planning applications update**

8. This year the Board has been consulted on 76 applications and has responded to 63 of these thus far. There have been 8 formal representations (1 support and 7 objections). Thus far 4 of the applications have been determined with 2 being in line with the Board's comments and 2 not in line.

## **Recommendation**

1. **The Board notes the report from the Planning Committee.**

## **Item 8                      Annual Audit Return**

**Author:** Chris Smith Finance Officer

**Summary:** The Audit Commission have completed their audit of the Board’s accounts for 2010-11 and advise that there are no matters which require them to raise issues arising from the audit.

**Purpose of the Report:** To inform members of the completion of the external audit for 2010-11.

### **Background:**

- 1 The Board is responsible for ensuring that its financial management is adequate and effective and that it has a sound system of internal control.
- 2 The Board prepares an annual return in accordance with proper practices which:
  - Summarises the accounting records for the year ended 31 March 2011; and,
  - Confirms and provides assurance on those matters that are important to the auditor’s responsibilities.
- 3 The auditor appointed by the Audit Commission, BDO LLP, is required to conduct an audit and, on the basis of the review of the annual return and supporting information, to report whether any matters give cause for concern that relevant legislation and regulatory requirements have not been met.

### **Audit Conclusion:**

- 4 On the basis of their review, in the opinion of the auditor the information in the annual return is in accordance with proper practices and no matters have come to their attention giving cause for concern that relevant legislation and regulatory requirements have not been met.

### **Recommendation:**

1. To approve and accept the audited annual return for 2010-11.

## Item 9

## Review of Member's Allowances

**Author:** Steve Rodrick

**Summary** In March 2011 the Board instructed the Executive Committee to create and put in place by 2012-2013 a mechanism for reviewing members' allowances. Proposed terms of reference and membership prepared by the Executive Committee are presented to the Board for consideration.

**Purpose of Report:**

1. To advise the Board of the proposed review mechanism.
2. To seek approval of the terms of reference.
3. To advise the Board that it should appoint a review panel.

### Background

1. At the Board meeting held in March 2011, when deciding on whether to award a cost of living increment to Board members, it was noted that no formal mechanism existed for reviewing members' allowances. It was decided that an independent review mechanism should be in place for 2012-13.
2. Although it was not made clear at the time this has been interpreted as meaning that a mechanism should be in place for 2012-2013 and not that a review should be undertaken in time for preparing the 2012-13 budget.
3. The current policy on members' allowances is to match annual increments to that awarded to staff. In 2011-2012 no cost of living increments were awarded.
4. The total cost of the members' allowances scheme covering the full Board, Planning and Executive committee is £32,000 per annum (Appendix 1).
5. The issue of members' allowances was debated in the context of, firstly whether they were affordable at the current level during the period 2011 -2015 and, secondly, what policy should apply to adjustments. In view of the scale of cuts to the government grant to the Board one option identified in the medium term financial forecast was to either reduce allowances or for members' to volunteer not to claim their entitlement. An option to help balance the budget by 2015 is to reduce the annual cost of the allowances scheme by £5,000.

### **Possible Review Mechanism**

6. It is proposed that a mechanism for reviewing members' allowances scheme should be based on a five yearly cycle undertaken by an independent panel. Its report should be undertaken in time to be available for members to make decisions on allowances with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April of the relevant year.
7. In the first instance the review panel would report to the Executive Committee, which would then make recommendations to the full Board.

### **Terms of Reference**

8. The role of the Review Panel will be to undertake a review of the members' allowances schemes on a five yearly cycle.
9. The panel will review allowances to ensure the allowances scheme is :
  1. Adequately rewarding members for their effort and contribution.
  2. Comparable with similar organisations.
  3. Affordable.
  4. Capable of being monitored and administered according to best practice.
  5. Reflect the balance between service which receives a monetary reward and that which is regarded as a voluntary public service.

n.b the review would only cover allowances and not expenses which are the same as for staff.

### **Membership of the Review Panel**

9. The panel should be small and independent of the Board. It is proposed the panel should consist of 3 members.
  - The Board's HR consultant (who would chair the group)
  - The Board's Finance officer
  - A independent member
10. The Chief Officer would act as the secretary to the group and the draft report would be submitted to the Board's monitoring officer and internal auditor for comment.



## **Cost**

11. The HR advisor to the Board and Finance officer would charge a fee for this work, as would the Monitoring officer (the Director of Legal Services for Bucks CC) and internal auditor. As a guide the total cost is likely to be in the order of £2,000.

n.b. this cost would only be incurred every 5 years unless the Board feels it necessary to undertake a review on a shorter cycle.

## **Next Steps**

12. The Executive Committee felt that if the Board approved the proposed review mechanism a review should be undertaken in 2012 and a report submitted to the Board in October 2012 and, if necessary, to the AGM. This would provide sufficient time for any financial implications to be incorporated in the budget for 2013-14.

## **Recommendations**

1. **To approve the proposed terms of reference.**
2. **To approve the proposed membership of an independent review panel.**
3. **To note the likely costs of the review.**
4. **To decide whether to request that the panel prepares a review in time for budget decisions to be made for 2014-2014.**

## **Appendix 1**

### **Conservation Board Members' Allowances 2011-2012**

<b>Allowance</b>	<b>£per head</b>	<b>Total</b>
Basic	660	17,820
Chairman of the Board	2,202	2,202
Vice chairman of the Board	550	550
Committee Members (1)	550	9,900
Chairman of a Committee (2)	824	1,648
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>£32,120</b>

## Item 10                      **Submission on National Planning Policy Framework**

**Author:**                      Colin White   Planning Officer

**Summary:**                      The Government published a Draft National Planning Policy Framework which will replace current Planning Policy and Minerals Policy Statements and Planning Policy Guidance Notes. The policy texts have been significantly reduced but some important details have been lost. The proposed response has been circulated to Members in advance of the meeting as the consultation closes on 17<sup>th</sup> October.

**Purpose of report:** To approve a response to the consultation on the Draft National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Background**

1.     The Draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was subject to a period of public consultation which lasted from 25<sup>th</sup> July to 17<sup>th</sup> October. A copy of the Draft NPPF has previously been circulated to members.
2.     The Government's desire to shorten the quantity of published planning guidance and policy has led to the much publicised reduction in the number of pages from over 1,000 to less than 60. However, it is not possible to make a 'like for like' comparison of current policy to the draft NPPF because much more advice and guidance is likely to be added in the future to clarify the NPPF's intent.
3.     Though the number of pages has been drastically reduced it appears that some important detail has been lost, particularly in connection with protected landscapes when compared, for example, to the previous advice contained in PPS7 and the South East Plan.
4.     Though the 'right levels of protection for AONBs and National Parks' are claimed by Ministers to be present in the draft NPPF, the claims are not reflected in the wording of the document at present. We understand that pressure from others, including the CPRE and The National Trust, may bring about changes to the wording and we await those with interest.
5.     However, the policy applicable to protected landscapes is not considered to reflect the current position and comments are made to try and address this. Though protected landscapes are subject to policy protection, which is welcome, and the AONB itself may be protected, there is concern about the potential implications for the areas immediately adjacent to the boundary and within the setting of the AONB.
6.     These areas are likely to be put under significant pressure for development which may well be displaced from urban areas into

greenfield locations. This arises from the removal of the policy that has encouraged brownfield sites to be developed before greenfield sites and reflects the fact that it is cheaper to develop greenfield sites. This is a matter that causes significant concern, particularly if a plan is absent or silent on the matter. This may be the case for some time to come for a number of Chilterns' local planning authorities which have yet to adopt a Core Strategy.

7. There is also a significant perceived shift away from the plan-led system to a development-led system, in that there is a presumption in favour of development and that it may come forward even if a local plan is absent or silent on a matter.
8. One other area of concern relates to the apparent downgrading of design advice and the Government's desire that design policies should avoid prescription and detail. This is a key issue because the Board has invested a lot in producing design advice that seeks to bring about a consistency of approach within the AONB.
9. The Draft NPPF was reported to the Planning Committee in September and a draft response, subject to various amendments, was approved for circulation to the Board and others.
10. These are reflected in the table at Appendix 1, which details a proposed response from the Chilterns Conservation Board to the consultation on the Draft NPPF. Only those paragraphs that are considered to have implications for the Chilterns AONB or the Conservation Board have been commented on. The relevant original text of the Draft NPPF has been included to enable Members to follow the reasoning behind the proposed response.

### **Recommendation**

1. **That the Board approves the proposed response to the Draft National Planning Policy Framework consultation.**

## Appendix 1

### Response of the Chilterns Conservation Board to the draft NPPF

<b>Para.</b>	<b>Draft NPPF text</b>	<b>Comment</b>
General		Whilst the Board finds much to applaud in the Draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) it is concerned about some detailed aspects of the NPPF. The Board considers that great care is needed in connection with the desire to allow for significantly greater development whilst apparently retaining policies that seek the protection of various areas, as this may lead to the displacement of development to areas that cannot cope.
General		The Board is aware that there are two versions of the NPPF in circulation, one being an easy to read guide. However, the two versions are not consistent in their use of terminology and it would be better not to have both in circulation as this will undoubtedly lead to a significant amount of confusion. As the easy to read version will, presumably, not be Government policy it is recommended that this is withdrawn immediately.
General		The Board considers that the draft NPPF would change the purpose of planning. The NPPF would herald a shift from a system that is currently plan-led (development should take place in accordance with the approved development plan unless there would be harm to interests of acknowledged importance) to one that has a primary purpose of being development-led (the presumption is in favour of development taking place when a plan is absent, silent, indeterminate or out of date, see comments on paragraph 14 below). This is a particularly worrying change and could place significant pressures on protected landscapes and their settings. This may apply in the Chilterns AONB where a number of local authorities have yet to adopt a Core Strategy or similar plan. The need to address planning applications for

		speculative development may also mean that authorities are frustrated in their desire to get local plans in place.
General		The Board considers that the draft NPPF appears to abandon several fundamental planks of the current system which have delivered many benefits over many years. These include: urban regeneration; the need to use land efficiently; reducing the need to travel and protection of the countryside for its own sake and its intrinsic value. The draft NPPF would also weaken other well-established principles such as the town centre-first policy for office development and the need to ensure that most new development takes place on previously developed land (the only mention of this in the NPPF is in relation to Green Belt).
General		The Board is very concerned that there is no proper mention of the need to protect Sites of Special Scientific Interest in their own right. Though European sites are protected the protection that should be afforded to nationally protected SSSIs is absent. The Board is also concerned that European landscape designations are not mentioned whilst European biodiversity designations are. This is an inconsistent approach and should also be rectified.
2	The Government expects the planning system to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs, while protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment. Planning has a key role in securing a sustainable future.	The Conservation Board, whilst welcoming the recognition given to the need to properly consider the natural and built environment whilst delivering development, objects to the use of the phrase 'protect and enhance' and considers that this should be amended (here and throughout the NPPF where it is used) to read 'conserve and enhance' in order to be consistent with legislation, particularly as it applies to the natural environment through the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. This comment also applies to the following paragraphs: 10 (third bullet point), 11, 19 (fifth bullet point), 23 (fifth bullet point), 103 (final bullet point which should state 'conserve

		and enhance' rather than 'protect'), 164 (first bullet point which should state 'conserving and enhancing protected' landscapes rather than 'protecting valued'), sub-heading before paragraph 167 (which should state 'conserve and enhance' rather than 'protect'), 167 (second bullet point which should state 'conserving' rather than 'protecting') and 167 (fourth bullet point which should start 'give great weight to the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty).
9	The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Sustainable development means development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. It is central to the economic, environmental and social success of the country and is the core principle underpinning planning. <b><u>Simply stated, the principle recognises the importance of ensuring that all people should be able to satisfy their basic needs and enjoy a better quality of life, both now and in the future.</u></b>	The Board considers that the final sentence of this paragraph is not consistent with the rest of the paragraph and represents a significant departure from the common understanding of the Brundtland definition of sustainable development. However, this definition is now somewhat dated and should be properly reconsidered to produce a more up to date definition that should be included at this point. The final sentence should be deleted and the rest of the paragraph should be re-drafted to take on board this point and more recent work that has been undertaken by DEFRA and the Town and Country Planning Association amongst others as well as the UK Sustainable Development Strategy.
10	Planning for places (an environmental role) – use the planning system to protect and enhance our natural, built and historic environment, to use natural resources prudently and to mitigate and adapt to climate change, including moving to a low-carbon economy.	Under 'planning for places' the Board welcomes need to consider the wider effects of development, however, the planning system should be used not to 'protect and enhance' but to 'conserve and enhance' the natural, built and historic environment.
11	These three components should be pursued in an integrated way, looking for solutions which deliver multiple goals. There is no necessary contradiction between	See comment under Paragraph 2 regarding the need for consistency with legislation as it applies to nationally protected landscapes such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the need

	increased levels of development and <b>protecting</b> and enhancing the environment, as long as development is planned and undertaken responsibly. The planning system must play an active role in guiding development to sustainable solutions.	to 'conserve and enhance' the natural beauty of such areas (line 3 delete 'protecting' and replace with 'conserving').
12	When taken as a whole, the policies in this Framework set out the Government's view of what constitutes sustainable development in practice and how the planning system is expected to deliver it.	The Board considers that this paragraph is not required and should therefore be deleted.
13	The Government is committed to ensuring that the planning system does everything it can to support sustainable economic growth. A positive planning system is essential because, without growth, a sustainable future cannot be achieved. Planning must operate to encourage growth and not act as an impediment. Therefore, significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system.	The Board is concerned that 'sustainable economic growth' appears to be a priority of the NPPF at the expense of the other key aims and objectives relating to social and environmental aspects of development.
14	At the heart of the planning system is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking. Local planning authorities should plan positively for new development, and approve all <b>individual proposals</b> wherever possible.	The planning system seeks to regulate the use and development of land in the public interest. The second sentence is in direct conflict with this because it gives much greater emphasis to private interests. This also conflicts with a plan-led system and should be addressed.
14	Prepare Local Plans on the basis that objectively assessed development needs should be met, and with <b>sufficient flexibility to respond to rapid shifts in demand or other economic changes</b> .	The Board is unclear what the NPPF means when, in the first bullet point, it refers to preparing local plans with 'sufficient flexibility to respond to rapid shifts in demand or other economic changes'. Does this refer to housing and land banks or something else? The Board is not convinced that the local plan system

		<p>will be any more flexible in the future compared to the system that we have now and this statement is raising false hopes. The Board considers that it needs to be clarified by being redrafted.</p>
14 Bullet 3	<p>Grant permission where the plan is absent, silent, indeterminate or where relevant policies are out of date.</p>	<p>The Board considers that the third bullet point (that Local Planning Authorities should grant permission where the plan is 'absent, silent, indeterminate or where relevant policies are out of date') has the potential to ride roughshod over the current system in that it actively promotes development whilst placing on those assessing proposals the burden of showing that it would be unacceptable. It would be better to have an up to date plan in place in order to better assess proposals and this should be the default position.</p> <p>The Board considers that local authorities should be allowed a period of grace to prepare and adopt a plan in order to ensure the proper planning of their area. The Board is concerned by the use of the word 'silent' in this instance because a plan cannot seek to be completely comprehensive and can neither predict every eventuality nor all forms of development that will come forward. The Board considers therefore that the third bullet point should be removed and any further similar references should also be removed (paragraph 110 for example). The NPPF should also more clearly stress the importance of closely integrating all of the strands of sustainable development together, rather than stressing one (development) as at present.</p>
16	<p>Development likely to have a significant effect on sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives would not be sustainable under the terms of the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p>	<p>The Board notes that development affecting sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives would not be sustainable. Whilst this is welcomed the Board is concerned that other designations and species that help to define sustainable development are missing. Proper consideration should be given to all protected sites and species</p>



		and necessary amendments should be made.
17	<p>The application of the presumption will have implications for how communities engage in neighbourhood planning. Critically, it will mean that neighbourhoods should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development</li> <li>• plan positively to support local development, with the power to promote more development than is set out in the Local Plan; and</li> <li>• identify opportunities to use neighbourhood development orders to grant planning permission for developments that are consistent with an adopted neighbourhood plan.</li> </ul>	The Board considers that this paragraph as drafted does not provide flexibility at the local level. It is considered to be too prescriptive.
18	<p>Those responsible for bringing forward development are expected to play their part by recognising and responding to the needs of communities. Development should be of good design and appropriately located. National incentives and relevant local charges will help ensure local communities benefit directly from the increase in development that this Framework seeks to achieve. The revenue generated from development will help sustain local services, fund infrastructure and deliver environmental enhancement.</p>	<p>Though the thrust of this paragraph is welcomed, the terminology is too loose. The Board suggests that 'be of good design' should be expanded to demonstrate what is actually meant here. For example, there is a need to explain the importance of traditional building materials, their durability and sustainability, and how they conserve and enhance local areas and add to and enforce local character and distinctiveness.</p>
19 Bullet 1	<p>Planning should be genuinely plan-led, with succinct Local Plans setting out a positive long-term vision for an area. These plans should be kept up to date and should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of</p>	<p>The Board welcomes the stance that the NPPF takes in connection with planning being 'genuinely plan-led' as detailed in the first bullet point. If this means that development should accord with the approved development plan then this is supported. However, when taken with the statements made in paragraphs 14, 26, 62 and 110 the Board considers that the</p>

	certainty and efficiency	<p>NPPF is inconsistent in its approach to planning applications relative to development plans.</p> <p>Either proposals should be determined in accordance with the approved development plan (which the Board supports and which seems to be reflected in paragraphs 19 and 62) or they should be determined on their merits taking account of the development plan if it exists or not (which the Board objects to and which seems to be reflected in paragraphs 14, 26 and 110 in particular). This inconsistency should be removed and the Board considers that the NPPF should be altered to ensure that proposals should be considered in accordance with the approved development plan (which would include the local plan, the NPPF and any other saved policy).</p>
19 Bullet 2	<p>Planning should proactively drive and support the development that this country needs. Every effort should be made to <b>identify</b> and meet the housing, business, and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth.</p> <p><b><u>Decision-takers at every level should assume that the default answer to development proposals is “yes”, except where this would compromise the key sustainable development principles set out in this Framework.</u></b></p>	<p>The Board considers that the second bullet point fails to take proper account of the need to identify relevant assets and also places too much emphasis on the need to comply only with the NPPF, without taking proper account of the local plan for an area. It is therefore suggested that ‘identify heritage and environmental assets and to’ is added before ‘identify’ in line 2. In addition, it is considered that the last sentence is unnecessary and should be deleted. Decisions should be taken in accordance with the approved local plan for an area. Should the final sentence remain then the Board considers that ‘the approved Local Plan and’ should be added before ‘this Framework’ in the final line of the bullet point.</p>
19 Bullet 4	<p>In considering the future use of land, planning policies and decisions should take account of its <b>environmental</b> quality or potential quality regardless of its previous or existing use</p>	<p>The need to take proper account of landscape impacts of development is not fully addressed in this bullet point. The Board suggests that ‘and landscape’ is added after ‘environmental’ in line 2.</p>
19 Bullet 5	<p>Planning policies and decisions <b>should seek</b> to <b>protect</b> and enhance environmental and</p>	<p>The Board considers that ‘should seek’ in line 2 is not strong enough and should be replaced by ‘must’. Also see comment</p>

	heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, and reduce pollution. Where practical and consistent with other objectives, allocations of land for development should prefer land of <b><u>lesser environmental value</u></b>	under Paragraph 2 regarding the need for consistency with legislation as it applies to nationally protected landscapes such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the need to 'conserve and enhance' the natural beauty of such areas (first line of fifth bullet point). The Board is unsure what the tests are that demonstrate which land would be of 'lesser environmental value', this should be clarified.
19 Bullet 5	As above	The need to take proper account of landscape impacts of development is not fully addressed in this bullet point. The Board suggests that ', landscape' is added after 'environmental' in line 2.
19 Bullet 6	Planning policies and decisions should make effective use of land, promote mixed use developments that create more vibrant places, and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas, recognising that some open land can perform many functions (such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, carbon storage, or food production)	The Board considers that the need to reinforce and add to local distinctiveness through the most appropriate design and use of building materials should be added to this bullet point.
21	Each local planning authority should produce a Local Plan for its area. This can be reviewed in whole or in part to respond flexibly to changing circumstances. Any additional development plan documents should only be used where clearly justified. Supplementary planning documents should only be necessary where their production can help to bring forward sustainable development at an accelerated rate, and must not be used to add to the financial burdens on development.	The Board objects to the stance taken in connection with supplementary planning documents (SPD). The NPPF states that SPD should only be produced in order to bring forward development at an accelerated rate. This is more than likely to lead to poorer quality developments as things are rushed through. In many instances SPDs, such as buildings design guides, have been used to improve the overall quality of development. If the principles of the SPD are accepted from the start, then there would be no delay and the quality of development would improve. This is something that clearly concerns the Government. The Board suggests that 'at an accelerated rate' is deleted as this text is not considered to be necessary.
23	Local planning authorities should	See comment under Paragraph 2

Bullet 5	set out the strategic priorities for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver: climate change mitigation and adaptation, <b><u>protection</u></b> and enhancement of the natural and historic environment, including landscape, and where relevant coastal management.	regarding the need for consistency with legislation as it applies to nationally protected landscapes such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the need to ‘conserve and enhance’ the natural beauty of such areas (fifth bullet point delete ‘protection’ and replace with ‘conservation’).
24 Bullet 6	Crucially, Local Plans should: identify land which it is <b><u>genuinely</u></b> important to protect from development, for instance because of its <b><u>environmental</u></b> or historic value	The Board considers that the bullet point which states that Local Plans should identify land which it is important to protect from development should clarify what is meant by ‘genuinely’ as this is a value judgement, in addition it should also include ‘landscape’ as one of the things that are valued (this is not addressed by either environmental or historic though may contain elements of both). The Board therefore suggests that ‘landscape,’ should be added before ‘environmental’ in line 2 of bullet point 6.
25	Local Plans are the key to delivering development that reflects the vision and aspiration of local communities. To do this, early and meaningful engagement and collaboration with neighbourhoods, local organisations and businesses is essential. A wide section of the community should be proactively engaged, so that Local Plans, as far as possible, reflect a collective vision and a set of agreed priorities for the development of the area, including adopted neighbourhood plans.	The Board considers that this paragraph fails to meaningfully address the public consultation that would be required to ensure that Local Plans are robust and fully reflect the vision and aspirations of local communities. This paragraph should more closely reflect the advice previously given in PPS12.
54 and Bullet 2	To enable each local authority to proactively fulfil their planning role, and <b><u>to actively promote</u></b> sustainable development, local planning authorities need to: attach <b><u>significant weight to the benefits of economic and housing growth.</u></b>	The Board is concerned about the text in the first line and suggests that ‘actively promote’ should be deleted and replaced by ‘achieve’. The Board is also concerned about the stance taken in the second bullet point which places greater emphasis on economic and housing growth at the expense of other elements of sustainable development. This is not consistent with other parts of the NPPF and the second

		bullet point should therefore be removed.
55	The application of the presumption should achieve the delivery of enhanced levels of development consistent with national, strategic and local requirements.	The final sentence of this paragraph is repetitive and not therefore relevant, therefore the Board suggests that it should be deleted.
59	Local planning authorities should publish a list of their information requirements for applications, which should be proportionate to the nature and scale of development <b>proposals</b> .	The Board considers that the requirement for information for applications does not address at least one aspect that should be considered – any impacts on the local area. Therefore the Board suggests that ‘and the sensitivity of the location’ should be added after ‘proposals’.
62	The planning system is plan-led.	This paragraph states that ‘the planning system is plan-led’. This is a statement that is welcomed and supported by the Board. However, it appears to directly conflict with other statements in the NPPF, particularly the final bullet point in paragraph 14 which allows for development to take place in the absence of a plan. The Board considers that the sentiment in paragraph 62 should receive much greater prominence.
64	Local planning authorities should consider using Local Development Orders to relax planning controls for particular areas or categories of development, where the impacts would be acceptable, and in particular where this would boost enterprise and growth. The use of article 4 directions to remove national permitted development rights should be limited to situations where this is necessary to protect <b>local</b> amenity or the wellbeing of the area	Article 4 Directions are often used to limit the impact of certain forms of development in wide areas. The Board is therefore concerned that the NPPF appears to be suggesting that any implications only apply at the local level. Therefore, the Board suggests that ‘local’ in line 5 should be replaced by ‘the’ in order to ensure that those instances where the implications of development would be felt over a wide area are addressed.
73 Bullet 3	In drawing up Local Plans, local planning authorities should ensure that they: support existing business sectors, taking account of whether they are expanding or contracting and, where possible, identify and plan for new or emerging sectors likely to locate	The Board does not think that it would be possible to draft a local plan that would include policies that would be ‘flexible enough to accommodate requirements not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances’. It is not possible to plan for everything and the requirement placed

	in their area. Policies should be <b><u>flexible enough to accommodate requirements not anticipated in the plan and to allow a rapid response to changes in economic circumstances.</u></b>	on local authorities by this sentence would not be achievable. The Board therefore recommends that the final sentence of this bullet point should be deleted.
81	Planning policies should support sustainable economic growth in rural areas by taking a positive approach to new development. Planning strategies should maintain a prosperous rural economy <b><u>including</u></b> policies to: support sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments that benefit rural businesses, communities and visitors <b><u>and which respect the character of the countryside.</u></b> This should include supporting the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations where identified needs are not met by existing facilities in rural service centres.	The Board considers that the current policy tests from PPS7 which seek protection of the countryside for its own sake should be incorporated into the first part of this paragraph. The requirement to respect the character of the countryside should apply to all rural economic development (not just tourism and leisure) and the Board therefore suggests that in the third line 'including' is deleted and replaced with the following: 'whilst respecting the character of the countryside and should include', and that the following is deleted from lines 2 and 3 in the third bullet point: 'and which respect the character of the countryside'.
81 Bullets 1 and 2	support the sustainable growth of rural businesses  promote the development and diversification of agricultural businesses	The Board considers that the first two bullet points are somewhat repetitive and would benefit from combination and redrafting. Therefore delete bullet points 1 and 2 and replace with the following to read: 'support the sustainable development of rural businesses including agriculture'.
81 Note and Glossary		The Board suggests that a note and Glossary reference are added to define what 'agricultural businesses' are, as this could be confusing with proper description.
82	Smarter use of technologies can reduce the need to travel.	The Board welcomes the Government's recognition that the smarter use of technologies can reduce the need to travel. This should be reflected across the whole of Government as well as local planning authorities.
102	Local planning authorities should: <b><u>as far as is practical,</u></b> ensure	The Board considers that this paragraph weakens the current presumption against

	sufficient levels of permitted reserves are available from outside National Parks, the Broads, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and World Heritage sites.	major minerals development in protected landscapes (MPS1 paragraph 14) and suggests that 'as far as is practical' is deleted from the first bullet point.
103 Bullet 7	When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should: consider allowing small-scale extraction of building stone at, or close to, relic quarries where it would contribute to the repair of historic buildings without compromising the requirement to <b>protect</b> designated sites.	See comment under Paragraph 2 regarding the need for consistency with legislation as it applies to nationally protected landscapes such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the need to 'conserve and enhance' the natural beauty of such areas (final bullet point which should state 'conserve and enhance' rather than 'protect').
109 Bullet 2	To boost the supply of housing, local planning authorities should: identify and maintain a rolling supply of specific deliverable <sup>s</sup> sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements. The supply should include an additional allowance of <b>at least 20 per cent</b> to ensure choice and competition in the market for land	<p>The Board is concerned about the requirement, as detailed in the second bullet point, to include within supply figures an additional housing allowance of at least 20%. The apparent intention is to make the development land market more competitive. The Board considers that this is unlikely to happen. In addition, it will stifle previous good intentions of bringing forward previously developed land, will lead to some sites that are already committed not coming forward in a timely manner, will lead to long-term planning blight, premature development on unsuitable sites, excessive and overcrowded developments and a move to more greenfield sites which are more easily brought forward. This would in turn place excessive pressure on areas like the Chilterns AONB which is in many instances close to or abuts large towns and other urban areas.</p> <p>The Board suggests that this element of the NPPF should be removed and that the second sentence of paragraph 109 should be deleted.</p>
113 Bullets 2 and 4	However, local planning authorities should avoid isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as: where development would ensure the future of	This paragraph is considered to be much weaker than the previous policy in connection with isolated new dwellings as detailed in paragraphs 9 to 11 of PPS7. The Board considers that the second bullet point does not provide sufficient

	<p>buildings of special architectural or historic <b>interest</b> (bullet 2); the exceptional quality <b>or</b> the innovative nature of the design of the dwelling. Such a design should: be truly outstanding <b>or</b> innovative, helping to raise standards of design more generally in rural areas, (bullet 4 and sub-bullet 1).</p>	<p>protection for heritage assets as drafted and suggests that ‘and takes proper account of its setting’ is added after ‘interest’. The Board also considers that the fourth bullet point may well lead to many more applications in rural areas and suggests that it should be deleted.</p> <p>Should it remain and in order to make the NPPF more robust the Board suggests that: ‘or’ in the first line of bullet point 4 should be deleted and replaced by ‘and’ (because something that is innovative is not necessarily of exceptional quality), and ‘or’ in the first sub-bullet point should be deleted and replaced by ‘and’ (for the same reason as above).</p>
<p>114 to 123 (117 and 118 in particular)</p>	<p>117 Local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes. However, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.</p> <p>118 Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles.</p>	<p>The Board welcomes the section that deals with design issues. However, in many cases there will need to be more prescriptive policies and advice in order to ensure that the essential spirit of a place is conserved or enhanced when development takes place. This could apply in Conservation Areas or within protected landscapes such as National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>The Board considers that paragraph 117 should be amended to include reference to the need to reinforce and add to local distinctiveness through the most appropriate design, which takes a long-term view, and use of building materials which are durable and sustainable, particularly when development takes place in Conservation Areas or protected landscapes for example.</p> <p>The Board also suggests that the following text is added as a new sentence at the end of paragraph 118, to read ‘However, in certain places (Conservation Areas and protected landscapes such as National Parks or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) it will be appropriate to influence the outcome by applying the principles detailed in buildings design guides for example.’</p>



130	130 Local communities through local and neighbourhood plans should be able to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. By designating land as Local Green Space local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in very special circumstances.	The Board welcomes the policy that allows local communities through local and neighbourhood plans to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to them. This would mean that local communities will be able to rule out new development other than in exceptional circumstances.
131 Bullet 4	The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used: <b><u>if the designation does not overlap with Green Belt.</u></b>	The Board considers that it would be appropriate for the Local Green Space designation to be used in the Green Belt and that the policies are not mutually exclusive. Therefore, the Board suggests that the fourth bullet point of this paragraph is deleted.
163	The Government's objective is that planning should help to deliver a healthy natural environment for the benefit of everyone and safe places which promote wellbeing.	As the key objective for the natural environment the Board considers that paragraph 163 falls short of what should be aimed for. The Board therefore suggests the following changes: delete 'healthy' in line 1 and replace it with 'functional and well-managed'; add ', whilst securing its intrinsic character, beauty and the diversity of its landscape, heritage and biodiversity,' after 'environment' at the start of line 2, and add ', healthy' after 'safe' in line 2. The revised text would read: 'The Government's objective is that planning should help to deliver a functional and well-managed natural environment, whilst securing its intrinsic character, beauty and the diversity of its landscape, heritage and biodiversity, for the benefit of everyone and safe, healthy places which promote wellbeing.'
164	To achieve this objective, the planning system should aim to conserve and enhance the natural <b><u>and local</u></b> environment by	The Board considers that 'and local' in the second line of the first sentence are not required and suggests that they are deleted.
164 Bullet 1	To achieve this objective, the planning system should aim to	See comment under Paragraph 2 regarding the need for consistency with

	conserve and enhance the natural and local environment by: <b><u>protecting</u></b> valued landscapes	legislation as it applies to nationally protected landscapes such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the need to 'conserve and enhance' the natural beauty of such areas (first bullet point which should state 'conserving and enhancing protected' landscapes rather than 'protecting valued').
164		The Board considers that the NPPF would benefit from an additional bullet point (after the first one) which deals with responsible land management. Therefore add the following: 'promoting environmentally responsible land management' as a new second bullet point.
164 Bullet 2	<b><u>minimising impacts on</u></b> biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity, <b><u>where possible</u></b>	The Board considers that this text significantly weakens the policy in connection with protection of biodiversity and suggests that 'minimising impacts on' should be deleted and replaced by 'enhancing' and 'where possible' should be deleted.
165	In preparing plans to meet development requirements, the aim should be to <b><u>minimise</u></b> adverse effects on the <b><u>local and natural environment</u></b> . <b><u>Plans should</u></b> allocate land <b><u>with the least environmental or amenity value where practical</u></b> , having regard to other policies in the Framework including the presumption in favour of sustainable development. <b><u>Plans should be prepared on the basis that objectively assessed development needs should be met, unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.</u></b>	The Board considers that this paragraph is not explicit enough about the need to protect land with environmental or amenity value and suggests the following changes to address this. In line 1 delete 'minimise' and replace with 'avoid'; in line 2 delete 'local and'; in line 2 add 'by:' after 'environment' and create two new bullet points to read: 'identifying and respecting the area's character and local distinctiveness, and' (first new bullet) and 'understanding and promoting appropriate land management and environmentally responsible practices.' (second new bullet); create a new sub-paragraph and add 'Where otherwise unavoidable,' before 'plans should allocate land'; delete 'with the least environmental or amenity value where practical' and replace with 'sequentially, avoiding the best and most sensitive sites or those with high amenity value, whilst', and delete from 'Plans should' in line 5 to the end of the paragraph as this is repetitive.

166	To this end, local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife sites or landscape areas will be judged. Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites.	The Board is concerned about the weakening of policy in connection with development in non-designated areas and considers that the current policy tests from PPS7 which seek protection of the countryside for its own sake should be incorporated into this paragraph.
Sub head before 167	Protect valued landscape	See comment under Paragraph 2 regarding the need for consistency with legislation as it applies to nationally protected landscapes such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the need to 'conserve and enhance' the natural beauty of such areas. In this instance the sub heading should read 'Conserve and enhance protected landscapes'.
167 Bullets 2 and 4	Local planning authorities should: maintain the character of the undeveloped coast, <b><u>protecting and enhancing</u></b> its distinctive landscapes, particularly in areas defined as Heritage Coast, and improve public access to and enjoyment of the coast; give great weight to <b><u>protecting</u></b> landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	See comment under Paragraph 2 regarding the need for consistency with legislation as it applies to nationally protected landscapes such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the need to 'conserve and enhance' the natural beauty of such areas (second bullet point which should state 'conserving' rather than 'protecting' and fourth bullet point which should start 'give great weight to the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of' National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty).
167 Bullet 4	Local planning authorities should: <b><u>give great</u></b> weight to protecting landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads. Planning permission should be refused for major developments in	The Board considers that the fourth bullet point of this paragraph: significantly weakens the current policy; is not consistent with the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000; does not provide sufficient safeguards for nationally protected landscapes or their settings, and it fails to mention the need to comply with the statutory management plans that are produced for such areas.

	<p>designated areas except in exceptional circumstances where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of: 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, the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere 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.</p>	<p>Therefore, the Board suggests the following changes (in addition to those already detailed above): add ‘whilst having due regard to statutory Management Plans,’ at the start of the bullet point; add footnotes and Glossary references to describe ‘National Parks, The Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and their settings’ and ‘natural beauty’ after ‘Beauty’ in line 2; add ‘and their settings’ after ‘Beauty’ in line 2 (consistent with the reference to setting that applies to heritage assets as detailed in paragraph 180); add ‘Support should be given for small-scale, suitably located and designed development necessary to facilitate the economic and social well-being of these areas and their communities.’ after ‘Broads.’ in line 4; add a footnote and Glossary reference for ‘major developments’ in line 5 (akin to that provided on page 16 of the draft NPPF Impact Assessment), and add ‘that’ after ‘demonstrated’ in line 6.</p> <p>The revised text would (subject to the amendments suggested above) read as follows:</p> <p>‘whilst having due regard to statutory Management Plans, give great weight to the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and their settings. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads. Support should be given for small-scale, suitably located and designed development necessary to facilitate the economic and social well-being of these areas and their communities. Planning permission should be refused for major developments in designated areas except in exceptional circumstances where it can be demonstrated that they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an</p>
--	---	---

		assessment of: 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, the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere 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.'
169 Bullet 4	When determining planning applications in accordance with the Local Plan and the presumption in favour of sustainable development, local planning authorities should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity by applying the following principles: planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location <b>clearly</b> outweigh the loss.	The Board welcomes the stance taken over ancient woodland and aged and veteran trees, but considers that the paragraph should be amended to ensure consistency with other policies. Therefore, the Board suggests that 'and demonstrably' should be added after 'clearly' in line 4 of the fourth bullet point.
173 Bullet 3	Planning policies and decisions should aim to: identify and protect areas of tranquillity which have remained relatively undisturbed by noise and are prized for their recreational and amenity value for this reason.	The Board welcomes the stance taken in connection with the need to identify and protect areas of tranquillity. However, because tranquillity is concerned with visual as well as noise impacts the Board considers that there is a need to add a reference to the need to consider the detrimental visual impacts that may arise from developments in the third bullet point.
175	By encouraging good design, planning policies and decisions should <b>limit</b> the impact of light pollution from artificial light on local amenity, intrinsically <b>dark landscapes</b> and nature conservation.	The Board welcomes the stance taken in connection with the need to limit the impacts of light pollution. However, we do not consider that this section has properly addressed the issues. Therefore, the Board considers that 'limit' in line 1 should be deleted and replaced by 'prevent'. In addition, and due to the impacts of urban

		glow on dark skies, the Board considers that 'and skies' should be added after 'dark landscapes' in the second line.
Glossary	Conservation: The process of maintaining and managing change to a heritage asset in a way that sustains and where appropriate enhances its significance.	The Board considers that the definition for 'conservation' is too narrow and does not deal adequately with the natural environment. This should be addressed by rewording.
Glossary		Add references to National Parks, The Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty with the definitions including text about the need to consider development affecting their settings.
Glossary		Add reference to and define 'natural beauty'.
Glossary		As there is confusion about what 'major development' constitutes, the Board recommends that a reference to 'major development' that reflects the General Development Procedure Order 1995 should be included in the Glossary.

**Item 11**      **Report on Developing a Sustainable Framework for UK Aviation: Scoping document - Department for Transport**

**Authors:**                      Steve Rodrick                      Chief Officer  
   Colin White                         Planning Officer

**Summary:**                      The Government is consulting on a proposed framework for the development of aviation which includes assessing impacts of aviation on the environment, local communities and related areas of government policy. It does so in the context of promoting sustainable economic growth as an overriding priority.

Many of the objectives for integration of aviation policy with other areas of government policy are of relevance to the proposal for a high speed railway. Some of the aspirations for reducing environmental impacts on local communities and reducing carbon emissions are supportable but notably inconsistent with the proposal for HS2.

**Background**

1.      The Government has issued a consultation paper “Developing a Sustainable Framework for UK Aviation: Scoping document” and the deadline for submissions is 20<sup>th</sup> October (it has been extend from 30<sup>th</sup> September). In his foreword the Secretary of State, Rt. Hon. Philip Hammond MP, says “aviation should be able to grow, but to do so, it must be able to play its part in delivering our environmental goals and protecting the quality of life of local communities.” He also says “.. we are not prepared to support growth at any price.”
2.      The Government position is framed by its decision to cancel additional runways at Heathrow and Stansted. There is no prospect of an additional runway at Gatwick and plans for a second runway at Luton are no longer being considered.
3.      Members may recall that the proposal to alter the use of airspace by the National Air Traffic Service (NATS), which would have resulted in more lower flying aircraft over the Chilterns, has been postponed and a wider review of air space management begun.
4.      The Government is also advancing the argument for HS2 that it will lead to a modal shift from domestic flights and in due course those to northern Europe, on to high speed rail. The Board believes it will actually lead to an increase in carbon emissions from aviation as vacated short haul flights will be replaced by much higher polluting long haul flights.

5. The consultation document highlights the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from aviation and to give greater weight to protecting the quality of life and environment of local communities. However, its primary and overriding aim is to promote economic activity.
6. The Board and many others have argued that all major decisions affecting transport should be in the context of a national transport strategy. Such a national overview is needed in order to enable balanced decisions to be made which require assessment and examination of the relationships between various transport modes, not least the link between domestic aviation and high speed rail. Interestingly the aviation document makes references to “..increased uses of alternatives to travel”. The proposal for High Speed 2 is actually based on encouraging more people to travel long distances and discounts the use of technology or incentives not to travel. This inconsistency should be highlighted.
7. The part played by the generation of high altitude water vapour and the creation of contrails and cloud cover is given insufficient attention. This should be addressed. The Chilterns is frequently adversely affected by this form of artificial cloud cover as so many international flights are routed over the area.
8. The EU Emissions Trading Scheme could play a significant role in restricting emissions generated by aviation. At present this is not fully understood and it is not expressed clearly in the document. However, any changes should reflect the need for all sectors to reduce their levels of emissions.
9. The Government recognises that the 2003 White Paper “The Future of Air Transport” failed to recognise the importance of addressing climate change and gave insufficient weight to the local environmental impacts of aviation. The opportunity to address these shortcomings should be taken now and should involve meaningful community involvement and consultation.
10. These issues are addressed in the proposed submission which is attached as Appendix 2.

### **Recommendations**

1. **To approve the proposed submission to the Department for Transport in response to its consultation on proposed aviation policy.**
2. **To make a submission to DfT highlighting the inconsistencies between its approach to aviation and the proposed development of High Speed 2.**



## **Appendix 2**

### **DRAFT**

#### **Developing a sustainable framework for UK aviation; Scoping document - Department for Transport, March 2011**

##### **The Chilterns Conservation Board and Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty**

The Chilterns Conservation Board was established by Parliamentary Order in 2004 with the following statutory purposes:

1. To conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and
2. To promote understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Chilterns AONB.

The Board also has a statutory duty:

3. To foster the social and economic well being of local communities.

The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty was designated in 1965 and is particularly affected by the aviation industry as both Heathrow and Luton airports are located close to its boundary and there are considerable numbers of overflying aircraft using both these airports and others further afield. The Bovingdon stack in particular, has a major impact on use of airspace over the Chilterns.

On many days during the year the area is affected by the contrails of large numbers of overflying aircraft, sufficient to form cloud which changes the weather by blocking sunlight.

The noise of aircraft using Luton and Heathrow has a considerable effect on local communities and the millions of visitors using the Chilterns for quiet recreation, many of whom are seeking peace and quiet away from London and other urban areas.

For these reasons the Board's submission concentrates on the environmental impacts of aviation on the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

##### **General Comments**

1. The Board welcomes the opportunity to comment on how the aviation industry should develop and notes the strong statements in the forward

by the Secretary of State on the need to reduce damaging impacts on local communities and the environment.

2. The Board also welcomes the recognition by Government of the adverse impacts of aviation on the environment and associated causes of climate change. It is re-assuring to read that the Government will not accept growth in aviation at any price.
3. The importance of a high quality of life and environment for local communities should be central to any national strategy. In the past the local impacts have too often been overridden or ignored by claims that rapid growth of aviation was in the national interest. Finding a balance is difficult but any claims for an overriding national interest should be supported by evidence, provide significant additional benefits and be widely accepted.
4. The Board agrees with the proposition that the cost of flying should reflect the environmental damage caused - local communities affected by the environmental damage should receive some of that income – areas such as the Chilterns bear a heavy environmental cost but receive few benefits in return.
5. Low profits and fierce price competition mean that airlines and airport operators are unlikely to voluntarily introduce any changes which may affect their commercial performance. Environmental improvements are much more likely to depend upon regulation or strong fiscal incentives and penalties.

### **Need for National Transport and Energy Strategies**

6. There is a need for national strategies to provide a framework for all forms of transport and for the generation and use of energy. Both need to link directly to the national targets for reducing carbon emissions and tackling climate change. Unless there is a link between the cost of flying and environmental impact, transport, especially aviation, will continue to cause disproportionately high levels of environmental damage.
7. National priorities should include reducing the need to travel, especially for business, energy consumption, and all forms of pollution (including noise and green house gases) no matter what the source is.
8. A national transport strategy would address the differing transport needs of domestic and international travel. This would also investigate the role and desirability of having a single major international hub airport. A key issue for those concerned about the capacity and impact of Heathrow is the large and growing proportion of transit passengers. Whilst the Board is aware that these passengers help the viability of

otherwise marginal services, the local communities bear a considerable environmental cost with disproportionately small economic benefit.

9. Claims that inward investment to the UK is highly dependent upon the number of long haul destinations directly linked to Heathrow need to be supported with evidence. Unquestioning acceptance of this argument will perpetuate the dominance of Heathrow and the south east at the expense of the rest of the country.
10. Heathrow is not well located for an international airport hub because of the large number of people affected by environmental pollution of several types. More dispersal of international flights to other UK airports is desirable and will help to spread any economic advantage and reduce dependency upon London.
11. High speed rail may provide an alternative for some air passengers, principally Glasgow/Edinburgh - London and for a small number to cities in north western Europe. There is unlikely to be a significant modal shift. An unintended, but predictable, consequence of building a high speed railway will be that any vacated short haul flight slots will be used by more long haul international services, thus significantly increasing aviation emissions, largely from London airports. This will directly increase environmental impacts. Carbon emissions and noise will increase as well as reducing local air quality around airports.

### **Air space Management**

12. The aviation strategy should also take into account the use and management of UK airspace. In particular the air space corridors for over flying, noise preferential routes and the need for and location of holding stacks. All are causes of significant nuisance to local communities. The Bovingdon stack and take off routes from Heathrow for heavy jets which fly over the Chilterns cause considerable noise nuisance. They have a knock on impact on Luton flights, often forcing them to fly lower over the Chilterns than they otherwise would.
13. AONBs are areas of countryside of national importance. They tend to be areas of relatively low population density but provide places where large numbers of visitors seek tranquillity as an escape from the noise of urban areas. The document suggests that it would be appropriate to route flights over areas of relatively low density population. This would be a simplistic and unfortunate strategy, thus rendering much of south east England relatively noisy with few tranquil areas. The Chilterns already suffers because of the large number of overflying aircraft using Heathrow, Luton, Stansted and Northolt. Current policies intended to protect or even extend tranquil areas have proven to be ineffective.

### **Emissions of Green House Gases**

14. The links between greenhouse emissions by aviation and climate change are widely accepted, even if all the mechanisms are not yet fully understood. In view of the potentially severe consequences of failing to tackle climate change, the precautionary principle must apply and, unless evidence suggests a course of action to the contrary, significant measures must be taken to reduce all green house gas emissions generated by aviation.
15. The generation of high altitude water vapour is given insufficient attention. The UK is affected by significant levels of overflying by international air traffic which create so many contrails that it is affecting the weather on a significant number of days by creating cloud and blocking out sunshine. This occurs more frequently during colder months when the loss of sunshine is important. Consideration should be given to routing more over flying aircraft over the sea.
16. The EU Emissions Trading Scheme could be an important mechanism for restricting aviation generated emissions. To many it is still not sufficiently clear how this will work in practice. It may have the effect of disguising a growth in aviation emissions as the industry seeks to grow but offset its emissions by other means. According to Lord Stern such an approach is not sustainable - all sectors must reduce their absolute level of emissions.

### **Noise**

17. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Parks are popular areas for quiet recreation and those seeking tranquillity. However, those seeking such peace and quiet are finding that rare quality is constantly being eroded mainly due to transport related noise, notably overflying aircraft.
18. For local residents noisy aircraft overflying between 11 p.m. and 6.30 a.m. are a particular nuisance. Their numbers seem to be getting greater. More consideration has to be given to the disturbance caused by aircraft when the nuisance is plainly anti-social.
19. As the document notes the nuisance is a combination of volume, timing and frequency. In the Chilterns it is not uncommon to have several aircraft audible at the same time e.g. Heathrow, Luton and overflying aircraft. Multiple point source noise pollution is not unusual.
20. It is important that once a Preferential Noise Route is agreed aircraft stay within it. They must be monitored and repeated offenders must be tackled.

### **Aviation and the local environment** **Community Involvement**

20. Too often the onus seems to be on local communities to fight for improvements – the industry seems reluctant to offer them and there has been insufficient pressure from Government. Community consultation and involvement has to be sensitively handled and meaningful. Too many of the current arrangements have disappointed those trying to make them work.

## Item 12                      Report on Natural Environment White Paper

**Author**                                      Kath Daly      Countryside Officer

**Summary:**                                      The Government published its White Paper on the Natural Environment and the UK National Ecosystem Assessment in early June.

**Purpose of the report:**      To inform members of the key points and highlight likely implications for the Board and AONB.

### Natural Environment White Paper

1.      The White Paper, *Natural Choice: Securing the Value of Nature* outlines the Government's vision for the Natural Environment over the next 50 years.
2.      Key themes of the White Paper are:
  - **Protecting and improving our natural environment** - more joined-up action at local and national level to create an ecological network resilient to changing pressures.
  - **Growing a green economy** - the idea that natural areas are a valuable asset, and that there are 'multi-million pound opportunities available from greener goods and services, and from markets protecting nature's services.'
  - **Reconnecting people and nature** – recognition of the benefits of contact with nature, and of the value and enriching role of voluntary activity.
  - **International and EU leadership**
  - **Monitoring and reporting**
3.      The White Paper incorporates many of the key themes of the Lawton Review of wildlife sites and ecological network 'Making Space for Nature' published in September 2010. The Review argued for 'a step-change in our approach to wildlife conservation, from trying to hang on to what we have to large-scale habitat restoration and recreation'. The review proposed that the essence of what was needed by way of conservation action was 'more, bigger, better, joined.' However, there are concerns that the ambitious proposals of the White Paper are not backed up by resources and legislation to make it happen.
4.      This emphasis on working with multiple landowners across large areas including those outside of designated sites and nature reserves– often

referred to as 'landscape scale conservation' - fits well within the AONB approach. These ideas are not new but the White Paper gives them new focus and impetus.

5. The Board promotes and supports landscape scale conservation in a number of ways, for example through contributing to land purchase within Living Landscape areas e.g. at Totternhoe, grants for land management in Biodiversity Opportunity Areas identified by local Biodiversity Partnerships e.g. Radnage Valley and support for initiatives such as the Chilterns Chalk Grassland project ( Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust); and networking events e.g. chalk managers day looking at landscape scale activity in practice the Bradenham Valley (2009).
6. A particular challenge for landscape scale conservation in the Chilterns include the level of complexity - intricate habitat mosaics, habitat fragmentation, and complex land ownership patterns including significant numbers of non-farming land-owners.

### **Nature Improvement Areas**

7. One of the initiatives announced within the White Paper included a national competition for grant funding for 12 large area projects (10,000 – 50,000 ha), known as Nature Improvement Areas. The total funding available is £7.5m over 3 years.
8. The competition is being administered by Natural England. The details were announced in late July and the deadline for a stage 1 application was 30<sup>th</sup> September.
9. A Chilterns Chalk NIA application was submitted by the Board on 29<sup>th</sup> September, with support from a wide partnership. The proposed NIA area stretches across 46,000 ha from Hitchin to Goring Gap, the foci are the habitats and geological sites associated with the thin chalk soils of the chalk escarpment and adjoining steep valley sides.
10. It is thought that there have been over 200 Stage 1 applications, of which only 20 will go through to the second stage, and of those only 12 will be approved. The deadline for second stage applications is mid-December; should the Board's application get through to the second round there will be implications in staff time and resources in putting together a full application including business plan and partnership agreement in a very tight timeframe.
11. Developing proposals of this sort – even in outline –places considerable pressures on local partnerships and organisations, particularly for those involved in supporting more than one proposal, and the NIA competition comes less than 2 years after a similar initiative to establish now abandoned Integrated Biodiversity Delivery Areas. If the Chilterns proposal is not supported in the NIA

competition, it will be important to work with partners to explore whether there are alternative ways of funding elements of the proposals, e.g. an HLF landscape partnership scheme.

### **Local Nature Partnerships**

12. Another initiative announced by the Natural Environment White Paper was Local Nature Partnerships. New and existing partnerships were invited by Defra to submit applications for funding (on average £20,000) to establish a Local Nature Partnership. The overall purpose of the LNPs was to 'bring a diverse range of individuals, businesses and organizations together at a local level to create a vision and plan of action of how the natural environment can be taken into account in decision making.' The deadline for applications was 31<sup>st</sup> July. The guidance stressed working at a landscape scale, strategic approaches and more integrated, cross-cutting approaches.
13. Whilst the guidance referred to making links with NIAs and biodiversity offsetting pilot areas (see below), the deadlines were such that a direct link could not be made as the outcome of the LNP application was not known at the time that the NIA proposals were in development.
14. Defra's expectation was that there would be around 50 LNPs across England. Within the AONB, Local Biodiversity partnerships and Green Infrastructure consortia have lead on development of LNP applications. Of the 4 applications covering the AONB, two have received conditional offers (Bucks and Milton Keynes, and Hertfordshire). Those for Oxfordshire and Bedfordshire were not approved. There is a further round of applications (deadline October 31<sup>st</sup>) which those not successful in the first round may apply to.
15. It is important to realise that the funding on offer is only for work to set up the LNPs, and the expectation is that they will be financially self-sustaining once established. This is at a time when Natural England's financial support for Biodiversity Partnerships has been cut.
16. It is too early to say what impact the LNPs will have. The guidance on LNPs encourages the establishment of broad strategic partnerships which can put in place 'a plan for how the natural environment can be taken into account in decision- making'. However, there is a concern that at a time of reducing resources and staff they will divert attention and effort away from achievements on the ground.
17. Board staff expect to work closely with, and contribute to, the emerging LNPs and to continue to work with existing partnerships in those parts of the AONB not covered by LNPs.



## **Biodiversity Offsetting**

18. Offsetting is when development of a site leads to reduction in biodiversity which is then provided for on a site elsewhere.
19. The Natural Environment White Paper also announced the government's intention to work with local planning authorities and their partners to test biodiversity offsetting in their areas over two years from in April 2012. The purpose of the pilot is to explore the potential for offsetting to inform future policy decisions as to how offsetting could best be employed.
20. None of the local authorities in the Chilterns AONB have indicated their intention to formally express an interest in being a pilot area, or in undertaking a complementary project, which would look to test some of the proposed methodology to provide Defra with further information.
21. The CCB has expressed an interest in being a member of the more informal offsetting toolkit Sounding Board. There may be benefits in keeping in close touch with how the offsetting pilot methodology is progressing, particularly given the potential for offsetting should HS2 proceed.
22. Hopefully being on such a Board could also allow us to make contact with other organisations to help share good practice. The information we have so far suggests some of the role could involve reading draft sections of the toolkit guidance for local authorities, developers in pilot areas and offset providers, to help make sure they are clear.
23. Some of our partner organisations expressed interest in taking forward biodiversity offsetting in their own time and that the CCB might provide a useful coordinating role. In theory, this could range from coordinating the sharing of good practice to becoming an offset provider, and a range of options in- between.

## **UK National Ecosystem Assessment (UK NEA)**

24. The National Ecosystem Assessment, published on the 2<sup>nd</sup> June, set out to analyse the value of the natural environment to people and the economy. Key messages of the report were that:
  - The natural world is critically important to our social and economic well-being but consistently undervalue it in conventional economic analysis and decision –making.
  - Many ecosystems in the UK are in long-term decline.
  - Pressures on ecosystem services (food, air, water, soil quality etc.) are set to grow.

- More integrated approaches to ecosystem management are needed. .
25. The NEA argues that the value of nature needs to be better integrated into policy across Government, and that the impacts on ecosystems should be considered within decision-making at all levels. The NEA provides new tools to help assess the value of different 'services' provided by ecosystems and broad habitats.
  26. A detailed technical report and key papers were published alongside the summary report which provide useful reference material, for example to inform the next AONB management plan and landscape scale projects.  
(see <http://uknea.unep-wcmc.org/Resources/tabid/82/Default.aspx>)
  27. The Chairman has written to Rt.Hon Caroline Spelman, Secretary of State for Environment Food and Rural Affairs, seeking reassurance that the government will apply this approach to its own activities, including HS2. DEFRA did not reply to the letter but passed it to Dept for Transport which did not respond to the points raised. A second letter has been sent.

### **Recommendations**

1. **To note that an application has been made for a Chilterns Nature Improvement Area.**
2. **That the Board supports the new Local Nature Partnerships in Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire**
3. **To support comparable local arrangements for biodiversity partnerships in Oxfordshire and Bedfordshire.**
4. **To maintain an informal link to national proposals to introduce biodiversity offsetting.**
5. **To seek reassurance from Government that it will apply the National Ecosystem Assessment approach to its own activities.**

## Item 13 Report on Sustainable Development Fund

**Author** Kath Daly Countryside Officer

**Summary** A summary of Sustainable Development Fund applications received and grants awarded is provided below, along with key points and issues arising in 2010-2011.

The total fund available in 2010 – 2011 was £45,000, of which £43,207 was paid in grants, with the balance paying for Members allowances and administration.

**Purpose of Report** To provide members with a summary of Sustainable Development Fund awards for 2010 - 2011 and to seek feedback.

### Applications received and projects funded 2010 - 11

1. A total of 33 grant applications were received in 2010 - 11, of which 22 were approved. The total of grants paid was £43,140.
2. The total value of projects funded was £203,186. This means that on average, the SDF grant represented 21% of the total cost of each project.
3. The average value of grant per project was £1960.
4. Table 1 below gives a breakdown by applicant type of successful projects:

Local Community / Voluntary Groups	11
Public Sector	2
Local Business	1
Wildlife / Landscape/ Recreation Group or charity	8
	22

5. Table 2 below gives summary information for each grant awarded.

### Key points and issues

6. Relatively small grants from the Board are enabling a wide range of community projects to go ahead when they otherwise may not. The scheme continues to be well used by local community groups and

charities, with a good range of projects including natural and historic environment, recreation, access and local economy.

7. Applications from businesses continue to be few in number. More targeted promotion via rural business networks will be needed if this is to rise, although it is likely that the availability of grants for local businesses through the LEADER programme is another factor. It would also seem to be the case – albeit based on a small sample size – that a relatively high proportion of applications from businesses do not go forward to successful projects for a mix of reasons, including the poor quality of some of the applications.
8. Another issue has been repeat applications. There is no fixed guideline on this issue - the panel assesses each application on its merits. However, applicants are made aware that they should not assume that repeat applications will be supported and need to demonstrate that they have explored alternative sources of funding and have addressed as far as they can the sustainability of the project outcomes.
9. Guidance to applicants on how to claim their grants has resulted in a significant improvement in grant claims and streamlining administration of the grant.
10. Obtaining good quality photos of projects for promotional purposes has been an on-going challenge. In the current round of funding (2011 – 12) applicants are being required to confirm (at the point of accepting the grant) that they understand they are required to supply good quality photos of the project and also to state at the start how they will acknowledge the Board's grant. The SDF grants provide many opportunities for the Board to maintain a high and positive local profile.

**Table 2:**

Applicant	Project	Total value of project	Grant
Tring in Transition	Tring Eco Fair	2,050	250
The Chiltern Society	Chiltern Way: Berkshire Loop	6,475	1,000
Chiltern Woodlands Project	Special Trees and Woods of the Chilterns book	7,480	2,500
Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust	Conserving Hertfordshire's Rare Water Birds at Tring Reservoirs	9,380	3,000

Ashley Green Parish Council	Ashley Green Footpath Stile-Free Access Completion	3,334	1,200
Coleshill Parish Council	Pond restoration	12,500	2,000
Transition Town High Wycombe	Food on our Doorstep (local food directory)	3,195	1,000
Friends of Ashridge	Mobility Vehicle Project	8,700	2,500
Buckinghamshire County Council	Coombe Hill Monument Restoration	51,654	1,000
Marlow Museum Project	Production of a Publicity Leaflet for the Museum	550	445
Chiltern Archaeology	Romans in the Hambleden Valley	15,490	3,000
Chilterns Open Air Museum	Toll House Landscaping Project	6,825	3570
Oxfordshire Geology Trust	Livelihoods from the Chalk	2,350	1,800
Friends of Studham Common	Tools store	2,086	1,029
The National Trust	Hughenden Manor - Tea Break in the Ice House	23,500	2,600
FSC Amersham	Amersham Eco-challenge award	3,140	2,210
Chilterns Open Air Museum	Chilterns Farm Landscaping	7,829	4,784
Chilterns Open Air Museum	Chiltern Cafe	2,432	1,778
Buckinghamshire School Improvement Service	Forest Schools reaching out	13,200	4,000

Endurance Life Ltd	Trailblaze	12,000	2,400
Chiltern Society South Chilterns Path Maintenance Volunteers	Chain Saw Course	1,273	611
Woodcote Conservation Group	Woodcote Community Centre Wildlife Pond	742	530
<b>Total</b>			<b>43,207</b>

### **Recommendations**

- 1. That the panel notes the report and continues to support the Sustainable Development Fund.**
- 2. To encourage more applications from small businesses**

## **Item 14**                      **Report on High Speed 2**

**The paper was presented to the Chilterns Conservation Board Executive Committee on 13<sup>th</sup> September**

**Author:**                      Steve Rodrick                      Chief Officer

**Summary:**                      Following the formal public consultation phase the Board needs to decide on its programme for the period prior to the Secretary of State's decision on whether to proceed with HS2.

**Purpose of the Report:**      To seek guidance from the Board on its next steps in the campaign to stop HS2 crossing the Chilterns.

### **Background**

1.      Since February 2011 the priority for the Board has been to make a formal submission to the public consultation. This required identifying possible impacts and helping raise awareness of these in order for them to be incorporated in the submissions of other organisations and the general public.
2.      The questions on which the public consultations were based did not lend themselves to presenting information on environmental impacts. In the event the Board answered fully most of the questions and submitted a supporting report on environmental impacts.
3.      The Transport Select Committee is investigating the business case for HS2 but its terms of reference do include some environmental matters. The Board made a full submission and was called as a witness on 6<sup>th</sup> September. The National Trust and CPRE also attended as witnesses. These were the only environmental organisations to be called.
4.      The chairman wrote to Chris Huhne MP, the Secretary of State for Energy, seeking clarification on whether it was Government policy to i achieve significant carbon reductions as part of any major government investment in infrastructure. This is in the context of government commitments to achieve carbon emission reductions of 80% by 2050 against a baseline of 1990.
5.      DECC did not respond but instead passed the letter to DfT. An official replied with standard information defending HS2 but did not answer the question about whether it was government policy to achieve carbon reductions as part of its own investment programme. The Chairman has written again to DECC seeking a response to the initial questions.

6. The chairman also wrote (18th July) to Rt.Hon Caroline Spelman, Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, seeking confirmation that following publication by the Government of the Natural Environment White Paper and National Ecosystem Assessment it was now government policy to ensure that business plans for all major development would include valuation of the environment. HS2 notably does not do so. The letter was not answered by DEFRA but sent to the Transport Dept which issued a standard defence of the proposal for DfT. A second letter has been sent to DEFRA.
7. One outcome of the Board's assessment of environmental impact is a possibility that the volume of spoil arising from the tunnelling and cuttings in the Chilterns will be in the order of 12 million cubic metres (loose volume) of which only 10% could readily be used for embankments and bunds in the AONB. The remainder would need to be disposed off line. HS2 Ltd refuted these calculations during the public consultation phase, but did subsequently significantly increase the volumes of arising from tunnelling compared to its published figures. It failed to publish a figure for the spoil arising from excavating cuttings.
8. The Chief Officer wrote to the Chief Executive of HS2 Ltd seeking to resolve the discrepancy in calculations and to clarify what HS2 policy was on disposal of the arisings. An unsatisfactory response was received which did not answer the points raised. A meeting is being sought with Sir Brian Briscoe, chairman of HS2 Ltd.
9. The reality is that if the route is constructed, as per the HS2 publications and maps, the volume of spoil which could require disposal will be approximately 10 million cubic metres. It is inconceivable this can be disposed of satisfactorily along the line without changing the landform. The alternative is transportation to a suitable disposal site. Neither Chinnor nor Pitstone Quarry could be considered satisfactory due to a number of factors including the problems caused by so many fully laden lorries using local roads for at least part of their journey. Contrary to the assertion by HS2 Ltd and DfT this cannot be considered a minor matter to be considered at a later stage.
10. Whilst HS2 Ltd has recognised some of the special qualities of the Chilterns AONB, it noticeably did not appraise the possible impacts specifically in its Appraisal of Sustainability. The Chilterns was simply included in a longer section of route from West Ruislip to Aylesbury, which includes countryside of notably different character. There is a possible argument that by failing to undertake a separate assessment of the AONB the Government cannot be clear on the potential impacts of its activities on the AONB, and thus is not in compliance with Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.



General duty of public bodies etc. **85.** - (1) In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty.

## **12. Proposed Strategy September – December 2012**

- a) To influence national politicians (incl. all MPs) who will vote on HS2 if the proposal reaches parliament.
- b) To raise public awareness so that the impacts on the Chilterns are fully identified and understood. To encourage representations to be made to all MPs. There will be a debate in the House on 13<sup>th</sup> October.
- c) Should the Secretary of State decide to proceed with the project based on a route through the Chilterns, to seek the avoidance or minimisation of any damaging impact of any aspect of the proposal including its design and construction.

## **13. Main areas of activity**

1. Continue to identify and promote possible environmental impacts.
2. Advise local and national politicians of the likely impacts of HS2 on the Chilterns AONB.
3. To provide briefings to local and national bodies involved with HS2, including those which are pro HS2.
4. Continue to raise public awareness, locally and nationally, of the likely impact of HS2 on the Chilterns AONB.
5. Undertake and support further research into the impacts of HS2.
6. Liaise closely with regulatory bodies on their assessment of the impacts of HS2, i.e. Environment Agency, Natural England and Forestry Commission.
7. Liaise with the water companies on possible impacts on the aquifer, water quality and river flows.
8. Provide the public with a source of information and advisory service.

9. Identify the impacts on land based businesses and other economic activity related to enjoyment of the Chilterns.
10. Provide support to local actions groups.
11. To seek legal advice on Government compliance with Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.

### **Recommendation**

1. **To decide upon the Board's strategy on HS2 for the period until the Government makes an announcement on whether it intends to proceed.**

## **Item 15     Promoting Woodfuel**

**Author:**                             Steve Rodrick             Chief Officer

**Summary:**                             The demand for all types of wood fuel is increasing significantly and is being boosted by the introduction of a Renewable Heat Incentive - a government subsidy. The effect on woods in the Chilterns could be significant as wood fuel markets provide a commercial return sufficient to encourage management of previously neglected woodlands.

**Purpose of the Report:**     To inform members of the impact on the AONB of an improving local market for wood fuel

### **Background**

1.     Before the wide availability of coal, the Chilterns economy was dominated by production of wood fuel for its own needs and export to London - that was the primary economic role of Henley as an inland port. With the introduction of coal the firewood market contracted and the Chilterns became a major supplier of timber for furniture. In turn that market contracted and for the past 50 years or more the commercially sustainable markets for timber from the Chilterns have been small and in decline.
2.     However, in recent years the demand for wood fuel (logs, chips and pellets) has increased, notably for logs - many wood buying stoves were installed following the major gales in the early 1990s when fallen timber was abundant. That market continues to grow by approximately 20% per year driven by life style choices and the relative increase in cost of other sources of energy.
3.     With the drive for renewable energy sources and lower carbon emitting fuels the demand for wood fuel is likely to grow for some time. To boost the market and encourage the installation of the best wood burning boilers, the government has recently introduced the Renewable Heat Incentive (RHI). By guaranteeing a minimum price over a long period the Government hopes to overcome the barriers to the market which are the relatively high price of wood fuel boilers compared to gas and uncertainty over long term availability and cost of wood.
4.     The encouragement for woodland owners to produce more wood as fuel is being increased by the introduction of a new grant by the Forestry Commission which is designed to help with on site costs, for example the construction of extraction roads. The grant scheme is

being managed, on contract, by Ngage Solutions Ltd based at Saunderton near Princes Risborough. The AONBs in the south east of England are target areas for this new grant.

### **Implications for the Chilterns**

5. The area of woodland in the Chilterns AONB is approximately 17,000 hectares, capable of a sustainable annual yield of up to 100,000 cubic metres. In practice less than 20% of this is harvested. The result is that many woods are under managed.
6. In each AONB Management Plan (1971, 1984, 2003, 2008) the problem of under managed woodland has been identified as a significant issue. The Management Plan has identified the prospect of demand for wood fuel creating new opportunities and that is now becoming a reality. The key issue is to ensure that the supply chain works efficiently and those considering installing wood fuel heating systems have confidence that they can source supplies, preferably from the Chilterns.
7. Initially the response by the wood fuel sector has been to provide more firewood for the domestic log market, believed to be growing by 20% per annum. This is likely to continue to be the main market but larger woodlands owners will increasingly consider harvesting larger volumes for chips and, in some case, for conversion to wood pellets. Currently there is no manufacturer in or near the Chilterns - Andover in Hants in the nearest.
8. It is noteworthy that BAA has issued a contract for 40,000 tonnes of wood chip annually to supply a wood fuel heating system installed at Terminal 5 at Heathrow. This is a very large contract but they are seeking a low price. Whilst some woodland owners in the Chiltern may supply this market, the price is likely to be too low to be of great interest.
9. There is public concern that felling of any woodland in the AONB is undesirable, but there are significant safeguards in place to ensure there is no over exploitation. Any felling will require Forestry Commission approval and restocking will be a condition - there is no danger of the woodland cover in the Chilterns declining. It may even provide an opportunity to convert some conifer plantations on what are now considered to be inappropriate sites, to be replaced by species better suited to the Chilterns.
10. The income received by owners for selling timber for wood fuel is likely to be, in many cases, used to undertake other conservation and amenity works which would otherwise be too expensive.

## **The Role of the Board**

11. As mentioned above the Board has identified under-management of woodland and the potential for wood fuel to provide viable new markets. To that end it has been involved in this sector in a number of ways:
  1. The potential for the wood fuel markets to help encourage management of small woodlands has long been identified in successive Chilterns AONB Management Plans.
  2. Support for the Chiltern Woodlands project which advises owners of small woods (under 20 hectares). Increasingly the project has been identifying the opportunity for owners to supply wood fuel.
  3. Jointly, with the Chiltern Woodlands Project, the Board has organised an annual woodland forum which regularly promotes wood fuel.
  4. The Board is a partner in an EU funded project (in partnership with Ngage Solutions Ltd, Bucks CC and Wycombe DC) investigating ways to increase the number of wood fuel heating systems in public buildings and the capacity of local woodland owners to supply them. A number of woodland owners have been identified who are interested in supplying timber for wood chips on a long term basis. A commercial partner has been identified to help organise local timber growers so they can provide a reliable supply of timber for larger contracts - the missing link to date.
  5. The Board has provided grant aid for wood fuel projects from the SDF, for example a wood fuel heating system at Braziers Court in Oxfordshire.
  6. Local wood processors have been regular demonstrators at the Chiltern Country Festival.
  7. The Board helped secure a LEADER programme for the Chilterns. A number of grants have been awarded to local businesses to help them increase the production of wood fuel.

## **Conclusion**

12. After many years of anticipating a significant increase in demand for wood fuel this market is now growing rapidly. This is good news for the Chilterns as the market is sufficient to provide an enhanced commercial return compared to alternative markets, is supporting local businesses, and providing a stimulus for management of previously neglected woodlands. There is a slight need for caution to avoid selling higher quality timber, for which there is no market at present, for conversion to wood fuel. The long term aim is to grow high quality

timber for uses such as furniture and to develop a viable market such as wood fuel for lower grade timber.

### **Recommendations**

- 1. To note the growth in the market for wood fuel and its potential benefits for woodlands and woodland owners in the Chilterns.**
- 2. To encourage the installation of more wood fuel heating systems particularly in public buildings.**
- 3. To promote the new Forestry Commission grant to ensure there is a high uptake in the Chilterns.**
- 4. To encourage applications from the wood fuel sector to the Sustainable Development Fund and LEADER programme.**

## Chilterns Conservation Board – Provisional Work Programme 2011-2012

### Conserve and Enhance Natural Beauty

No.	Area of Work	Key Actions and Outputs	CCB Budget	Progress April - Sept.
1	Management of Chalk Grassland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for site management on 3 sites.(contributing to improved management on around 15 ha lowland calcareous grassland.)</li> <li>• Training Programme</li> <li>• Chalk Grassland Managers Day (50 delegates)</li> <li>• Promotion of ELS and HLS (Environmental Stewardship Schemes0</li> <li>• Support for BBOWT chalk grassland project</li> </ul>	£3,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management advice (including sheep grazing) to LA &amp; individuals.</li> <li>• Work underway on autumn edition of e-bulletin for site managers</li> <li>• Chalk grassland manager's day held at Dancer's End / Aldbury Nowers 14<sup>th</sup> July – 50+ participants</li> <li>• Liaison with NE over ELS/HLS priorities to pass onto farmers.</li> <li>• Contribution to works at Oakley hill via Chalk grassland budget. Chalk grassland day part hosted by BBOWT's Chalk grassland project, one outcome of which is provision of</li> </ul>

				<p>feedback to site managers from participants and species experts giving in-field talks. Proposals being developed with BBOWT chalk grassland officer re. joint approaches to working on sites outside BBOWT reserves.</p> <p>Other potential projects under discussion – Nashleigh Hill, Chesham, and Whipsnade Downs.</p>
2	Management of Commons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for site works (3 no.) (contributing to improved management /restoration of around 15 ha BAP priority habitat)</li> <li>• Annual Commons Day (40 delegates)</li> <li>• Training Programme for local groups</li> <li>• Support for Commons Network</li> <li>• Publication and promotion of guidance incl. newsletter (2</li> </ul>	<p>£7,000</p> <p>Total budget £500,000 (June – Dec 2015)</p>	<p>(NB: £4000 of the budget reserved as match funding for HLF project)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commons Day and HLF project launch at Totternhoe Knolls took place on 30<sup>th</sup> September – 80 participants.</li> <li>• Commons Network site visit and meeting held 23<sup>rd</sup> June, Brush Hill. (18 participants)</li> <li>• Newsletter published in May (spring), August (summer), October (autumn).</li> </ul>



		<p>editions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance of database</li> <li>• HLF Stage 2 application project officer will be employed to develop the bid- the aim is to submit this bid by March 2011</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HLF application successful- grant of £403,00 awarded by HLF.</li> <li>• Project Officer (Rachel Sanderson) appointed in June</li> <li>• Steering Group created and met on 26 September.</li> </ul>
3	Woodland Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advice and training on all aspects of woodland management to owners of small woodlands (target of 50 no. = 200 hectares of woodlands) – via Chiltern Woodlands Project.</li> <li>• Hedgerow Trees Initiative to promote management and planting of trees in hedgerows and in-field</li> </ul>	<p>£5,000</p> <p>Need to secure additional resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreement in place with Chiltern Woodland Project – 20 visits have taken place</li> <li>• Initiative delayed due to additional work pressures created by HS2</li> <li>• Presentation of new ADAS Tree Risk Policy arranged for forthcoming Land Management Group</li> </ul>
4	Ancient Woodlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey of all woodlands to identify ancient woodland (partnership with NE, FC and CWP).Feb 2010- Dec 2011</li> </ul>	<p>£34,000 (ring fenced reserves + income from partners)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey in progress</li> <li>• All surveying for 2011 undertaken</li> <li>• Project operating within budget</li> <li>• Project officer has successfully transferred to Thames Valley</li> </ul>

5	<p>Promotion of good land management practice</p> <p>Events and publications- C'side Dept budget</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active promotion of uptake of the agri-environment and forestry grant schemes</li> <li>• Advice service, especially to new owners of land.</li> <li>• Promotion of good hedgerow management</li> <li>• Distribute information pack (30 no.)</li> </ul>	£1,000	<p>Environmental Records Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advice to 2x local groups on site specific management.</li> <li>• Land management Group (partner organisations and farmers) held 27<sup>th</sup> June.</li> <li>• Participation with Wycombe Rural Forum farm tour, 23<sup>rd</sup> June.</li> <li>• 5 packs issued via Open Farm Sunday events.</li> <li>• National Environment White Paper <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- partnerships bids supported for Local Nature Partnerships (LNPs)</li> <li>- Submitted bid for Chilterns Chalk Nature Improvement Area (NIA)</li> <li>- Expression of interest to Biodiversity Offsetting Sounding Board</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
6	Conservation of Chalk Streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to support the Chalk Streams Project</li> <li>• Pursue and develop new funding opportunities</li> <li>• River restoration programmes for</li> </ul>	<p>£19,200</p> <p>Combination of project grant aid, ring fenced</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project operating with full support</li> <li>• Working with Thames River Restoration Trust to secure funding for restoration projects through DEFRA river</li> </ul>

		<p>Misbourne, Chess, Gade, Ver, Bulbourne, Hughenden, Wye</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Riparian Management incl. willow pollarding and river corridor landscape enhancement</li> <li>• River enhancement through schemes and support of local community partnerships – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Dacorum Environment Forum Water Group (R. Ver, Bulbourne and R. Gade)</li> <li>○ River Chess Association</li> <li>○ Impress the Chess partnership</li> <li>○ Misbourne River Action</li> <li>○ Revive the Wye</li> <li>○ Chiltern Society (bedlining scheme)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Implement relevant actions in CCB Management Plan.</li> <li>• Comment on all relevant plans</li> <li>• Liaising with Environment Agency and Water Companies to reduce abstraction</li> </ul>	<p>reserves and project support budget</p>	<p>improvement fund. 2 project bids submitted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding of Project by EA confirmed for 2012/13</li> <li>• Partnership projects with EA on Misbourne at Little Missenden and Sarratt on R. Chess. £46 000.</li> <li>• Supporting River Chess Association in lobbying against combined sewage overflows.</li> <li>• Kingsmead (R. Wye) restoration scheme developed for implementation in October.</li> <li>• Working with Chiltern Society's in revised HLF bid for bedlining scheme.</li> <li>• HS2 consultation - CCSP comments incorporated into CCB response</li> <li>• Bucks CC Surface Water Management Plan for Chesham and High Wycombe</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support BBOWT water vole recovery project work on Chiltern chalk streams</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Veolia R. Misbourne flow augmentation trial completed (Sept '11)</li> <li>Advice given to EA on priority restoration projects for Chess and Misbourne as part of Restoring Sustainable Abstraction programme</li> <li>R. Chess water vole survey completed. Water vole population now recovered back to 2001 population size (size prior to population crash).</li> <li>Expression of interest submitted to host a Chilterns rivers catchment as part of DEFRA's catchment management pilot scheme,</li> </ul>
7	Orchards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop new project</li> <li>Recruit volunteers</li> <li>Undertake survey work and condition assessment</li> <li>Training programme</li> <li>Events programme</li> <li>Submit bid to HLF</li> <li>Promote grants and advice to owners</li> </ul>	Staff time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project delayed due to additional work pressures created by HS2</li> <li>Continued liaison with groups and private individuals over training, events, planting and management.</li> </ul>
8	Response to Planning Applications and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submit response on relevant planning applications. (approx 40)</li> </ul>	Staff time	<p>Main areas of work have been :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>South Oxon DC core strategy</li> </ul>

	Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submit response to consultation on development and mineral plans</li> <li>• Respond to all relevant national and regional planning plans.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wycombe Sports Stadium and Village</li> <li>• Arla Dairy, Aylesbury</li> <li>• HS2</li> <li>• Comments submitted on 11 planning applications</li> </ul>
9	High Speed 2 Railway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain objection to HS2 proposal</li> <li>• Assess impact of HS2 proposals</li> </ul>	£10,000 Staff time. It is impossible to determine the scale of input needed at this stage, but is likely to be an ongoing area of work for many years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This has involved considerable staff and member time. It has resulted in a diversion of effort from other areas of work. Requests for additional support from NE and HS2 Ltd were declined.</li> <li>• Completion and analysis of landscape audit, photographic surveys etc.</li> <li>• Publication of results via web pages.</li> <li>• Chief Officer gave evidence at Transport Select Committee on 6<sup>th</sup> Sep</li> <li>• Considerable media coverage</li> </ul>
10	Promote Planning Policies and Guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publish Planning Policy Guidelines</li> <li>• Offer training and advice</li> </ul>	£1,500 Staff time (may need allocation from project support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National Planning Policy Framework</li> <li>• Localism Bill</li> </ul>

			budget)	
11	Roads in the Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote newly published and revised guidance.</li> <li>Lobby for low noise road surfaces</li> <li>Assess major highway proposals for environmental impact</li> </ul>	Staff time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low key area of work to date.</li> <li>Advising National Trust on options for traffic calming at Bradenham</li> </ul>
12	Buildings in the Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote new edition of Building Design Guide.</li> <li>Promote use of all published guidance.</li> <li>Organise Building Design Award with C'Soc (20 entries )</li> <li>Organise annual Planning Conference. (70 delegates.)</li> </ul>	£500	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promotion of new edition ongoing.</li> <li>Copies circulated to all parish councils and local planning authorities</li> <li>Deign Award ceremony held and awards presented with follow up publicity.</li> <li>Planning conference planned for 5<sup>th</sup> October with theme of renewable energy</li> </ul>
13	Under-grounding of power lines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying power lines suitable for under grounding (1no.)</li> <li>Securing agreement from power companies (EDF and Scottish and Southern) to include in their 5 year regional programmes</li> </ul>	Staff Time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ongoing but SSE have suspended their involvement in the programme</li> </ul>

14	Building design, renewable Energy and climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Publish guidance on building design adaptation for climate change and</li> <li>• Publish position statement on renewable energy technology</li> </ul>	<p>£2,500</p> <p>Staff Time</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early stages of preparation</li> </ul>
----	--	--	---------------------------------	---

<b>Promoting Understanding and Enjoyment</b>				
<b>No</b>	<b>Area of Work</b>	<b>Key Actions and Outputs</b>	<b>CCB Budget</b>	
17	Events Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What's On programme – on line</li> <li>• Wildlife on the Move Programme (12 events)</li> </ul>	Sponsorship/ advertising income target of £1,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On target - programme on going</li> <li>• Income from Wildlife on the Move £230</li> </ul>
18	Orchards Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Engagement programme</li> <li>• Volunteers (50 days)</li> <li>• Research</li> <li>• Events</li> <li>• Web pages and leaflets</li> <li>• Talks</li> </ul>	Staff time New funding source to be secured – poss HLF bid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delayed pending diversion of effort to HS2</li> </ul>
19	Red Kites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Events Programme</li> <li>• Friend of Red Kites scheme</li> <li>• Merchandising</li> <li>• Information service</li> </ul>	£1,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Friends of Red Kite scheme on hold – to be evolved into Caring for the Chilterns Fund (£60 income)</li> <li>• Red kite merchandise income £1,093.30 to date</li> <li>• Donations for red kite talks / walks / pin badges £944.50</li> <li>• Much time spent dealing with red kite feeding issues / queries- interview on R4 Today programme- 11.10.2011</li> </ul>



20	Countryside Festival	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Countryside Festival</li> <li>• 4,000 visitors</li> <li>• 100 exhibitors</li> <li>• Net income of £3,000</li> </ul>	No net cost to CCB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Held on 18<sup>th</sup> September in partnership with National Trust.</li> <li>• Over 100 exhibitors</li> <li>• Over 3,300 paying adults (approx total visitors ~ 6,000)</li> <li>• Net income approx £4,500</li> </ul>
21	Major Events Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attend 5 major events <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Henley Show</li> <li>• Bucks Show</li> <li>• Thame and Oxfordshire Show</li> <li>• 2 others</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	£1,000  Donations- £1,000	Attended : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thame Show</li> <li>• Armed Forces Day</li> <li>• Open Farm Sunday (see below)</li> <li>• Several HS2 rallies</li> <li>• Bucks Show</li> <li>• Henley Show</li> <li>• Chilterns Countryside Festival</li> </ul>
22	People and Places Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add 15 profiles (total to 100)</li> <li>• Publication based on profiles currently on web site</li> </ul>	Part of web site budget.  To be self financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ongoing</li> <li>• Planned booklet behind scheduled - now re-scheduled for summer 2012</li> </ul>
23	Schools Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote Learning Directory</li> <li>• Produce Chilterns-wide education pack for KS2 History and Geography</li> <li>• Support Trout in the Classroom</li> </ul>	£1,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learning Directory distributed.</li> <li>• 'Understanding the Chilterns in Place and Time' produced and distributed free to over 300 schools. Remainder to be sold. Income to date £125.</li> </ul>

		<p>project (two schools in Chess Valley)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop on line learning zone</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trout in the Classroom project underway</li> <li>• Learning Zone incorporated in the re-design of web site</li> </ul>
24	Access for All Programme (includes Chilterns Country)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of Chilterns Country series and decide which to reprint</li> <li>• Lead a disabled ramble</li> <li>• Design and promote an additional 2 stile-free routes in the Chilterns</li> <li>• Work with partners to get three new access for all trails on to web site (Coombe Hill, Totternhoe, Dunstable).</li> <li>• Investigate access for all trail at Hodgemoor Woods in conjunction with the Forestry Commission.</li> <li>• Access Audit at Penn Wood for the Woodland Trust (CCB providing 10 days paid consultancy time)</li> </ul>	<p>£3,100 plus partner contributions</p> <p>£2,000 fee from the Woodland Trust</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Led Disabled Ramble on 20th August 2011 starting at Dunstable Downs -20 participants</li> <li>• One stile-free walk designed and on web site (Greys Court)</li> <li>• Additional Estate map designed for Greys Court showing walks in the area, now on web site</li> <li>• Inception meeting mid-October, must be completed by February 2012</li> </ul>
25	Development and Management of Walks and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote web site by publicising new walks, promoting walk of the</li> </ul>	Staff time or self-financing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New walk of the month feature on web site</li> </ul>

	Rides Web Site and other on-line information	<p>month and press activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target income from web advertising £1,000</li> <li>• Promote blog and investigate other mechanisms to update the site regularly and make it more interactive.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• £500 through web advertising to date (through photo adverts)</li> </ul>
26	Chilterns Cycleway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reprint and distribute 10,000 promotional leaflets</li> <li>• Promote and sell guide book (1,000 guide books)</li> <li>• Pursue Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) Expression of Interest with CTC</li> <li>• More circular day rides from gateway towns</li> <li>• On-going assessment of signage improvements, especially in Tranquil area</li> <li>• Carry out market research to elicit user feedback</li> <li>• Keen Cycleway Blog updated</li> </ul>	£3,000 plus staff and volunteer time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leaflets currently being reprinted, £200 from Fox's of Amersham for an advert on the leaflet</li> <li>• Three additional retail outlets for guide books</li> <li>• LSTF expression of interest submitted 8th June, full application to be submitted Feb 2012</li> <li>• West Wycombe circular ride and Wendover loop ready to promote. Further day rides in production.</li> <li>• Signage improvements implemented in northern Chilterns (area 3).</li> <li>• Market research underway to elicit user feedback. Electronic survey has been designed and now being circulated. Collate results end of October.</li> </ul>

27	Access Conference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organise conference (70 delegates)</li> </ul>	£1,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned for March 2012</li> </ul>
28	Enjoying the Historic Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Walk Back in Time events programme (Summer and Winter – 40 events)</li> <li>Chilternsaetna newsletter (biannual-electronic version only)</li> </ul>	£2,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summer Walk Back in Time programme published and distributed</li> <li>Chilternsaetna published July. 1,500 printed copies, plus downloadable from website</li> </ul>
29	Enjoying Woodlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support training courses on woodland archaeology organised by CWP</li> <li>Publish woodland heritage booklet</li> <li>Organise Annual Woodland Forum with CWP (60 delegates)</li> </ul>	£3,500  Income to CWP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 course held</li> <li>Woodland Heritage Booklet delayed</li> <li>Woodland Forum planned for March 2012</li> <li>Project being developed to promote the understanding of the ecological and cultural importance of Box Wood. A project group has been formed and an initial EoI submitted to the Heritage Lottery Fund – a</li> </ul>

				positive response has been received .
30	Wood Fuel Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support establishment of Chilterns Wood Fuel Group</li> </ul>	£500	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Active participation as a funding partner in the TIMBER (wood fuel) EU funded project</li> </ul>
31	Raising Awareness of Farming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement programme to raise public awareness of farming. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farm Sunday</li> <li>• Updated farming calendar on web site</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	£500	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in 2x Open Farm Sunday events (Hamptden Bottom and Offley Hoo)</li> <li>• Contact with other participants resulting in providing information and leaflet packs for 3 other farms in addition to above</li> <li>• Promotion of Open Farm Sunday, including individual events, via CCB web site.</li> </ul>
32	Chalk Streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management advice visits to riparian owners – 10no</li> <li>• Increase community involvement in chalk streams management</li> <li>• Hold an Annual Forum (50 delegates)</li> <li>• Published Annual Report</li> <li>• Organise Events Programme</li> <li>• Develop website education resource</li> <li>• Campaign to reduce water</li> </ul>	£19,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 advisory visits to landowners to date</li> <li>• Misbourne Riverfly monitoring group set up</li> <li>• Annual Forum held in Misbourne Valley – June.</li> <li>• Annual report published and distributed</li> <li>• 4 walks and talks held to date</li> <li>• Led Queen Mary Univ. of London MSc. Course field trip –</li> </ul>

		abstraction and to conserve water.		<p>30<sup>th</sup> Sept.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lobbying Environment Agency on issue of unconsented works to R. Misbourne</li> <li>• Project operating with full support</li> </ul>
33	Promoting Tourism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation in South East Protected Landscape tourism project. Work with local tourism businesses to encourage participation in the project and to develop and market 3 themed short-break packages.</li> <li>• Organise quarterly Bucks and Chilterns Tourism network meetings and investigate possibility of developing a Leader tourism bid.</li> <li>• Promote membership of Green Tourism Business Scheme</li> <li>• Distribute literature to tourism businesses</li> </ul>	£1,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project underway. Providing advice and contacts to product developer who will work with tourism businesses and taking part in Project Steering Group. 6 businesses signed up to date. Launch event on 14 October.</li> <li>• Two meetings organised (16th June and 28th July), next planned for 20 Oct, over 30 participants. Leader Expression of Interest has been submitted and Ngage have approved progressing to full application.</li> <li>• GTBS- upgraded to Gold Standard</li> <li>• Ongoing</li> </ul>
34	Getting to Know the Chilterns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Web site developed particularly to provide visitor information. (170,000</li> </ul>	£9,675	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 112,112 visits in 2011 to 22nd Sept</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>visits)</li> <li>Publish Chalk and Trees – two editions published (15,000 copies and</li> <li>Publish range of information literature</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New website live on 23rd Sept. Running smoothly, staff learning to update it via Content Management System. Online shop, OS and Amazon affiliate links built to provide income. 4 online sales to date.</li> <li>Spring/Summer edition of Chalk and Trees published in April, Autumn/Winter edition in production.</li> </ul>
35	Working with the Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue 40 press releases</li> <li>Target of 10 radio/TV interviews</li> <li>Publish articles – 10no.</li> </ul>	Staff time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10 press releases and 3 letters issued</li> <li>10 radio and 3 TV interviews</li> <li>1 article published</li> </ul>
36	Photography	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update library</li> </ul>	Staff time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ongoing</li> </ul>
37	State of the Environment Monitoring.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organise annual state of the environment workshop.</li> <li>Publish State of the Environment Report (electronic version only)</li> </ul>	£2,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>State of the Environment forum held- 24 organisations represented.</li> <li>Drafting of 2011 report in progress</li> </ul>
38	Conserving Tranquillity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to any proposals which will result in increased noise caused by over flying</li> </ul>	Staff time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HS2</li> <li>Lobbying for low noise surfacing for A413 and A4128</li> <li>Response to consultation on</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote measures to reduce noise pollution arising from road traffic especially along the M40 and 'A' roads.</li> </ul>		national strategy for aviation
39	Promotion of River Thames Corridor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigate the addition of two more walking loops linking in with the Thames Path</li> <li>Produce a programme of costed possibilities with view to possible HLF bid</li> <li>Continue with South East Protected Landscape work, promoting walking breaks along the Thames.</li> </ul>	Staff time with view to funding bid	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>First walking loop from Whitchurch underway</li> </ul>



## Managing the Chilterns Conservation Board

	<b>Area of Work</b>	<b>Key Actions and Outputs</b>	<b>Budget</b>
1	AONB Management Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promotion</li> </ul>	Staff Time <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ongoing</li> </ul>
2	Annual Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Publish report</li> <li>1,000 copies</li> </ul>	£1,100 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Review published</li> </ul>
3	Board Bulletin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Electronic bulletin</li> <li>6 editions per year</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 editions of bulletin published</li> </ul>
4	Annual Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual Forum with attendance of 140 representing at least 50 organisations</li> </ul>	£2,300 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual forum planned for 11<sup>th</sup> November. Venue - Amersham Rugby Club</li> </ul>
5	CCB meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 4 meetings per year</li> <li>Av 85% attendance</li> </ul>	£1,355 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Board meeting held in June (89% attendance)</li> <li>New clerk (Deirdre Hansen) appointed with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> June</li> </ul>
6	CCB Executive Committee Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 4 meetings per year</li> <li>Av 85% attendance</li> </ul>	£150 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meetings held in May (78% attendance) and September (56%)</li> </ul>
7	CCB Planning Committee Meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 4 meetings per year</li> <li>Av 85% attendance</li> </ul>	£500 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meetings in May (100% attendance) September (67%)</li> </ul>
8	Sustainable Development Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All funds allocated</li> </ul>	£40,000. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>16 applications.</li> <li>£27,148 awarded to date</li> </ul>

9	Annual General Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To hold an AGM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned for 19th October</li> </ul>
1 0	AONB Tours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two tours held for members (April and Sept)</li> <li>Walking tour (June)</li> </ul>	<p>£1,500</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tour held in April</li> <li>Walking Tour held in July</li> <li>Sept tour replaced by workshop on review of AONB Boundary with site visits to Chinnor Hill and Bledlow</li> </ul>