

Rachael Riach

From: SUE WINNAN [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 December 2021 15:57
To: Neighbourhood Planning Mailbox
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Buckland Neighbourhood Plan submission

I live in Buckland Village:

Sue Winman
[REDACTED]

Buckland
[REDACTED]

I would like to register my support for the new Buckland Neighbourhood plan submission.

I think there should be no development in the Conservation area - and none outside the current settlement boundary.

Buckland Village is a small village with no pavements and any additional development would make the village even more dangerous - this applied to Buckland Road.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email.

Regards

Sue Winman

Date: 10 January 2022
Our ref: 375666
Your ref: Replacement Buckland Neighbourhood Plan



Planning Policy Team
County Hall
Walton Street
Aylesbury
Buckinghamshire HP20 1UA

Hornbeam House
Crewe Business Park
Electra Way
Crewe
Cheshire
CW1 6GJ

**BY EMAIL ONLY - Neighbourhoodplanning@buckinghamshire.gov.uk
planning.policy.buckinghamshire.council@notifications.service.gov.uk**

T 0300 060 3900

Dear Planning Policy Team

Replacement Buckland Neighbourhood Plan

Thank you for your consultation request on the above dated and received by Natural England on date 25th November 2021.

At this time, Natural England is not able to fully assess the potential impacts of this plan on statutory nature conservation sites or protected landscapes or, provide detailed advice in relation to this consultation. If you consider there are significant risks to statutory nature conservation sites or protected landscapes, please set out the specific areas on which you require advice.

The lack of detailed advice from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment. It is for the deciding authority to determine whether or not the plan is consistent with national and local environmental policies. Other bodies and individuals may provide information and advice on the impacts of the plan on the natural environment to assist the decision making process.

Guidance on the assessment of Neighbourhood Plans, in light of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (as amended), is contained within the [National Planning Practice Guidance](#). The guidance highlights three triggers that may require the production of an SEA, for instance where:

- a neighbourhood plan allocates sites for development
- the neighbourhood area contains sensitive natural or heritage assets that may be affected by the proposals in the plan
- the neighbourhood plan may have significant environmental effects that have not already been considered and dealt with through a sustainability appraisal of the Local Plan.

Natural England does not routinely maintain locally specific data on all potential environmental assets. As a result the responsible authority should raise environmental issues that we have not identified on local or national biodiversity action plan species and/or habitats, local wildlife sites or local landscape character, with its own ecological and/or landscape advisers, local record centre, recording society or wildlife body on the local landscape and biodiversity receptors that may be affected by this plan, before determining whether an SA/SEA is necessary.

Please note that Natural England reserves the right to provide further comments on the environmental assessment of the plan beyond this SEA/SA screening stage, should the responsible authority seek our views on the scoping or environmental report stages. This includes any third party appeal against any screening decision you may make.

Yours faithfully

Sharon Jenkins
Operations Delivery
Consultations Team
Natural England

Rachael Riach

From: jon sainsbury [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December 2021 16:03
To: Neighbourhood Planning Mailbox
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Buckland Neighbourhood Plan Consultation 2021

Hi,

My interest is as a resident of Buckland Village although I also sit on the Parish council as a BPC counsellor.

My address is:

Tessel Dyke
Buckland Village
Aylesbury
[REDACTED]

I would like to be notified of future progress of the Neighbourhood plan

My Email address is as [REDACTED]

I **support** the submitted plan and would like to provide comments.

The new policy defines the housing settlement boundary which is important as it only allows new development within the existing boundary.

The separation between Aston Clinton is maintained under the new plan; also important to prevent the villages merging and Buckland becoming part of Aylesbury, which is already encroaching on Aston Clinton boundaries.

The plan supports local agriculture and new rural businesses.

The plan also adds more protection to the environment, biodiversity and wildlife within the parish. It adds some additional protection against the industrialised development of agricultural land in and around the boundary.

The plan also considers the environment within the parish, protecting heritage assets and ensuring the local amenity is protected for the benefit of the parishioners and local wildlife.

Thank you for your consideration

Kind regards

J.P Sainsbury

Rachael Riach

From: Lloyd Sweet, Robert <Robert.LloydSweet@HistoricEngland.org.uk>
Sent: 12 January 2022 12:05
To: Planning Policy Team Buckinghamshire Council; Neighbourhood Planning Mailbox
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Replacement Buckland Neighbourhood Plan – Publication Town and County Planning England The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

To whom it may concern

Thank you for consulting Historic England on the submission version of the Buckland Neighbourhood Plan. Historic England is the government's advisor on planning for the historic environment including advising on the conservation of heritage assets and champion good design in historic places. As such, our review of the plan is limited to those areas that fall within our remit and silence on other matters should not be treated as agreement or consent.

Policy BP.14

We recognise the desire of the community to provide greater protection for their heritage, including the non-designated heritage assets identified and analysed in their appendix F. Without commenting on individual non-designated heritage assets and their suitability, we are satisfied that the buildings, in general have been appropriately considered against relevant factors (in general their historic or architectural interest), although we are uncertain whether the list of 'Other buildings of note' are part of this Local List or not and that no reason is given for the inclusion of Ramblers. We would be grateful if the examiner could seek clarification of this matter from the steering group. Nevertheless, unfortunately we feel the proposed Policy BP.14 paragraph 1 goes beyond the protection afforded to non-designated heritage assets via the NPPF, which requires process of justification of unavoidable harm to the significance of a heritage asset resulting from a proposal, taking into account the significance of the asset and the nature and extent of the harm. We feel this is better expressed in Policy BP.14 of the made plan, which should be retained, with the addition of reference to the list of buildings identified in Appendix F to which the policy is considered to apply. The list is short enough that the addresses could helpfully be included in the supporting text to aid clarity for decision makers.

We feel the addition of the second paragraph referring to the potential restoration of the Wendover Arm of the Grand Union Canal is a positive, locally distinct element of the plan and would even suggest adding a clause to the effect that proposals for development that would frustrate this restoration should be resisted.

We hope these comments are of assistance to the examiner but would be pleased to answer queries relating to them if needed.

Yours sincerely

Robert Lloyd-Sweet

Robert Lloyd-Sweet | Historic Places Adviser | South East England | Historic England
Cannon Bridge House | 25 Dowgate Hill | London | EC4R 2YA
Mobile: 07825 907288



Work with us to champion heritage and improve lives. Read our Future Strategy and get involved at historicengland.org.uk/strategy.

Follow us: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#) Sign up to our [newsletter](#)

This e-mail (and any attachments) is confidential and may contain personal views which are not the views of Historic England unless specifically stated. If you have received it in error, please delete it from your system and notify the sender immediately. Do not use, copy or disclose the information in any way nor act in reliance on it. Any information sent to Historic England may become publicly available. We respect your privacy and the use of your information. Please read our full [privacy policy](#) for more information.

From: Planning policy - Buckinghamshire Council

<planning.policy.buckinghamshire.council@notifications.service.gov.uk>

Sent: 25 November 2021 10:28

To: Lloyd Sweet, Robert <Robert.LloydSweet@HistoricEngland.org.uk>

Subject: Replacement Buckland Neighbourhood Plan – Publication Town and County Planning England The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL: do not click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and were expecting the content to be sent to you



Dear Robert Lloyd Sweet

Replacement Buckland Neighbourhood Plan – Publication

Town and County Planning England The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

Buckland Parish Council has produced a Draft Replacement Neighbourhood Plan covering the entire parish area.

The reason we are writing to you is because you have previously commented on the replacement neighbourhood plan, or are a statutory body we need to inform.

Rachael Riach

From: jon sainsbury [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 December 2021 16:03
To: Neighbourhood Planning Mailbox
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Buckland Neighbourhood Plan Consultation 2021

Hi,

My interest is as a resident of Buckland Village although I also sit on the Parish council as a BPC counsellor.

My address is:

Tessel Dyke
Buckland Village
Aylesbury
[REDACTED]

I would like to be notified of future progress of the Neighbourhood plan

My Email address is as above [REDACTED]

I **support** the submitted plan and would like to provide comments.

The new policy defines the housing settlement boundary which is important as it only allows new development within the existing boundary.

The separation between Aston Clinton is maintained under the new plan; also important to prevent the villages merging and Buckland becoming part of Aylesbury, which is already encroaching on Aston Clinton boundaries.

The plan supports local agriculture and new rural businesses.

The plan also adds more protection to the environment, biodiversity and wildlife within the parish. It adds some additional protection against the industrialised development of agricultural land in and around the boundary.

The plan also considers the environment within the parish, protecting heritage assets and ensuring the local amenity is protected for the benefit of the parishioners and local wildlife.

Thank you for your consideration

Kind regards

J.P Sainsbury

Buckinghamshire Council Response to Buckland Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation

Neighbourhood plan document sections where comments have been made

Contents – note the list below of sections or policies in the plan is taken from the neighbourhood plan contents list. The list of policies and policy titles differs between the contents list and the actual content of the neighbourhood plan. Where differences occur these have been identified below.

About Buckland Parish

Why this plan?

Just to note for the examiner that the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan was adopted in September 2021 and at that time replaced the 2004 Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan for the Aylesbury Vale area of Buckinghamshire.

Map of Buckland Parish

Aims and objectives to be achieved over the plan period

Our vision for Buckland in 2033

Policy BP1: Housing Settlement Boundary

Having a specific paragraph reference to a particular NPPF undermines the policy if the NPPF is replaced as it would be expected to be with the Planning White Paper reforms. The 2019 NPPF has already been replaced this year – the equivalent para reference to the AONB is para 176 but 177 is also relevant but there should also be a reference for Green Belt too as Policy BP1 also concerns Green Belt. NPPF 2021 para 149 would be the best reference for the Green Belt. So suggest “or as replaced” is added after updating the NPPF references to read “...paragraphs 149 and 176-177 of the NPPF (2021)”

Conservation and Design –

Policy BP2: Development within and adjacent to the Conservation Area

Policy BP3: AONB/Green Belt

Protected Habitat and Designation Sites Recognition

Policy BP3 states: “Any significant development into the AONB or Green Belt will be resisted, except in very exceptional circumstances....Exceptional circumstances would include:

- Development and diversification of agriculture
- Re-use of redundant buildings or the replacement of an existing building.”

Many protected species could be present within this type of habitat (such as bats); it is therefore recommended for clarification within this policy to bring awareness about the potential presence of protected species.

Protected and notable species are material considerations in planning applications and should be fully assessed and mitigated for as part of any development applications. Section 99 of ODPM Circular 06/2005 states: “It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision. The need to ensure ecological surveys are carried out should therefore only be left to coverage under planning conditions in exceptional circumstances, with the result that the surveys are carried out after planning permission has been granted. However, bearing in mind the delay and cost that may be involved, developers should not be required to undertake surveys for protected species unless there is a reasonable likelihood of the species being present and affected by development. Where this is the case, the survey should be completed and any necessary measures to protect the species should be in place, through conditions and / or planning obligations before permission is granted.”

It is welcomed to see within Policy BP10 that previous comments in relation to the above points being made has been integrated into the policy.

Policy BP4: Local Distinctiveness

The policy or supporting text needs to explain how the exceptional circumstances will work. How would they be proved? It would be better to remove this ambiguity by explaining how a taller building or structure could be acceptable, for example: “Buildings should not be more than two storeys high, unless special circumstances can be proved that a development of more than two storeys would not harm the local character and distinctiveness.”

Policy BP5: No Further Coalescence

It needs to be made clear the points of coalescence – is it Buckland village up to the Aston Clinton Parish boundary? The policy doesn’t say from where the concern about coalescence is from. This policy just seems largely redundant now with the settlement boundary not allowing any housing development outside the defined settlement boundary anyway unless it is a rural exception scheme – but it can catch non-residential forms and the concern for coalescence could be added into for example Policy BP9 criteria for business development.

Housing-

Policy BP6: New Development

Biodiversity Net Gain

It is welcomed to see within the policy that biodiversity net gains are a requirement within major and minor applications.

In line with the Environmental Act 2021 it is recommended to incorporate 10% net gains within the Policy.

When discussing biodiversity net gains it should be mentioned that these net gains must be 'measurable'. The Local Plan Policy 'NE2 Biodiversity and Geodiversity' of the emerging Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) 2013-2033 states that: "c. A net gain in biodiversity on minor and major developments will be sought by protecting, managing, enhancing and extending existing biodiversity resources, and by creating new biodiversity resources. These gains must be measurable using best practice in biodiversity and green infrastructure accounting and in accordance with any methodology (including a biometric calculator) to be set out in a future Supplementary Planning Document".

Development on or adjacent to these designated sites and priority habitats should be avoided. The Local Plan Policy 'NE1 Biodiversity and Geodiversity' of the Aylesbury Local Plan 2013-2033 states: "g. When there is a reasonable likelihood of the presence of protected or priority species or their habitats, development will not be permitted until it has been demonstrated that the proposed development will not result in adverse impacts on these species or their habitats. The only exception will be where the advantages of development to the protected site and the local community clearly outweigh the adverse impacts. In such a case, the council will consider the wider implications of any adverse impact to a protected site, such as its role in providing a vital wildlife corridor, mitigating flood risk or ensuring good water quality in a catchment".

Policy BP7: Meeting Local Housing Needs

Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) Policy H1 states a minimum of 25% affordable housing. Might the NHP want to seek more than this as others are on eligible s106 sites (should there be any forthcoming)? What about other elements of the NPPF that have been introduced after the drafting of VALP which was based on the 2012 version? Do they want or need to consider for example First Homes or Para 65 10% affordable home ownership?

If First Homes then would they want to apply a local connection to these as per First Homes Guidance?

Ideally if they include First Homes then we would welcome an approach that would maintain the same number of affordable rent and shared ownership that we would have expected from a min 25% with a 80% rent, 20% intermediate (preferred shared ownership) split. For example, 35% with 25% First Homes, 60% rent, 15% shared ownership as per Winslow's current proposals.

Policy BP8: Affordable Homes

Employment

Policy BP9: Small business sites

Note - title of this policy differs on contents page to wording in body of the plan.

This is unclear what is meant by “The design of the premises falls within policies”. It would be clearer to say “The design of development meets Policies BP2-5”. These are the design policies in the neighbourhood plan.

Policy BP10: Redevelopment of existing businesses

Note this policy is listed in contents page but is not included in body of the plan

Policy BP11: Reuse of Redundant Farm Buildings

Note this policy is numbered as BP10 in body of the plan

Protected Habitat and Designation Sites Recognition

Policy BP3 states: “Any significant development into the AONB or Green Belt will be resisted, except in very exceptional circumstances....Exceptional circumstances would include:

- Development and diversification of agriculture
- Re-use of redundant buildings or the replacement of an existing building.”

Many protected species could be present within this type of habitat (such as bats); it is therefore recommended for clarification within this policy to bring awareness about the potential presence of protected species.

Protected and notable species are material considerations in planning applications and should be fully assessed and mitigated for as part of any development applications. Section 99 of ODPM Circular 06/2005 states: “It is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed development, is established before the planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision. The need to ensure ecological surveys are carried out should therefore only be left to coverage under planning conditions in exceptional circumstances, with the result that the surveys are carried out after planning permission has been granted. However, bearing in mind the delay and cost that may be involved, developers should not be required to undertake surveys for protected species unless there is a reasonable likelihood of the species being present and affected by development. Where this is the case, the survey should be completed and any necessary measures to protect the species should be in place, through conditions and / or planning obligations before permission is granted.”

It is welcomed to see within Policy BP10 that previous comments in relation to the above points being made has been integrated into the policy.

Car Parking

Policy BP12: Business traffic –

Policy: BP12 – Business traffic notes that provision must be made for all staff and visitor parking to be accommodated on-site, to ensure the safety of other more vulnerable road users. The Highway Authority is supportive of this policy.

There are no parking standards mentioned therefore the provision to be made will be adherence to the VALP car parking standards in Appendix B Table 2 in VALP. These could be referred to in Policy BP12.

Policy BP13: Provision of on-site parking spaces

Note this policy is numbered as Policy BP11 in the body of the plan

Policy: BP11 – Provision of on-site parking spaces proposes that garages will be excluded from the calculation of parking provision in new developments. However, it should be noted that the newly adopted Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan allows garages of sufficient size to be counted as parking spaces. Furthermore, planning conditions can be imposed to ensure garages are retained for vehicle parking.

The Neighbourhood Plan seeks that developments do not cause additional traffic congestion or over-spill parking on narrow rural roads, and that developments contribute towards measures to reduce traffic speeds and improve highway safety. Whilst the Highway Authority has no in-principle issue with the Plan, we must be realistic regarding financial contributions and works that we can secure based on the amount of development proposed. It appears that only relatively small developments would be acceptable, therefore only relatively minor financial contributions and improvement works would be justifiable.

Community Facilities and Heritage

Policy BP14: Community Facilities –

Note this policy is numbered BP13 in the body of the plan

Policy BP15: Heritage

Note this policy is numbered BP 14 in the body of the plan

Natural Environment

Policy BP16: Biodiversity

Note this policy is numbered BP15 in the body of the plan

Biodiversity Net Gain

It is welcomed to see within the policy that biodiversity net gains are a requirement within major and minor applications.

In line with the Environmental Act 2021 it is recommended to incorporate 10% net gains within the Policy.

When discussing biodiversity net gains it should be mentioned that these net gains must be 'measurable'. The Local Plan Policy 'NE2 Biodiversity and Geodiversity' of the emerging Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) 2013-2033 states that: "c. A net gain in biodiversity on minor and major developments will be sought by protecting, managing, enhancing and extending existing biodiversity resources, and by creating new biodiversity resources. These gains must be

measurable using best practice in biodiversity and green infrastructure accounting and in accordance with any methodology (including a biometric calculator) to be set out in a future Supplementary Planning Document”.

Biodiversity Enhancements

There is no mention of biodiversity enhancement features within Policy BP6 of new development nor policy BP15.

For example there are a few bats records within the area as mentioned within the plan and very few hedgehog records. It is recommended for the neighbourhood plan to include some specific biodiversity enhancements to enhance these species locally. For example Policy G3: ‘Biodiversity’ of the Wendover Neighbourhood plan 2019-2033 states that: “All suitable new buildings bordering open spaces will be required to incorporate integrated swift and bat boxes.” The Aylesbury Vale Green Infrastructure Strategy states that development in suitable areas should provide bat or bird roosting provision within the fabric of the buildings.

Protected Species Recognition

It is welcomed to see that there is a section for the Natural environment with references to rare species like the black poplar within Policy BP15.

Although muntjac deer are found within the Parish they are non-native species rapidly spreading across the country damaging our woodlands. This species is recommended not to be mentioned within the plan to stop any false suggestions that they are rare and native.

Please include the word ‘common’ within the follow sentence: “bats found within the village: common pipistrelles, soprano pipistrelles, and brown long eared bats...”

It is recommended throughout the neighbourhood plan when referring to the plantation of trees, scrub or hedgerows it should be stated to be of ‘local provenance’ which entails the native species to be sourced locally and planted in appropriate areas.

Infrastructure

Policy BP17: Infrastructure

Note this policy is numbered as policy BP16 in the body of the plan.

Proposed Parish Projects

Monitoring Progress

Aims of these policies

3

Appendices

Appendix A: Map of Neighbourhood Area– designated 31 January 2014

Appendix B: Map showing 3 distinct areas of the Parish

Appendix C: Map of Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Green Belt

Appendix D: Map of Buckland Conservation Area

Appendix D/1: Map of Buckland Conservation Area with views into and out of

Appendix E: Listed Buildings

Appendix F: Non designated Heritage Assets

Appendix G: Natural Heritage

Appendix H: Housing Settlement Boundary

Appendix I: Leisure Areas

Appendix J: Primrose Copse

Appendix K: Land at Lower Buckland

Appendix L: 2019 Housing Survey

Appendix M: Census figures for 2001 and 2011

What is your full name? - Name	Please indicate whether you support or object to the submitted Neighbourhood Plan. - Support/Object	Please provide your comments, suggested changes or reasons for objecting. - Comments
Nigel Hayward	I support the submitted Neighbourhood Plan but do not wish to make any comments or suggest changes	Not Answered
Lee Moran	I support the submitted Neighbourhood Plan but do not wish to make any comments or suggest changes	Not Answered
christopher baynes	I support the submitted Neighbourhood Plan but do not wish to make any comments or suggest changes	Not Answered
Richard Peel	I support the submitted Neighbourhood Plan but do not wish to make any comments or suggest changes	Not Answered
Charlotte Peel	I support the submitted Neighbourhood Plan but do not wish to make any comments or suggest changes	Not Answered
Maddie Bennett	I support the submitted Neighbourhood Plan but do not wish to make any comments or suggest changes	Not Answered
David Livingston	I support the submitted Neighbourhood Plan and would like to provide comments or suggest changes	I very much support the updated Neighbourhood Plan. It seeks to protect heritage assets and the conservation area and has extended the policy on protecting wildlife and biodiversity in t he area. It also protects Buckland from coalescence with Aston Clinton which is very important.
Lola Sainsbury	I support the submitted Neighbourhood Plan but do not wish to make any comments or suggest changes	Not Answered
Julia Morrice	I support the submitted Neighbourhood Plan but do not wish to make any comments or suggest changes	Not Answered
Matthew Henry Hardy	I support the submitted Neighbourhood Plan and would like to provide comments or suggest changes	I whole heartely support the Buckland Neighbourhood Plan and its aims among which are to maintain the distinctive feel and architectural diversity of the village without being blind to the need for appropriate low cost housing.