

## **Bierton, Broughton and Kingsbrook Neighbourhood Development Plan**

### **Examiner's Clarification Note**

This Note sets out my initial comments on the submitted Plan. It also sets out areas where it would be helpful to have some further clarification. For the avoidance of any doubt, matters of clarification are entirely normal at this early stage of the examination process.

#### ***Initial Comments***

The Plan provides a clear vision for the neighbourhood area. The relationship between the vision and objectives of the Plan, and the policies is very clear. This matter is simply but effectively captured in the table on page 43 of the Plan. It provides a robust structure for the wider document.

The relationship between the Evidence Papers and the policies has been well-considered.

The Plan is presented in an effective way. The difference between the policies and the supporting text is very clear. The Plan makes good use of maps and photographs.

#### ***Points for Clarification***

I have read the submitted documents and the representations made to the Plan. I have also visited the neighbourhood area. I am now in a position to raise issues for clarification with the parish councils.

The comments made on the points in this Note will be used to assist in the preparation of the examination report and in recommending any modifications that may be necessary to the Plan to ensure that it meets the basic conditions.

I set out specific policy clarification points below in the order in which they appear in the submitted Plan:

#### ***Policies P1/HO1/HO2***

In combination these policies establish a spatial strategy for the neighbourhood area.

Nevertheless, I am minded to recommend a modification which would combine the three separate policies into one overarching policy. This would provide the clarity required by the NPPF in general terms. It also acknowledges that Policy P1 is not a policy in its own rights (as it is delivered through the combination of Policies HO1/HO2).

Do the parish councils have any comments on this proposition?

The proposed development boundary for Bierton has generated considerable comment in general, and in respect of the Aylesbury Road boundary in particular.

To what extent are the parish councils satisfied that the development boundary for Bierton has followed the guidance set out in Appendix 5? In particular, how was the tension managed between using clearly defined features as the development boundary (Item 1) and excluding large gardens where the parish councils have concluded that their inclusion would harm the character of the village concerned (Item 3d)?

Given the strategic nature of the Kingsbrook development, are the four proposed development boundaries needed in order to deliver the Plan's objectives?

On what basis was the ceiling of four homes defined in Policy HO1? As submitted would that limit potentially conflict with the development of the residual elements of the Kingsbrook development?

#### *Policy F1*

The principle of the policy is entirely appropriate.

However, to what extent would development proposals be required to demonstrate the 'justified enhancement'?

#### *Policy G1*

The Local Green Spaces (LGS) report provides a helpful level of detail.

However, neither Appendix 2 nor the Local Green Spaces report provide any detailed clarity on the extent of the proposed LGSs. In addition, the identification of the LGSs is more complicated than otherwise would be the case as the various maps primarily show elements of green infrastructure (which in some cases overlap with the proposed LGSs). The scale of the maps reinforces these issues.

Please can I have a map of each of the proposed LGS at a scale which will make their locations clear.

The language used in relation to proposed LGS5 (Sports Field) and LGS6 (Railway Park) suggests that the spaces concerned are yet to be developed. Please can the parish councils advise about their intentions and/or provide an update of the assessment.

#### *Policy G2*

The policy approach is helpfully underpinned by the Evidence Paper.

The initial explanation in the Paper is helpful. However, many of the identified views are of the surrounding landscape and elements of the built environment and which do not appear to be of sufficient importance to justify their incorporation as a key view in the Plan. Are the views identified in Section 4.0 of the Landscape Study of a different magnitude to the other identified views?

Given the policy's focus on the identified key views and vistas, is there any added benefit in its cross reference to development boundaries?

#### *Policies HE1*

The principle of the policy is entirely appropriate.

However, is the second sentence necessary as the first sentence offers support to proposals which are consistent with the Rights of Way Improvement Plan?

#### *Policy HH2*

As submitted, this is not a land use policy. It simply comments that the parish councils will produce a conservation plan. Was this approach deliberate?

Are the parish councils satisfied that national and local policies are sufficiently robust to safeguard heritage assets in the neighbourhood area?

### *Policy T1*

As submitted, this is not a land use policy. In addition, the works anticipated are highways works and would be delivered separately by the Highways Authority.

Please can the parish councils advise on its rationale for the policy?

### *Aspirations*

The parish councils will have seen that its aspiration with regard to the ELR have generated considerable comments.

Please can the parish councils advise on the rationale for the approach?

In any event, is it a genuine neighbourhood plan aspiration as it requires a single third party to deliver the ambition, rather than one where the parish councils would work with other organisations to deliver agreed ambitions?

### **Representations**

Do the parish councils wish to comment on any of the representations made to the Plan?

In particular do they wish to comment on the following representations:

- Barratt DWH Thames;
- Ecology and Arts Club;
- Hallam Land Management;
- Jean Wheatley;
- Hobbs Developments; and
- Revera Limited/M&G Real Estate?

Buckinghamshire Council's representation suggests changes to certain policies. Do the parish councils have any comments on its suggestions?

### **Protocol for responses**

I would be grateful for responses by 10 August 2022. Please let me know if this timetable may be challenging to achieve. It is intended to maintain the momentum of the examination.

In the event that certain responses are available before others, I would be happy to receive the information on a piecemeal basis. Irrespective of how the information is assembled, please could it come to me directly from Buckinghamshire Council. In addition, please can all responses make direct reference to the policy or the matter concerned.

Andrew Ashcroft

Independent Examiner

Bierton Broughton and Kingsbrook Neighbourhood Development Plan.

11 July 2022