



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

**Planning Committee**

**on 10.00 a.m. Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> July 2017**

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

**Agenda**

- |  |               |
|--|---------------|
| 1. Election of Chair                                 | 10.00 – 10.05 |
| 2. Apologies   | 10.05 – 10.06 |
| 3. Declarations of Interest                          | 10.06 – 10.07 |
| 4. Update on HS2 Detailed Design Principles          | 10.07 – 10.37 |
| 5. Minutes of Previous Meeting                       | 10.37 – 10.40 |
| 6. Matters Arising                                   | 10.40 – 10.55 |
| 7. Public Question Time                              | 10.55 – 11.00 |
| 8. Co-option of External Professional                | 11.00 – 11.05 |
| 9. Chilterns Buildings Design Awards update          | 11.05 – 11.15 |
| 10. Report on Cumulative Impacts of Development work | 11.15 – 11.30 |
| 11. Development Plans responses – update             | 11.30 – 11.45 |
| 12. Planning Applications – update                   | 11.45 – 12.00 |
| 13. Any urgent business                              | 12.00 – 12.25 |
| 14. Date of Next and Future Meetings                 | 12.25 – 12.30 |

**Item 1      Election of Chair**

**Author:**                                Lucy Murfett Planning Officer

**Lead Organisations:**      Chilterns Conservation Board

**Resources:**                        N/A

**Summary:**                        To elect a Chair to the Planning Committee.

**Purpose of report:** Ditto.

**Background**

1. Gill Gowing, previous Chair of the Planning Committee, finished her service as a Secretary of State appointed Board Member on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2017. At the meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017 Planning Committee elected Secretary of State appointed Board Member Elizabeth Wilson as Vice Chair.
2. Committee is asked to elect a Chair.
3. Welcome also to the new members of Planning Committee who joined at the AGM: Colin Courtney and Sue Biggs.

**Recommendation**

1.      **That Committee elects a Chair of Planning Committee.**

**Item 4      Update on HS2 Detailed Design Principles**

**Author:**            Helen Hall, HS2 Programme Manager Chilterns AONB HS2 Review Group

**Lead Organisations:**      Chilterns AONB HS2 Review Group

**Resources:**            n/a, HS2 funds the HS2 Review Group

**Summary:**            Work is underway to draw up Detailed Design Principles for the stretch of HS2 through the Chilterns AONB. This is being undertaken by Land Use Consultants and overseen by the Chilterns AONB HS2 Review Group. This work forms Part 1 of the HS2 Chilterns Enhancement and Integration Plan. The draft document contains a vision for the HS2 corridor through the Chilterns, a set of principles, strategies and advice and illustrative designs for different components.

**Purpose of report:** To update the Committee on the work on HS2 Detailed Design Principles

**Background**

1. HS2 will pass through the Chilterns AONB, partly in tunnel (with ventilations shafts) and partly above ground (some 9km) in a combination of cuttings and viaducts. The Chilterns AONB is the only nationally protected landscape through which Phase 1 of HS2 passes. At the petitioning stage, the Board and other partners pressed for a more sensitive landscape-led approach to HS2 within the AONB, and in response HS2 Ltd agreed to establish and fund a Review Group (on which CCB officers are represented) to oversee the emerging design. The work includes a consultancy commission to develop:
  - a) Location specific design principles that could reasonably be applied to the detailed HS2 works within Bill Limits in the Chilterns and its setting to achieve high quality outcomes (the “detailed design principles” or DDP); and
  - b) Additional environmental integration and enhancements projects.
2. Land Use Consultants were appointed to undertake the Detailed Design Principles project, reporting to the Review Group. The DDP document has been drafted and its key features will be summarised, followed by an opportunity for discussion.
3. The Detailed Design Principles will be finalised over the summer and brought back to the next Planning Committee (scheduled for 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017) for approval.

**Recommendation**

1. **That Committee notes the update and provides feedback at the meeting**

**Item 5      Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**Author:**                                  Lucy Murfett Planning Officer

**Lead Organisations:**      Chilterns Conservation Board

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

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

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

**Background**

4. The draft minutes from the meeting on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017 are attached (at Appendix 1) for approval.

**Recommendation**

1.      **That the Committee approves the minutes of its meeting which took place on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017.**

**Appendix 1**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON Wednesday  
1<sup>st</sup> March 2017 at THE CHILTERN CONSERVATION BOARD OFFICE, STATION  
ROAD, CHINNOR, COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Appointing Body</b>
<b>Appointed by Local Authorities</b>	
Cllr David Barnard	North Herts District Council
Cllr Lynn Lloyd	South Oxfordshire District Council

<b>Appointed by the Secretary of State</b>	
Gill Gowing	Secretary of State, Chair
Helen Tuffs	Secretary of State
Elizabeth Wilson	Secretary of State

<b>Elected by Parish Councils</b>	
Cllr Tony Penn	Buckinghamshire

<b>Others present-</b>	
Lucy Murfett	CCB Planning Officer
Euan Cheung	CCB Volunteer

<b>And others</b>	
Deirdre Hansen	Minute taker

The Planning Officer introduced Ernie Cheung a planning student, who is volunteering at the CCB.

**283. Election of a Vice-Chair.**

Elizabeth Wilson was proposed, seconded and unanimously elected to serve as Vice-Chair until the AGM.

Gill Gowing the Chair of the Planning Committee will cease to be a member of the Board from April 1<sup>st</sup>. The Planning Officer thanked Gill for all her work and help over the years in particular with the CCB's Planning Committee. She was thanked for Chairing the Committee and her knowledge of the Chilterns has been a valuable asset to the Committee.

10.10 Cllr David Barnard arrived.

#### **284. Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr Alison Balfour-Lynn, Hertfordshire Parish Councils, Cllr Heather Kenison, Three Rivers District Council, Cllr Nick Rose, Chiltern District Council and Mike Stubbs, Planning Advisor to the CCB

Absent: Cllr George Case, Buckinghamshire Parish Councils.

#### **285. Declarations of Interest**

No declarations of interest were made.

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

The minutes of the meeting held 30<sup>th</sup> November 2016 were approved as a true record and signed by the Chair.

#### **287. Matters Arising from the minutes**

It was reported that it appeared that Bovingdon Brickworks had been mothballed.

#### **288. Public Question time**

No members of the public were present.

#### **289. Chilterns Building Design awards update.**

The Planning Officer updated the Committee on the progress of the 2017 Chilterns Building Design Awards, which are underway.

A healthy number of entries have been submitted with the closing date of 1<sup>st</sup> March. The Planning Officer was grateful to the Chair who has taken on the task of revamping the invitation to enter the award and also is on the new judging team, accompanied by Elizabeth Wilson for the Chilterns Conservation Board. The Chair and the Chiltern Society have worked hard on getting the word out, promoting the Design Awards and managing the administration.

The Award will be presented at the winning building.

The Committee discussed encouraging participation in the award scheme.

#### **1.The Committee NOTED the update**

#### **290. Next Planning Forum on Cumulative Impacts of Development.**

The Planning Officer had informed the Committee that the next Planning Forum will be held 22 March 2017 at the offices of Dacorum Borough Council. The session will be facilitated by Professor Riki Therivel, an expert in strategic environmental assessment.

The Planning Officer showed a slide of a typology illustrating the combined/cross boundary long term effects of development across the Chilterns.

It is intended that the Planning Forum can provide leadership and long term assistance with the local planning process, local plans and development.

The Committee discussed the cumulative effects of development on the Chilterns, which the Committee was reminded is a nationally protected landscape.

Members to inform the Planning Officer if they wish to attend the Planning Forum

- 1. The Committee NOTED the update and that members inform the Planning Officer if they wish to attend the Planning Forum on 22<sup>nd</sup> March.**

10.50 Sue Holden- Chief Officer joined the meeting.

### **291. Other emerging Planning Projects for 2017-18**

The Planning Officer introduced project ideas for the forthcoming year and asked the Committee's views on how they could best be taken forward.

The work load is extensive and resources limited. The Committee discussed the projects proposed and the limitations of resources at length and provided the Planning Officer with a steer on the way ahead.

- 1. The Committee PROVIDED steer for the Planning Officer to help prioritise and develop projects.**

### **292. Housing White Paper**

The Planning Officer gave a brief summary and an update on the Housing White Paper entitled "Fixing our Broken Housing Market" published 7<sup>th</sup> February. The consultation will close 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2017.

The Committee discussed the key message on which the CCB's response should be centred.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the update and PROVIDED a steer for the Planning Officer to shape the response to this Government consultation.**

### **293. Development Plan Responses**

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that she had submitted responses on 6 development plan documents and 3 railway consultations.

She was thanked for her responses on the North Herts Local Plan Proposed Submission Local Plan 2011-2031. The CCB comments had been welcomed and noted.

She gave brief comment on some of the submissions made.

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

**294. Planning Applications Update**

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

The responses were discussed and particular note was made of:

- a. Land off Peppard Road, Emmer Green P16/S3630/0. The CCB had objected on the principle that permitting this application would in effect prejudice the AONB boundary review application.
- b. Land at Bishopswood Middle Field and Memorial Hall Sonning Common, P15/S4119/FUL, although the plans have been amended the CCB’s objection has not changed.
- c. New Barn Farm, Cholsey MW0094.16. The CCB had objected.
- d. Land West of Chaul End Road, Caddington. CB/16/04593. The Committee commented that placing of an existing Rugby Club with associated development was not appropriate development in the AONB countryside.
- e. It was noted that the Planning Advisor has done a sterling job at the Molins Sports Ground public hearing.

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

**295. Urgent Business**

There was no urgent business.

**296. Date of the next meeting was changed to Thursday 20<sup>th</sup> July 2017 at CCB offices at 10.00 am.**

**Future date: Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> November 2017**

**The Chairman.....**

**Date.....**

**Item 7      Co-option to the Planning Committee**

**Author:** Lucy Murfett Planning Officer

**Lead Organisations:** Chilterns Conservation Board

**Resources:** Co-optee's travel expenses

**Summary:** Committee to consider the co-option of additional members

**Purpose of report:** As above

**Background**

1. The Board's standing orders set out that Planning Committee is able to co-opt non-Board members onto the Committee. The process is that such persons shall not exceed four per committee and that they must be nominated by two members of the committee and approved by a majority vote of the committee. They are non-voting and cannot be counted in determining whether a committee is quorate. Co-opted members do not receive an allowance but the Board can decide to pay travel expenses at the normal rates.
2. In the past various professionals have been co-opted onto the Planning Committee, among them Mike Stubbs, Gill Gowing and Richard Bossons and their skills and expertise have bolstered the workings of the Committee. A representative of the Chiltern Society planning group has also at times held a co-opted place. However there have been no co-optees since circa late 2014. Areas that would be of assistance include someone with professional landscape expertise, someone working in planning law and an infrastructure planning expert.
3. A suitable candidate has come forward, Chris Hannington, a Landscape Architect and Manager for Trees and Landscape at Wokingham Borough Council. Planning Committee is therefore invited to co-opt Chris.
4. Suggestions for other professionals who share the Board's vision and might be willing to serve would be welcomed.

**Recommendation**

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

**Item 8      Chilterns Buildings Design Awards update**

**Author:**                                  Lucy Murfett Planning Officer

**Lead Organisations:**      Chilterns Conservation Board

**Resources:**                      Staff time, Planning Committee member time, CCB budget £500

**Summary:**                          A report on the 2017 Chilterns Buildings Design Awards.

**Purpose of report:** To update the Committee on this year's awards.

**Background**

1. The Chilterns Buildings Design Awards 2017 recently concluded, organised jointly by the Chilterns Conservation Board and the Chiltern Society.
2. The awards showcase the very best new buildings in the Chilterns, celebrate excellence and promote good practice in designing buildings which are particularly sympathetic to the character of the Chilterns countryside and villages. The Judging Team consisted of two architects and three planners. Two judges were nominated by the Chiltern Society, two from Chilterns Conservation Board, together with an independent chair and a previous Award winner.
3. The judging panel shortlisted entries on 15<sup>th</sup> March, visited 8 shortlisted entries on 3<sup>rd</sup> May, with the culmination of the Awards being the presentation to the winners on 15<sup>th</sup> June at the winning building. This was the 18th year of the Chiltern Building Design Awards, and there was a record high of 24 entries.
4. Congratulations to this year's winners:
  - Winner - New build winery, The Winery At Hundred Hills, Hundred Hills Vineyard, Stonor Valley, Henley, Oxon
  - Highly Commended – Private House, 19 Mill Lane, Old Amersham, Bucks
  - Commended – New Build Art, Music & Resource Centre, The John Turner Building, Shiplake College, Shiplake, Henley, Oxon
  - Commended – Conversion of Victorian Sawmill into Passivhaus, The Old Sawmill, Parmoor, Frieth, Bucks
5. The winery at the Hundred Hills vineyard was the overall winner because judges felt it exemplifies good vernacular design and the use of high quality materials (brick, flint and clay tiles). It sits in harmony with its setting of the vineyard and represents a

significant enhancement to the site, which formerly contained unattractive redundant farm buildings.

6. The deadline for next year's entries will be 1<sup>st</sup> March 2018, Committee is asked to encourage owners or designers of any great building in the wider Chilterns area completed in the last three years to apply.
7. The new format for publicity and new style of presentation at the Winery (rather than formal ceremony) appeared to work well and the awards were brought in under budget.

### **Recommendation**

1. **That the Committee notes the update.**

**Item 10      Report on Cumulative Impacts of Development work**

**Author:** Lucy Murfett Planning Officer

**Lead Organisations:** Chilterns Conservation Board

**Resources:** Staff time, Planning Committee time, £200 plus VAT for workshop facilitator, plus funding from Chiltern Society for advice note

**Summary:** A date has been set for a Planning Forum meeting in March to consider the Cumulative Impacts of Development.

**Purpose of report:** To update the Committee on forthcoming new area of work.

**Background**

1. At the last Planning Committee members heard about the next Planning Forum to be held on 22nd March on the topic of the cumulative impact of development on the Chilterns AONB. Leading expert on Strategic Environmental Assessment, Professor Riki Therivel, had been commissioned to run the workshop session to examine the potential for an assessment of the long term combined impacts of all the development planned across the Chilterns, including HS2, housing and other growth.
2. The Planning Forum session was hosted by Dacorum Borough Council in Hemel Hempstead. It went well and was attended at 26 delegates, with most of the Chilterns LPAs represented. The format was an introduction on cumulative impact assessment, followed by a workshop where delegates identified the likely significant impacts of growth on valued environmental and social attributes of the AONB, and finished with discussion on impact avoidance and reduction.
3. Following the session the slides were circulated and an idea was suggested for a concise advice guide on CIA in the AONB to planners working on Local Plans. The Chiltern Society has kindly offered to fund this guide which is being produced by Professor Riki Therivel and is at the final draft stage, comments welcome.
4. Also of interest on large-scale long-term thinking is the new AECOM report which promotes the concepts of a green ring of protected landscapes (including the Chilterns) around London, 'room to breathe', and the world's greenest city region.

**Recommendation**

1. **That the Committee notes the update.**



**APPENDIX 2****CCB Responses on Development Plan Consultations:**

Consultation document	Consulted by	Response – summary	CCB response date
Watlington Neighbourhood Plan SA Scoping Report	SODC	<p>1. The Chilterns Conservation Board is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the SA Scoping Report.</p> <p>2. The Chilterns Conservation Board agrees with the conclusion that there are likely to be significant environmental effects because “most of the possible development sites either adjoin or are very visible from the Chilterns AONB” (section 2.1).</p> <p>3. Understanding the effects on the Chilterns AONB will be important for shaping the plan. The effects on the Chilterns AONB are not just visual, it is not simply a landscape issue. It is a common misunderstanding that development which is sited and designed to reduce visual harm in the AONB is all that is needed. Conserving natural beauty involves conserving the flora, fauna and geological and physiographical features of the AONB (defined in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act section 92). Impacts can be direct (e.g. loss of habitat by building on it) or indirect (e.g. development generating more traffic and harm to air quality and tranquillity in the AONB).</p> <p>4. The Board is pleased to see the coverage in the SA Scoping Report of the Chilterns AONB and the many references to protecting the natural and historic environment in the ‘What Watlington Wants’ aims and objectives.</p> <p>5. Recognition on page 15 of the landscape and visual effects from Watlington Hill is welcomed, this is the key viewpoint to consider. However other key views should be recognised, most importantly the views from the Ridgeway which is a National Trail and the oldest road in Britain (see <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/exploreenjoy/interactive-map.html#id_215">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/exploreenjoy/interactive-map.html#id_215</a> and <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/exploreenjoy/walks-rides/ridgeway.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/exploreenjoy/walks-rides/ridgeway.html</a>). Also the Oxfordshire Way which links the Chilterns to the Cotswolds AONB (<a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/exploreenjoy/interactive-map.html#220">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/exploreenjoy/interactive-map.html#220</a>) and the circular promoted route ‘Walks on commons between Ewelme and Ibstone’ which passes through the Parish (see <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/uploads/files/Walks_and_Rides/Ewelme_Ibstone_Chilterns_Commons_Walk.pdf">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/uploads/files/Walks_and_Rides/Ewelme_Ibstone_Chilterns_Commons_Walk.pdf</a>). There are other locations on the Ridge and high points which should be identified in a landscape and visual impact assessment.</p> <p>6. The coverage on pages 48 and 49 on landscape and environment is good. It is good to see awareness of dark skies protection and existing light pollution, this will be an important consideration for the planned new development too.</p> <p>7. The cumulative impacts of growth of Watlington plus the proposed new development at Chalgrove Airfield should be assessed; together they could have a more significant impact on views eg from Watlington Hill than when considered separately.</p> <p>8. You could consider a cross reference on Page 51 (energy level usage and water stress) to section A11.2 Chalk streams. It would be useful to consider whether there is abstraction from the chalk streams or discharge to them when assessing the impact of new development.</p> <p>9. There is a Special Area of Conservation fairly close to the WNDP area and I would recommend considering the effects of the WNDP on this international wildlife site and referring to Appropriate Assessment.</p>	2.3.17

	<p>10. It is premature to state on page 55 that “Any proposed development would need to take into account the views of the Chilterns AONB Board, who are likely to oppose this sort of development in principle. The justification for development can be made through the Plan.” The ability to justify the development planned depends on the extent of harm and whether the plan is able to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB. You should create a plan that achieves this. The Parish Council is subject to a legal duty to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB, see <a href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/section/85">http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/section/85</a>, and the CRoW Act 2000 section 85 could usefully be referred to in the Neighbourhood Plan and SA.</p> <p>11. Page 56: North Wessex Downs AONB Management Plan 2009-2014 (North Wessex Downs AONB Council of Partners) describes the WNDP area bordering the NWD AONB, this is not correct.</p> <p>12. The Chilterns Conservation Board Position Statement on Development Affecting the Setting of the AONB available at <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservationboard/planning-development/position-statements.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservationboard/planning-development/position-statements.html</a> would be a useful addition. The AONB setting is “The area within which development and land management proposals, by virtue of their nature, size, scale, siting, materials or design could be considered to have an impact, either positive or negative, on the natural beauty and special qualities of the Chilterns AONB.” To help consideration of the sites on the non-AONB but AONB setting side of Watlington, the advice it contains on avoiding harm may be of assistance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Measures to consider the impact on the setting of the AONB, including where required through Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments, ecological surveys or historical assessments;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Care being taken over the design, orientation, site layout, height, bulk and scale of structures and buildings through the preparation of a design and access statement;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Consideration not just of the site but also the landscape and land uses around and beyond it;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Careful consideration of colours, materials and the reflectiveness of surfaces;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Restraint and care over the installation and use of street lighting, floodlighting and other external lighting to prevent harm to the dark night skies of the AONB and its setting;</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The grouping of new structures and buildings close to existing structures and buildings to avoid new expanses of development that are visible and out of context (though any likely detrimental impact on historic buildings or groupings will need special consideration to avoid insensitive development), and</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive mitigation measures, for example including landscaping and open space that incorporates only native species (where possible contributing to BAP targets and the provision of Green Infrastructure), and noise reduction (though landscaping in certain contexts can be damaging to historic features, deposits, landscape or character so will require careful consideration).</li> </ul> <p>13. The following documents may be of assistance going forward for your evidence base list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the Buildings Design Guide Supplementary Technical Notes dealing with Flint, Brick and Roofing Materials,</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Highways in the Chilterns</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the Chilterns Conservation Board’s Position Statement on Development Affecting the Setting of the Chilterns AONB</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the Chilterns Conservation Board’s Position Statement on Renewable Energy</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the Making of the Chilterns Landscape (Chilterns Historic Landscape Characterisation Project Summary)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> the Chilterns Historic Landscape Characterisation Project report</li> </ul> <p>All of these documents are available as free downloads from the Chilterns AONB website <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/board-publications.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/board-publications.html</a> or <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development.html</a></p>	
Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Main mods	OCC	<p>MM68 - The Chilterns Conservation Board supports MM68 which is in line with our Statement of Common Ground with OCC</p> <p>MM67 – Not Sound, not consistent with National Policy The reference to ‘character’ of the AONB misunderstand the AONB as just a visual constraint. In fact natural beauty is defined in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 section 92 <a href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/section/92">http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/section/92</a> as its “flora, fauna and geological and physiographical features”, so it is not just a question of protecting its character.</p> <p>The footnote 105 should not be to a justification of why small scale facilities are acceptable in the AONB. It is not appropriate for the plan to refer to the topic papers which form part of its preparation. The appeal cases listed will become quickly dated. It would be more relevant for the footnote to explain the purposes of AONB designation: In Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 section 82 <a href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/section/82">http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/section/82</a> as its AONBs are designated “for the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area”.</p> <p>Suggest wording changes as follows:</p> <p>Small scale* waste management facilities for local needs could be acceptable in AONBs where the development would not compromise the <b>purposes objectives</b> of their designation<sup>105</sup>. Policy W4 looks to steer larger scale waste facilities** to be in or close to specified towns, but at Witney, Wantage, Didcot, Chipping Norton, Henley, and Wallingford, such facilities will need to be located in a way that does not adversely affect the <b>AONB character</b> or <b>the</b> setting of the AONB. Larger scale facilities are unlikely to be acceptable in or close to the AONB. Proposals for development (both minerals and waste) within AONBs should have regard to the relevant AONB Management Plan.</p> <p>*Insert new footnote: Facilities less than 20,000 tonnes per annum (small-scale facilities in Policy W4)</p> <p>Footnote 105: <del>The Waste Strategy Topic Paper provides information on appeal decisions where waste facilities of this size have been proposed in AONBs.</del> <b>AONBs are designated for the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area, which includes its flora, fauna and geological and physiographical features (Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 sections 82 and 92).</b></p>	16.3.17
Pirton Submission Neighbourhood Plan	Pirton PC	<p>I read the submission Pirton Neighbourhood Plan with pleasure and just wanted to say thank you for the amendments which better conserve and enhance the AONB. Your work on Character Assessment is great and this is something we want to encourage other neighbourhood plan groups to do. At some stage I hope to produce a guidance note like this</p>	30.3.17

		<p>one produced by another AONB (Cranborne Chase)  <a href="http://www.ccwwdaonb.org.uk/uploads/docs/Planning/FactSheet9_LCAN_neighbourhoodPlanning.pdf">http://www.ccwwdaonb.org.uk/uploads/docs/Planning/FactSheet9_LCAN_neighbourhoodPlanning.pdf</a> and give Pirton as an example.</p>	
<p>Chinnor Submission Neighbourhood Plan</p>	<p>Chinnor PC</p>	<p>1. The Chilterns Conservation Board is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the submission Chinnor Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>2. The Board supports the Vision of the plan:</p> <p>“A Plan that promotes co-ordinated and sustainable growth in the period to 2033 whilst maintaining, enhancing and improving the existing vibrant community and positively addressing its economic, social and environmental issues.”</p> <p>and Objective 3: “To safeguard the intrinsic character of Chinnor, its surrounding countryside and its setting adjacent to the Chiltern Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty”</p> <p>3. However, the Board is concerned that the plan will not deliver these. The scale of development envisaged is beyond a sustainable level. The impacts on the Chilterns AONB of 700 homes has not been properly assessed or addressed. The June 2016 Screening Opinion<sup>1</sup> concluded that “the Chinnor NDP is not likely to have a significant effect on the environment and therefore does not require a SEA. However if additional housing sites are allocated in a subsequent drafts of the neighbourhood plan, the statutory consultees will need to be consulted again and it may then become necessary to prepare and SEA”. At that time it was anticipated that Chinnor would take a minimum of 160 new homes through the allocation on two housing sites. This is clearly no longer the case with over 700 new homes envisaged.</p> <p><sup>1</sup> SODC Screening Statement on the determination of the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in accordance with the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 and European Directive 2001/42/EC for the Chinnor Neighbourhood Development Plan, June 2016</p> <p>4. Surrounding Chinnor with large scale new developments harms the setting of the AONB including the view from the Ridgeway National Trail and from the key viewpoints on the escarpment of Chinnor Hill. Additional traffic is likely to travel through the AONB, increasing air pollution (especially concerning is the effect of nitrogen deposition on protected habitats), and reducing its tranquillity and recreational value. An assessment is needed to identify impacts inside &amp; outside the AONB on the AONB’s geology, ecology, hydrology, tranquillity, landscape, sense of wildness, enjoyment etc.</p> <p>5. The cumulative impacts of the 700 homes should be assessed along with major development in neighbouring villages and towns (eg Aylesbury, Longwick, Thame, and 2700 homes at nearby Princes Risborough). A recent appeal decision for 500 homes at Park Mill Farm Princes Risborough identified severe harm to the local transport network and a need for consideration of cumulative impacts (PINS Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/W/16/3146838).</p> <p>6. The Board welcomes the decision that the neighbourhood plan contains no additional allocations. The number already permitted already greatly exceeds the number anticipated in the South Oxfordshire Core</p>	<p>28.3.17</p>

	<p>Strategy and the initial stages of the new South Oxfordshire Local Plan. Whether to treat the permitted sites as neighbourhood plan allocations is worth careful consideration so that the Parish might benefit from enhanced CIL receipts and qualify for the 3 year housing land supply requirement (as opposed to the usual 5 year land supply).</p> <p>7. The plan refers to Chinnor as being near but not in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). This needs correcting because a significant part of the neighbourhood area to which the neighbourhood plan policies would apply is actually in the AONB. The area south of the Ridgeway is within the AONB, and the area that is not designated AONB forms part of the setting of the Chilterns AONB. The current plan is overly focussed on Chinnor village.</p> <p>8. Various policies and sections of the neighbourhood plan seem parochial, old fashioned and limited in their ambitions. The Recreation section focusses on local circular walks and running spaces, missing the presence running across the neighbourhood area of the Ridgeway. The Ridgeway is a long distance National Trail which is Britain's oldest road, links through some of the Country's finest landscapes from Avebury to Ivinghoe Beacon (see <a href="http://www.nationaltrail.co.uk/ridgeway">http://www.nationaltrail.co.uk/ridgeway</a>)</p> <p>9. The "wildlife" section is small in its ambitions and does not follow NPPF para 113 advice that "Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks". Policy CH GP6 - Planting for Wildlife requires every development to plant trees "to provide natural food for wildlife and to maintain the existing character of the area". This fails to understand that tree planting is not the most appropriate habitat to create in every case, there are rare protected and priority habitats in this neighbourhood area like chalk grassland and early succession exposed chalk at Chinnor Cement Works, which could point to a more appropriate biodiversity strategy. For more information please see the Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscapes Study  <a href="http://owls.oxfordshire.gov.uk/wps/wcm/connect/occ/OWLS/Home/">http://owls.oxfordshire.gov.uk/wps/wcm/connect/occ/OWLS/Home/</a>, the Chilterns AONB Management Plan  <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservationboard/management-plan.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservationboard/management-plan.html</a> and Natural England's NCA Profile:110 Chilterns (NE406)  <a href="http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4977697">http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/4977697</a>.</p> <p>10. Policy CH T2 - Enhancement of Tourism Facilities should contain an additional criterion which ensures the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity and geological assets.</p> <p>11. Policy CH GP12 - Compliance with South Oxfordshire Design Guide states that all new developments should comply with the principles and objectives in the South Oxfordshire Design Guide. This should also refer to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide which has been adopted by SODC as SPG. The plan policies need to address the whole of the designated neighbourhood plan area. A significant area is in the Chilterns AONB. Here the most appropriate design guidance is the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide, see  <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservationboard/planning-development/buildings-design-guidance.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservationboard/planning-development/buildings-design-guidance.html</a>.</p> <p>12. On page 89 an additional reference should be made to refer to the SPG status of the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide: "The Chilterns</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>Buildings Design Guide 2010 published by the Chilterns Conservation Board adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance by SODC:  <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planningdevelopment/buildings-design-guidance.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planningdevelopment/buildings-design-guidance.html</a>”</p> <p>13. On page 89 and 91 wording changes are needed to reflect the full title of the Chilterns AONB Management Plan: A Framework for Action <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/management-plan.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/management-plan.html</a>, and to convey that the AONB Management Plan is not the Chilterns Conservation Board’s document, but a statutory partnership document which requires delivery by all the constituent authorities. It has been formally endorsed by SODC and has the status of a material consideration in the NPPG, see NPPG Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 8-004-20140306 available here <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/natural-environment">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/natural-environment</a></p> <p>14. Policy CH IN1 - Infrastructure Priorities should include investment in enhancing the Chilterns AONB.</p> <p>15. There is much of relevance for Chinnor in the Chilterns Conservation Board Position Statement on Development Affecting the Chilterns AONB (<a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development/positionstatements.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development/positionstatements.html</a>) which could be brought into the Neighbourhood Plan, providing useful information on harm and how to design development to address that harm: “Proposals for development will be supported where they have demonstrated that they comply with the Chilterns AONB Management Plan and, where proposals are in the setting of the AONB, with the Position Statement on Development Affecting the Setting of the Chilterns AONB, by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measures to consider the impact on the setting of the AONB, including where required through Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments, ecological surveys or historical assessments;</li> <li>• Care being taken over the design, orientation, site layout, height, bulk and scale of structures and buildings through the preparation of a design and access statement;</li> <li>• Consideration not just of the site but also the landscape and land uses around and beyond it;</li> <li>• Careful consideration of colours, materials and the reflectiveness of surfaces;</li> <li>• Restraint and care over the installation and use of street lighting, floodlighting and other external lighting to prevent harm to the dark night skies of the AONB and its setting;</li> <li>• The grouping of new structures and buildings close to existing structures and buildings to avoid new expanses of development that are visible and out of context (though any likely detrimental impact on historic buildings or groupings will need special consideration to avoid insensitive development), and</li> <li>• Comprehensive mitigation measures, for example including landscaping and open space that incorporates only native species (where possible contributing to BAP targets and the provision of Green Infrastructure), and noise reduction (though landscaping in certain contexts can be damaging to historic features, deposits, landscape or character so will require careful consideration).”</li> </ul> <p>16. The Chinnor Neighbourhood Plan could include a special policy on the AONB. The Chilterns Conservation Board has worked with local planning officers from across the AONB to develop a model policy for inclusion in development plans across the whole of the AONB. (Recommended text provided)</p>	
<p>OXIS Stage 1 Report</p>	<p>OCC</p>	<p>1. Page 30 explains that that Stage 1 has included establishing existing infrastructure capacity and key issues – but none of these appear to relate to the state of the natural environment. Suggest addition of</p>	<p>5.4.17</p>

	<p>coverage from the State of Nature in Oxfordshire 2017 report (<a href="http://www.wildoxfordshire.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/State_of_Nature_Oxfordshire_FINAL_LOWRES_NEW_spreadsv4.pdf">http://www.wildoxfordshire.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/State_of_Nature_Oxfordshire_FINAL_LOWRES_NEW_spreadsv4.pdf</a>)</p> <p>State of Nature in Oxfordshire 2017 Key Findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Despite widespread historic loss of species-rich semi-natural grasslands, Oxfordshire still has some of the rarest and finest grasslands in the country.</li> <li>• Our rivers are much cleaner than they were 30 years ago, and targeted action has helped the recovery of local populations of threatened species, such as water vole and otter.</li> <li>• Long-term declines in farmland and woodland biodiversity continue, with some associated species at serious risk of extinction, such as the turtle dove. However, the area of woodland recorded in the county over the last 30 years has increased.</li> <li>• There is continued fragmentation and loss of connectivity across the county’s landscapes, effecting the future viability of habitats and species.</li> </ul> <p>Key Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urgently create larger and more connected areas of high quality habitats.</li> <li>• Help farmers to find financially viable ways of managing land to provide greater benefits to nature.</li> <li>• Improve practical advice and support for communities and landowners.</li> <li>• Ensure better planning for blue and green infrastructure that benefits nature and people.</li> <li>• Put sustainable development that invests in nature at the heart of local decision-making.</li> <li>• Increase access to green space and volunteering opportunities to keep people in touch with the health and well-being benefits of nature.</li> <li>• Develop more collaborations within our strong and diverse environment sector.</li> <li>• Continue to improve the methodology for monitoring the state of nature across Oxfordshire.</li> </ul> <p>2. Why is no mention of the three AONBs in Oxfordshire until nearly the end of the report (page 184) and then only in the green infrastructure section? Surely earlier mention of the AONBs as areas of Oxfordshire nationally designated as some of the country’s finest landscapes, and a key recreational, health and biodiversity resource should come earlier?</p> <p>3. The report lacks coverage of the capacity of the natural environment. Natural Capital is mentioned only briefly and not explained. The Strategy assumes that the levels of growth proposed for Oxfordshire (39% increase in housing, 25% increase in jobs by 2040) should and will happen. It takes a predict and provide approach to dealing with the infrastructure consequences of this growth. The Chilterns Conservation Board recommends that an infrastructure strategy should not simply follow but lead. There could be instances where it is necessary to limit development, for example where pressures would harm the AONB or ensure that the infrastructure solutions proposed are desirable and sustainable e.g. new boreholes to abstract water from chalk aquifers in the AONB (p153) are likely to be a problem.</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>4. Page 46 suggest delete Fairmile Hospital from the South Oxfordshire list, this development is completed and no further housing is proposed on the site in the South Oxfordshire Local Plan preferred options.</p> <p>5. Page 40 section 3.1 should refer to airport growth eg Heathrow Third Runway, doubling of Luton airport passenger numbers and consequential airspace changes which will affect passenger travel through and over Oxfordshire. Similarly HS2 is only mentioned in passing.</p> <p>6. Page 194 states “Although growth within AONBs is severely restricted, development on the AONB periphery can have an impact on the quality and character of these special areas by disrupting views into and out of the areas. Development on the edges of the AONBs will need to be carefully assessed to ensure that they conserve and enhance the quality and natural character of the area.”</p> <p>This refers only to visual impacts (impacts on views to and from the AONB). It implies that natural beauty is purely a visual or aesthetic matter, and about landscape character, when in fact the definition is much broader (Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 sec 92) “the conservation of the natural beauty of an area includes a reference to the conservation of its flora, fauna and geological and physiographical features”. So this sentence should say: “Although growth within AONBs is severely restricted, development on the AONB periphery (its setting) can impact on the quality, character and integrity of these special areas by for instance disrupting views into and out of the areas, generating traffic through AONBs, raising recreation pressure at key visitor sites, increasing water abstraction to serve development and reducing air quality and tranquillity. Development on the edges of the AONBs will need to be carefully assessed (individually and cumulatively) to ensure that they conserve and enhance the quality, integrity and natural character of the area”.</p>	
<p>Three Rivers and Watford Green Belt Stage 1 Methodology</p>	<p>Three Rivers</p>	<p>1. The Chilterns Conservation Board is grateful for the opportunity to submit comments on the Green Belt methodology.</p> <p>2. The study area contains parts of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Chilterns AONB is nationally protected as one of England’s finest landscapes. Its status in planning is equal to that of a National Park (NPPF para 115). Currently the AONB is not mentioned at all in the Stage 1 Methodology.</p> <p>3. As well as a Green Belt Review, or as part of it, if you are considering allocations in or near the AONB (we strongly advise against), an assessment would be needed of the impacts on the AONB. Natural Beauty is not just about visual appearance, but also the AONBs flora, fauna, geological and physiographic features (CRoW Act 2000 sec 92 <a href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/section/92">http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/section/92</a>). So the assessment would need to consider impacts on special qualities of the AONB<sup>1</sup>, on chalk streams, wildlife, habitat fragmentation, air pollution, loss of tranquillity, cumulative impacts on the AONB etc.</p> <p><sup>1</sup> See statutory Chilterns AONB Management Plan 2014-2019: A Framework for Action for the special qualities</p> <p>4. By way of example, recently Dacorum Borough Council proposed an allocation in the AONB west of Tring, to which CCB objected at the Examination. The Planning Inspector concluded<sup>2</sup>: “I have reflected on what I heard at the hearing sessions where this site was discussed, as</p>	<p>13.4.17</p>

		<p>well as the submitted written evidence. On the basis of this verbal and written evidence I have serious concerns that the gypsy and traveller site element of site LA5 is unsound. <i>This is because of the lack of a formal assessment by the Council to assess its likely impact on the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and in particular whether it would conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB...</i> In conclusion, for the Plan to be found sound the Council will need to, as a minimum, advance main modifications to remove reference to the provision of a gypsy and traveller site as part of LA5” (<i>emphasis added</i>). The proposed allocation in the AONB was subsequently deleted.  <sup>2</sup><a href="https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/pc4--inspector%27s-post-hearing-note-todacorum-borough-council-regarding-la5-site.pdf?sfvrsn=4">https://www.dacorum.gov.uk/docs/default-source/strategic-planning/pc4--inspector%27s-post-hearing-note-todacorum-borough-council-regarding-la5-site.pdf?sfvrsn=4</a></p> <p>5. The study methodology should be revised to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. add reference to the Chilterns AONB.</li> <li>b. exclude from the assessment land outside the local authority’s boundary which is in the Chilterns AONB (one parcel currently extends across the Chess Valley between Chenies and Sarratt) or explain the rationale for including it.</li> <li>c. add words in bold to the proforma “Enhancing landscapes and visual amenity - Does the parcel form part of the setting of a sensitive landscape (<b>nationally designated AONB landscape</b>, historic or otherwise)”?</li> <li>d. In the proforma under the sub-heading “Local Role of the Green Belt” Add a second row containing the words “<b>Conserving and enhancing the AONB and its setting. Does the parcel form part of the AONB or its setting?</b>”.</li> <li>e. When considering inseting from the Green Belt the villages of Sarratt and Heronsgate which sit adjacent to and near the Chilterns AONB, consider the impact on the setting of the AONB. Add words in bold “Interface with the surrounding landscape – settlement depth, rear garden character, glimpsed/panoramic views to the wider landscape, connectivity with landscape context, <b>proximity of AONB and effects on the AONB’s special qualities and setting</b>”. Please see Chilterns Conservation Board’s Position Statement on Development Affecting the Setting of the Chilterns AONB for further information.</li> </ol> <p>6. The Board is grateful for the opportunity to make these written comments and wishes the Council well in the next stages of work. If we can be of further assistance please contact us.</p>	
<p>Consultation on Housing White Paper</p>	<p>DCLG</p>	<p>Q1 Do you agree with the proposals to: a) Make clear in the National Planning Policy Framework that the key strategic policies that each local planning authority should maintain are those set out currently at paragraph 156 of the Framework, with an additional requirement to plan for the allocations needed to deliver the area’s housing requirement?                  No                  1a) Strongly disagree with making it a requirement to plan for the allocations needed to deliver the area’s housing requirement. In areas which have constraints like National Parks and AONBs, it will not be appropriate to plan for full OAN. These are nationally protected landscape, safeguarded in the national interest because their landscape character and natural beauty are valued as outstanding. Here the focus</p>	<p>2.5.17</p>

	<p>should be on small scale development to meet local needs, planned with the utmost care and quality.</p> <p>Q2 What changes do you think would support more proportionate consultation and examination procedures for different types of plan and to ensure that different levels of plans work together?  Chilterns Conservation Board would welcome encouragement in the NPPF for joint cross boundary plans (or spatial development strategies) for Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Please widen the scope of Spatial Development Strategies to include plans with DPD status for nationally protected landscapes. For example, the Chilterns AONB is covered by 13 local authorities, which makes getting a cohesive, consistent, landscape-led approach in each local plan very difficult. We prepare AONB Management Plans but they lack DPD status and are barely used by planners in decision making. One AONB (Arnside and Silverdale AONB) is piloting producing a joint DPD for its AONB. We need encouragement and resources for joint teams to achieve this for other AONBs, so that we have single AONB plans for each protected landscape, like National Park local plans.</p> <p>Q3 Do you agree with the proposals to:  b) From early 2018, use a standardised approach to assessing housing requirements as the baseline for five year housing supply calculations and monitoring housing delivery, in the absence of an up-to-date plan?  No  A standardised approach to assessing housing requirements would fail to consider constraints, such as area being National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In nationally protected landscapes, the priority should be conservation and enhancement natural beauty, and increasing the area's recreational and visitor role. A standardised approach would be counter to the principle that special areas need special treatment. The DCLG, like all public bodies, including ministers of the Crown, local authorities and parish councils, is subject to Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, which states under "General duty of public bodies etc"  “(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.”  It is not clear how introducing a standardised approach could achieve compliance with this statutory requirement of regard for AONB conservation and enhancement.</p> <p>Q4  4b) No  Please take extreme care if re-wording the NPPF para 14 presumption in favour of sustainable development. The proposed addition of the word 'strong' in the plan making section "unless: specific policies in this Framework provide a strong reason for development to be restricted" compared with the current wording of NPPF para 14 'specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted" could cause misinterpretation and a field day for planning barristers! We prefer the existing clear instruction "should be restricted" to the less direct and passively expressed "provide a strong reason for development to be restricted".  The new word "strong" could be interpreted as the fact that a site is the AONB is a strong reason in itself to restrict development. Or it could be argued by a developer that a particular site in the AONB or a particular</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>veteran tree is not special enough to provide a "strong" reason to restrict development. AONB planners do not have the resources to defend each AONB site in this detail. The presumption should protect the AONB and provide a default priority to conservation and enhancement, not development.</p> <p>The wording for decision-taking: "unless specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted" could be beefed up to do more than 'indicate', it could 'require' or 'protect' designated areas and features. For example "unless strong policies in this Framework require that development should be restricted such as those relating to (...list including AONB)". Or "unless strong policies in this Framework protect areas or special features such as (...list including AONB). This would match up with the instruction for 'great weight' to nationally protected landscapes in paragraph 115 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Q8 Do you agree with the proposals to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to:</p> <p>a) Highlight the opportunities that neighbourhood plans present for identifying and allocating small sites that are suitable for housing? Yes</p> <p>c) Give stronger support for 'rural exception' sites – to make clear that these should be considered positively where they can contribute to meeting identified local housing needs, even if this relies on an element of general market housing to ensure that homes are genuinely affordable for local people? Yes</p> <p>Support rural exceptions sites provided that proposals in protected landscapes like AONBs are sensitively located in the landscape and well related in scale to the village. The focus should be on meeting housing needs of the local village community, rather than accommodating housing requirements from the wider district.</p> <p>f) Encourage greater use of Local Development Orders and area-wide design codes so that small sites may be brought forward for development more quickly? No. Area-wide design codes should exclude parts of a district or borough covered by a designation like AONB or conservation area. Here a standard design code approach would not reflect the special qualities or needs of that designated area. In the Chilterns AONB we have the well respected Chilterns Buildings Design Guide, and in Conservation Areas there are (often but not universally) Conservation Area Character Assessments and Management Plans. These should be used to develop carefully developed and discussed development proposals, rather than an area-wide design code approach.</p> <p>Q9b Where land is removed from the Green Belt, local policies should require compensatory improvements to the environmental quality or accessibility of remaining Green Belt land? Yes</p> <p>9f) When carrying out a Green Belt review, local planning authorities should look first at using any Green Belt land which has been previously developed and/or which surrounds transport hubs? Yes provided that transport hubs are defined as urban locations, and do not include areas around rural stations.</p> <p>Q10e) Where a local or strategic plan has demonstrated the need for Green Belt boundaries to be amended, the detailed boundary may be determined through a neighbourhood plan (or plans) for the area in question?</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>10e) Yes but it is unclear how a neighbourhood plan could meet the proposed test of having assessed alternatives to green belt release - they do not operate at the geographical scale required.</p> <p>10f) When carrying out a Green Belt review, local planning authorities should look first at using any Green Belt land which has been previously developed and/or which surrounds transport hubs?</p> <p>10f) Yes provided that transport hubs are defined as urban locations, and do not include areas around rural stations.</p> <p>Q12 Do you agree with the proposals to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to: a) Indicate that local planning authorities should provide neighbourhood planning groups with a housing requirement figure, where this is sought?</p> <p>Yes but in providing a housing requirement figure to a neighbourhood plan group, the local authority should reduce the requirement to reflect constraints such as AONB or conservation areas. A simple mathematical split between villages of a certain category is inappropriate, as is assuming all villages can take a proportional percentage growth. The split needs to be carefully developed and consulted on through the district wide local plan.</p> <p>Q13 Do you agree with the proposals to amend national policy to make clear that plans and individual development proposals should:</p> <p>a) Make efficient use of land and avoid building homes at low densities where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs?</p> <p>No. In some cases like small scale additions to AONB or National Park villages, a soft new village edge is required, which may be low densities to reduce visual impact and increase trees and planting in the development. Policies should not make high densities compulsory in every location.</p> <p>Q14 In what types of location would indicative minimum density standards be helpful, and what should those standards be?</p> <p>Use minimum densities in urban locations only, and allow for exceptions where sites have a protective designation eg conservation area, world heritage site.</p> <p>Q16 Do you agree that:</p> <p>a) Where local planning authorities wish to agree their housing land supply for a one-year period, national policy should require those authorities to maintain a 10% buffer on their 5 year housing land supply?</p> <p>No</p> <p>b) The Planning Inspectorate should consider and agree an authority's assessment of its housing supply for the purpose of this policy?</p> <p>No</p> <p>This proposal appears to add workload to PINS and local authorities and encourage short-termism.</p> <p>Q17 a) A requirement for the neighbourhood plan to meet its share of local housing need?</p> <p>Concerned with the proposal that a neighbourhood plan will be required to meet "its share" of local housing need. Villages in protected landscapes like AONBs should not have to meet a numerically calculated share or proportion of growth. Development should be planned based on what can be accommodated without compromising the statutory purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB.</p> <p>Q19 Do you agree with the proposal to amend national policy so that local planning authorities are expected to have policies setting out how</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>high quality digital infrastructure will be delivered in their area and accessible from a range of providers?                  No. Not clear why this is necessary when digital infrastructure enjoys generous permitted development rights. Where new telecoms masts are involved there should be additional controls and a sequential approach requiring mast sharing first, especially in protected landscapes like AONBs.</p> <p>Q20 Do you agree with the proposals to amend national policy so that:                  b) Authorities are expected to identify the additional development opportunities which strategic infrastructure improvements offer for making additional land available for housing                  No. It depends on whether the strategic infrastructure is in a sustainable location. Often strategic infrastructure is in rural areas and not in suitable locations. For example HS2 through the nationally protected Chilterns AONB landscape, there should be no expectation that housing should accompany this in future.</p> <p>Q22 Do you agree that the realistic prospect that housing will be built on a site should be taken into account in the determination of planning applications for housing on sites where there is evidence of non-implementation of earlier permissions for housing development? Yes but care will be needed to ensure this policy tool does not favour greenfield over brownfield sites.</p> <p>Q25 What are your views on whether local authorities should be encouraged to shorten the timescales for developers to implement a permission from three years to two years, except where a shorter timescale could hinder the viability or deliverability of a scheme? We would particularly welcome views on what such a change would mean for SME developers.                  Brownfield sites may need longer timescales.</p> <p>Q28 Do you agree that for the purposes of introducing a housing delivery test, national guidance should make clear that:                  No. Disagree with the proposed Housing Delivery Test which assesses local authorities based on performance of housebuilders, over which they have little control.</p> <p>Q29 The housing delivery test                  No. These proposals fuel the presumption in favour, and will lead to more examples of speculative planning applications in unsustainable locations. Planning should be plan-led.</p> <p>Q30 What support would be most helpful to local planning authorities in increasing housing delivery in their areas? Encourage and properly resource plan-making, remove the presumption in favour of sustainable development to reduce speculative applications and time spent on costly appeals.</p> <p>Q34 Do you agree with the proposals to amend national policy to make clear that the reference to the three dimensions of sustainable development, together with the core planning principles and policies at paragraphs 18-219 of the National Planning Policy Framework, together constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development means for the planning system in England?                  No. This approach is not clear, concise or helpful as a definition of sustainable development in planning. Different parts of the NPPF can be</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>selectively quoted to argue any position on sustainable development!                  The presumption in favour of sustainable development in particular is a misnomer given the types of speculative development it has encouraged. An up to date definition which brings in concepts of natural capital should be developed.</p> <p>Q35 Do you agree with the proposals to amend national policy to:                  a) Amend the list of climate change factors to be considered during plan-making, to include reference to rising temperatures?                  Yes                  b) Make clear that local planning policies should support measures for the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change?                  Yes</p> <p>Q36 Do you agree with these proposals to clarify flood risk policy in the National Planning Policy Framework?                  Yes. Natural capital and sustainable water supply should also have more emphasis in the NPPF. The Chilterns chalk streams, a globally rare habitat of chalk fed crystal clear waters, are degraded by pollution and over-abstraction for water supply. None currently meet Water Framework Directive standards. There is insufficient attention to the cumulative effect of development planned across many local authorities which draw on these chalk streams.</p> <p>Q37 Do you agree with the proposal to amend national policy to emphasise that planning policies and decisions should take account of existing businesses when locating new development nearby and, where necessary, to mitigate the impact of noise and other potential nuisances arising from existing development?                  Yes. Emphasis on improving tranquillity in the countryside would also be welcome, especially nationally protected landscapes like National Parks and AONBs. The Chilterns AONB suffers from noise from major infrastructure including motorways, A-roads, Luton airport and, in the future, potential increased over-flight from Heathrow airport 3rd runway and from HS2.</p> <p>Q39 To support more flexibility in adapting to changing markets and technology, and to further support farming efficiency and productivity, we are seeking views on amending existing agricultural permitted development rights. Should the thresholds set out in Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) be amended?                  No                  Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty are a nationally protected landscape, safeguarded in the national interest because their landscape character and natural beauty are valued as outstanding. They have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty, which is equal to National Parks.                  The legal requirements for protecting Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which underpin national planning policy, are set out in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. Section 82 of this Act sets out that the primary purpose of AONB designation is to conserve and enhance natural beauty, while Section 85 requires that Statutory Undertakers exercise a “duty of regard” to the purposes of AONB designation. The Government is therefore clearly directed to have regard to the purposes of AONB designation when carrying out its functions.                  The DCLG, should therefore be able to clearly show how they have</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>considered the purposes of AONBs in their decision making on any proposed legislative changes.</p> <p>Farming is an important component of the special qualities and characteristics of many of the AONBs with a long established tradition of mixed farming helping to create the natural beauty and the pastoral scenery is a particularly valued part of the landscape. The Kent Downs AONB recognises the need to secure a viable, resilient and competitive farming industry however it is crucial that this is balanced against the need for sensitive environmental management in landscapes of national importance.</p> <p>Within nationally protected landscapes the conservation and enhancement of the special qualities and characteristics of the landscape designation is the priority. New development within AONBs or affecting their setting, whether related to agriculture or otherwise, should not compromise this primary purpose. The Kent Downs AONB Unit is concerned that taking agricultural development outside of planning control in AONBs could result in harm to these nationally protected landscapes.</p> <p>Under the current arrangements, the AONB Units work closely with the local planning authorities in the AONBs to support agricultural development within the context of conserving and enhancing landscape character; if development was to be taken out of the planning system, this would remove the ability of local planning authorities to manage the impacts of development on landscape character.</p> <p>We therefore consider it important in AONBs to maintain the existing thresholds set out in Part 6 of Class A in AONBs. In this way, the local planning authorities, often in consultation with AONB Units, will be able to manage proposals to ensure that the special qualities of the designated landscape are appropriately conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>Should future legislative changes take such development outside of planning control, exemption for AONBs would be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework's presumption in favour of sustainable development, which acknowledges the need for more control on development in AONBs and other protected landscapes than elsewhere (footnote 9 to paragraph 14).</p> <p>Q40. To further support delivery of rural homes for rural workers, the Government is consulting on a new agricultural to residential use permitted development right. It is proposed that this would allow conversion of up to 750sqm, for a maximum of 5 new dwellings, each with a floor space of no more than 150sqm. The Government is seeking views on how best to ensure these properties meet local need. It also proposes amending the existing Class Q permitted development right to increase the existing threshold from 450sqm to 465sqm to bring it into line with the current permitted development right threshold for agricultural development.</p> <p>a) How should the right be framed to best ensure homes are available to meet local need?</p> <p>Restrictions to ensure they are for local rural workers. Only allow where in or near a village, do not allow remote rural barn conversions in unsustainable locations.</p> <p>b) Should the new right have similar conditions to the existing Class Q right</p> <p>Yes. It is considered imperative that any new permitted development rights for agricultural to residential use are subject to the same condition (j) that restricts such permitted development rights on article 2(3) land under the existing Class Q right.</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>National Parks and AONBs are currently excluded from current permitted development allowing change of use from agriculture to residential use. This is considered an entirely appropriate and justified approach and it is considered essential that this position is maintained. Extending permitted development to AONBs would remove the ability of local planning authorities to manage the impacts of development on key elements of landscape character. It could also lead to the proliferation of more agricultural buildings in nationally protected landscapes to replace those that are lost to agriculture through residential conversion.</p> <p>By maintaining the requirement for the change of use of agricultural buildings to residential in AONBs, the Local Planning Authorities, often in consultation with the AONB Unit, will be able to manage the details involved in such conversions and changes of use to ensure that the special qualities of the designated landscape are appropriately conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>In the Chilterns AONB we have the well respected and useful Chilterns Buildings Design Guide which gives advice on how to convert farm buildings sympathetically with good and bad practice illustrations and checklists (eg do not radically alter the appearance of a building, ensure extensions reflect the design of the original building, undertake protected species surveys and incorporate bird and bat boxes, retain existing openings and limit the number of new openings, do not break roof slopes with dormer windows or roof lights, retain as much of the original structure as possible, where possible ensure materials replicate those of the existing buildings, limit the sub-division of both internal and external space, limit clutters and domestic paraphernalia). All the value of this guidance would be lost if barn conversions were PD, and the last of our rare historic Chilterns farmsteads could be converted with no design control or consideration about the appropriateness of a residential re-use.</p>	
<p>SEA and SA Draft Scoping Report for new Dacorum Local Plan</p>	<p>DBC</p>	<p>Q1. Do you think the Local Plan might have a 'likely significant effect' on Natura 2000 sites (in particular the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC)? If so, in which broad locations and what might be the likely effects?</p> <p>Yes. There is likely to be pressure on the Chilterns Beechwood SAC from new development in terms of, for example, air-borne pollution from increase in vehicular traffic (especially nitrogen compounds), decrease in tranquillity, increased visitor pressure and possibly effects on the water system from increased abstraction to serve development. The traffic pollution effects are likely to be most acute where major roads pass close to the SAC for instance the A41 southwest of Tring, and A4251 and B4506 near Ashridge. The effects should be assessed cumulatively with the proposed growth of local authorities, and also with HS2 which will have effects both during construction and in the longer term. Increased passenger numbers with Luton airport development is likely to affect the SAC (increased noise, light pollution, kerosine pollution). An appropriate assessment is likely to be needed.</p> <p>Q2. Are there any other policies, plans or programmes (PPPs) that contain environmental protection or sustainability objectives, or which identify issues, that are not covered by the PPPs listed in this Scoping Report?</p> <p>Yes, please add the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 which provides the legal framework for and duties towards the Chilterns AONB. Also the Hertfordshire Landscape Character Assessment. Thank you for including the. This is due to be updated for the 2019 -2024 period so it</p>	<p>4.5.17</p>

	<p>could be referred to as “Chilterns AONB Management Plan 2014-19 (and successor)”.</p> <p>Other documents which may be of relevance are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide</li> <li>• the Buildings Design Guide Supplementary Technical Notes dealing with Flint, Brick and Roofing Materials,</li> <li>• the Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Highways in the Chilterns</li> <li>• the Chilterns Conservation Board’s Position Statement on Development Affecting the Setting of the Chilterns AONB</li> <li>• the Chilterns Conservation Board’s Position Statement on Renewable Energy</li> <li>• the Making of the Chilterns Landscape (Chilterns Historic Landscape Characterisation Project Summary)</li> <li>• the Chilterns Historic Landscape Characterisation Project report</li> </ul> <p>All of these documents are available as free downloads from the Chilterns AONB website <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/board-publications.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/board-publications.html</a> or <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development.html</a> Also potentially the UK Government’s proposals to address air quality, when these are published.</p> <p>Q3. Is there any other baseline information which is relevant to the SA/SEA of the Local Plan that has not been included?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A water cycle study should be updated to assess Local Plan development proposals.</li> <li>• A cumulative impact assessment.</li> </ul> <p>Q4. Are there any other problems, opportunities or issues that might be relevant to the Local Plan and have not been covered?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water abstraction for development and its effect on chalk streams and chalk rivers. The SA/SEA should address chalk streams and refer to the Rivers Gade, Ver and Bulbourne as chalk streams, they are a globally rare habitat and not ordinary rivers. For more information please see <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/about-chilterns/chalkstreams.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/about-chilterns/chalkstreams.html</a></li> <li>• Tree diseases eg Ash Dieback, Sudden Oak Death</li> <li>• Agricultural or forestry land use change resulting from a change in policy and subsidy support post Brexit.</li> <li>• HS2, Luton airport expansion and development in other districts which have direct, indirect and cumulative effects.</li> </ul> <p>Q5. Are there any further interrelationships between topics that have not been identified?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for cumulative impact assessment to consider effects on the Chilterns AONB.</li> <li>• The air quality assessment should cover effects of air pollution on biodiversity as well as human health. See for instance the Plantlife report 2017 <a href="http://www.plantlife.org.uk/uk/our-work/policy/nitrogen">http://www.plantlife.org.uk/uk/our-work/policy/nitrogen</a></li> </ul> <p>Q6. Where do you see the main issues in the area and which topics do you want see addressed with priority within the SA/SEA?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chilterns AONB as a nationally protected landscape and the threats it faces.</li> <li>• Development pressure and effects on AONB, Chilterns Beechwoods SAC and Chilterns chalk streams.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

		<p>Q7. Do the SA/SEA objectives provide a reasonable framework through which the likely significant environmental and sustainability effects of the Local Plan can be assessed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is landscape not integrated with biodiversity?</li> <li>• Why is conserving and enhancing the Chilterns AONB not mentioned? Dacorum contains a significant area of a nationally protected landscape.</li> <li>• Why is natural beauty not mentioned?</li> <li>• Why is air quality focussed on urban areas and human rather than wildlife receptors?</li> <li>• Why are chalk streams and Chilterns Beechwoods SAC not mentioned?</li> </ul> <p>Q8. Do you believe that the significant effects of the Local Plan can be identified using the methodology outlined in the Scoping Report? Depends on the availability of detailed data and cross-boundary working with neighbouring authorities and wider (eg Chilterns AONB wide) to assess cumulative effects.</p> <p>Q9. Are there other/additional methodologies that could be used to identify the significant effects of the Local Plan?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cumulative Impact Assessment</li> <li>• Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</li> <li>• Actions to conserve and enhance the AONB should be informed by landscape and visual impact assessment, having considered all relevant landscape character assessments and should focus upon:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>&gt; the Chilterns AONB's special qualities which include the steep chalk escarpment with areas of flower-rich downland, broadleaved woodlands (especially beech), commons, tranquil valleys, the network of ancient routes, villages with their brick and flint houses, chalk streams and a rich historic environment of hillforts and chalk figures;</li> <li>&gt; the scope for enhancing and restoring those parts of the landscape which are degraded or subject to existing intrusive developments, utilities or infrastructure;</li> <li>&gt; locally distinctive patterns and species composition of natural features such as chalk downland, trees, hedgerows, woodland, field boundaries, rivers and chalk streams;</li> <li>&gt; the locally distinctive character of settlements and their landscape settings, including the transition between man-made and natural landscapes at the edge of settlements;</li> <li>&gt; visually sensitive skylines, geological and topographical features;</li> <li>&gt; landscapes of cultural, historic and heritage value;</li> <li>&gt; important views and visual amenity, including key views from the steep northwest facing chalk escarpment overlooking the low clay vale, and foreground views back to the AONB; and</li> <li>&gt; tranquility and remoteness and the need to avoid intrusion from light pollution, noise, and motion.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p>South Oxfordshire Second Preferred Options Local Plan</p>	<p>SODC</p>	<p>Chapter 4 Our Spatial Strategy STRAT1 Object</p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board would like to see more emphasis on the AONB in the overall strategy. Around half the district is in the AONB, which is a nationally protected landscape. Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) are designated by the Government for the purpose of ensuring that the special qualities of the finest landscapes in England and Wales are conserved and enhanced. In policy terms they have the same planning status as National Parks. The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 section 85 places a statutory duty on local authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of AONBs when coming to decisions or carrying out their activities relating to, or affecting, land within these areas. South Oxfordshire is the</p>	<p>17.5.17</p>

	<p>largest of the ten local authorities with land in the Chilterns AONB, with 27.9% of the Chilterns AONB falling within South Oxfordshire. Having a good development plan strategy and set of policies in South Oxfordshire is essential for the long term future of the Chilterns AONB, and SODC holds a very significant responsibility to cherish it.</p> <p>Conserving and enhancing the AONB should be promoted the first bullet point in the strategy. This would also be consistent with the Council's saved South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 which put 'protecting and enhancing the natural and built environment' as its first key objective. The current overall strategy bullet point (number 7) is 'protecting and enhancing the countryside and particularly those areas with the AONBs and Oxford Green Belt by ensuring that outside towns and villages any change relates to very specific needs such as those of the agricultural industry or enhancement of the environment.' This is flawed in that it fails to reflect the designations hierarchy or give great weight to the AONB: it puts the general countryside before the AONB, and the AONB and Green Belt on an equal footing. It also assumes that the AONB is land outside towns and villages, when in fact many of the AONB settlements are washed over or enclosed by the AONB, and the special qualities of the Chilterns AONB include the villages with their brick and flint houses.</p> <p><i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i></p> <p>Promote conserving and enhancing the AONB to the first bullet point in the strategy.</p> <p>Disentangle AONB from Green Belt and the wider countryside. Put AONBs first to reflect the designation hierarchy and comply with the NPPF para 113 that "Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks.</p> <p>Re-word 'protecting' to 'conserving' to match NPPF para 115 and Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 section 85.</p> <p>Chapter 4 Our Spatial Strategy Para 4.15 STRAT2 Object</p> <p>Disagree with the statement in para 4.15 that "National Planning Policy is clear that local planning authorities should ensure that they meet the full, Objectively Assessed Needs for market and affordable housing in the Housing Market Area".</p> <p>In fact National Policy is caveated and refers to designations like AONB which should be taken into account when establishing the appropriate quantum of development:</p> <p>NPPF para 182 states "the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable developments "</p> <p>NPPF para 14 and 47 on meeting full OAN only "as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework", with a special exemption for the AONB in footnote 9, and repeated in advice in Planning Practice Guidance para 044: "The Framework is clear that local planning authorities should, through their Local Plans, meet objectively assessed needs unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits , when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or specific policies in the Framework indicate development should be restricted . Such policies include those relating to sites protected under the Birds and Habitats Directives, and/or</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>designated as Sites of Special Scientific Interest; land designated as Green Belt, Local Green Space, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty , Heritage Coast or within a National Park or the Broads; designated heritage assets; and locations at risk of flooding or coastal erosion.” SODC has made no cumulative assessment of the effect on the AONB of this quantum of development or sought to set a lower than OAN figure, instead opting for uplifts and accepting unmet need from Oxford.The quantum of new housing and employment land proposed is too high and fails to adjust for the constraint of the AONB.</p> <p>The southern half of the district is covered by the two AONBs, where National Planning Policy states that planning applications for major development in the AONB should be refused except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest (NPPF para 116). No process appears to have been undertaken to moderate the OAN housing number in the SHMA based on the high level of constraint in the district.The spatial strategy in the plan involves development at AONB settlements, which in practice means housing development on AONB green field sites at the edge of settlements.The adverse impacts of meeting full OAN, plus unmet need for Oxford, has not been properly assessed.</p> <p>In order to achieve the purpose of the AONB any development that takes place should ensure the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the area.This means that the AONB should not be considered as a no-go zone, equally any development that does take place should invariably be small-scale and sensitive in nature .The Local Plan fails to recognise this. By failing to have a distinctive strategy for the AONB settlements, the Council has not demonstrated that it is following national policy on protected landscapes (NPPF para 115 and 116), or its duty of regard to the AONB under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (see Section 85 <a href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/section/85">http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/section/85</a> ).</p> <p><i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i></p> <p>Lower the quantum of development in Policy STRAT2 to reflect constraints including the AONBs.</p> <p>Correct the wording in STRAT2 "provision will be made to meet the need for..." because the levels listed are not need but include uplifts which take them beyond what is required (economic growth and affordable housing uplifts as explained in para 4.20).</p> <p>Correct the wording in para 4.15 to reflect the NPPF caveats about meeting full OAN where policies indicate development should be restricted (including AONB).</p> <p>Chapter 4 Our Spatial Strategy Policy STRAT5 Comment Unclear why the policy refers to a requirement for a health impact assessment and not other kinds of assessment, for example a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. LVIA's will be essential and should be decisive in establishing a strategic development's acceptability, especially where nationally protected landscape could be impacted; Chalgrove Airfield is potentially in the setting of the Chilterns AONB.</p> <p><i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i></p> <p>Refer to other kinds of assessment too, including Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments.</p> <p>Chapter 4 Our Spatial Strategy STRAT 9 Comment</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>The masterplan for the airfield should be landscape-led. Impacts of the Chalgrove airfield development on the Chilterns AONB need proper assessment. Para 4.58 states that it is located outside any flood zone, the AONB and the Green Belt. However, it is possible that the airfield site is visible from within the AONB (e.g. from Watlington Hill, a National Trust grassland site providing panoramic views over the flat land of Oxfordshire Vale). The South Oxfordshire Landscape Assessment SPD (Atlantic Consultants) concludes on LCA3 the Clay Vale/ Undulating Open Vale that: "areas of open landscape on elevated ground and on the floor of the vale (including airfield sites) are visually exposed and new development would be highly prominent unless closely associated with existing built form or well-integrated within new landscape frameworks". This intervisibility of Chalgrove airfield with the Chilterns AONB should be assessed through a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and, if visible, could act as a constraint on the height and extent of development, see the Chilterns Conservation Board's Position Statement on Development Affecting the Setting of the Chilterns AONB available here <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development/position-statements.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development/position-statements.html</a></p> <p>Furthermore impact on the AONB is not only about visual impact. The AONB can be affected adversely by, for example, noise, air and water pollution, loss of tranquillity, light spill over previously dark landscapes and skylines, water abstraction to serve development, increased recreation pressures etc. Traffic through the Chilterns AONB on the B4009 is likely to increase, worsening air quality in the Watlington Air Quality Management Area. Upgrades along the route to the M40 could affect the rural character of the road. Our guidance note, prepared with the County Councils, Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Highways in the Chilterns <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/uploads/files/ConservationBoard/Environmental_Guidelines_Highways.pdf">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/uploads/files/ConservationBoard/Environmental_Guidelines_Highways.pdf</a> summarises advice on how to avoid inappropriate changes and manage roads to conserve and enhance the special qualities of the AONB.</p> <p><i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i></p> <p>Bullets point ii) should read "A layout and form that respects the setting of the Listed Buildings, Registered Battlefield and Chilterns AONB beyond the site"</p> <p>Chapter 5 Delivering New Homes Table 5c Comment</p> <p>Completions should be updated to March 2017 monitoring figures. The row in the table "Sites in the smaller villages (NDPs and infill sites) and windfall sites" should be split into 2 rows. Windfalls should be reported as a separate row because not all windfalls are in smaller villages or neighbourhood plans, there will be windfalls and infill in the towns, larger villages and thorough barn conversions etc in the wider countryside. Once granted these would appear in Commitments but a row is needed to include a windfall allowance for future years.</p> <p><i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i></p> <p>Split row into: 1 Housing in the smaller villages and rural areas 2 Windfall allowance</p> <p>Chapter 5 Delivering New Homes Policy H1 Object</p> <p>The policy as drafted allows all housing development on previously-developed land in and adjacent to towns and larger villages. This will</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>have the effect that all garden centres, stables, quarries, scrapyards, scout huts, mobile homes sites, institutions, employment land etc on the edge of settlements will be likely to come forward for housing development, and the policy will permit them without caveat about impact on the natural and historic environment, highway safety, loss of valued facilities or respect to the policies of a neighbourhood plan which may have chosen not to allocate the sites. This policy risks outwards sprawl of development into the countryside and harm to the setting of villages and the AONB. Some rural PDL sites are large eg thinking of earlier cases like CABI, Fairmile Hospital, Highlands Farm, Mongewell Park, and future ones like RAF Benson. As it stands the policy is too permissive, caveats are needed. Furthermore since built up areas are not defined in the plan, this is likely to lead to protracted discussions through the DM process. The policy wording could also be misread as allowing housing on PDL in built-up areas and on greenfield land adjacent to built up areas.</p> <p>"Infill" should be defined in the policy or in a footnote to the policy, given a recent appeal decision reported in the planning press about the lack of weight given to supporting text in a local plan. The infill definition is very important and should not be left to para 5.10.</p> <p>Not all infill is appropriate, suggest adding the word "It is appropriate infilling" and cross referring to Policy H18 which contains important caveats about land in settlements which is unsuitable for infilling. As it stands there is a lack of consistency between H1 and H18.</p> <p>The travelling community policy is missing an important word "and". As it stands it implies that personal and temporary permissions will be the exception not the rule, so that most caravan permissions will be permanent and general.</p> <p><i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i></p> <p>Amend policy wording as shown in bold:</p> <p><b>"On sites that are not allocated, housing development and conversions to dwellings will be permitted on previously-developed land which is in or adjacent to the existing built-up areas of towns and larger villages provided that it does not conflict with other policies in the development plan . In other locations, the potential to develop PDL will be balanced against other policies of the development plan, particularly with reference to safe and sustainable access to services and facilities and safeguarding the natural and historic environment. "</b></p> <p><b>"ii) It is appropriate infilling *(see Policy H18) within the existing built up areas..."</b></p> <p><b>* footnote within policy "infill development is defined as the filling or a small gap in an otherwise continuous built-up frontage or on other sites within settlements where the site is closely surrounded by buildings"</b></p> <p><b>"Permission for single residential caravans or mobile homes will only be given in exceptional circumstance and on a temporary and personal basis"</b></p> <p>Chapter 5 Policy H3 Object</p> <p>The allocations at the market towns are too high and the figures take no account of AONB constraint.</p> <p>Para 5.14 states that the 15% distribution does not take into account social, economic and environmental factors that may impact on the ability of settlements to accommodate the amount of development that has been calculated. Why not? This is unsatisfactory. It runs counter to the requirement for strategic environmental assessment to ensure that options and their effects are explored and understood. Henley-on-Thames and Wallingford are constrained by the AONB, and the Council</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>has a statutory duty under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (section 85) to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty. The NPPF para 115 instructs that “Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.” No weight appears to have been given in the distribution decision. The 15% allocation could involve major development in the AONB, which is specifically prohibited by paragraph 116 of the NPPF unless in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest. Accommodating a mathematically-derived proportion of housing growth is unlikely to meet that test, it is not exceptional, there are no national considerations, and alternative sites exist.</p> <p><i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i></p> <p>Inform the distribution decision with consideration of the AONB so that the Council's meets its statutory duty of regard towards conserving and enhancing the AONB. This is likely to mean lower numbers for          Powered by Objective Online 4.2 - page 7          Henley-on-Thames, which is highly constrained and should again be capped as in the Core Strategy, and Wallingford which is in the setting of both the Chilterns AONB and North Wessex Downs AONB.</p> <p>Chapter 5 Policy H4          Object          The Chilterns Conservation Board does not support applying a blanket proportional growth figure of 15% growth for the larger villages. Since 15% is the same percentage as the market towns this is no kind of a spatial planning hierarchy. The larger villages provision does not mention the AONB or make a distinction between AONB and non-AONB villages. Para 5.27 states that the 15% distribution does not take into account social, economic and environmental factors that may impact on the ability of settlements to accommodate the amount of development that has been calculated. Why not? ...At the moment there is no evidence to demonstrate that the district council has had sec 85 statutory regard, AONB settlements are not being treated any differently from non-AONB settlements. The Board does not consider that the quantity proposed for the larger villages is appropriate for the AONB or for achieving a focus on Science Vale. The bulk of the overall larger village provision should be located at Berinsfield to achieve its regeneration objectives.</p> <p>The NPPF para 115 instructs that “Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.” No weight appears to have been given in the distribution decision. The 15% allocation could involve major development in the AONB, which is specifically prohibited by paragraph 116 of the NPPF unless in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest. Accommodating a mathematically-derived proportion of housing growth is unlikely to meet that test, it is not exceptional, there are no national considerations, and alternative sites exist. It is unreasonable to defer to neighbourhood plans the responsibility for carrying out a major development assessment which should be done at the point of split between the larger villages, because neighbourhood plans are the wrong spatial scale to carry out the assessment of whether there are alternatives sites not in the AONB (NPPF para 115 major development test second bullet).</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Settlements in or in the setting of the AONB should have special consideration. This national landscape designation will clearly constrain the ability to accommodate further development in the AONB and to a lesser extent in the setting of the AONB. The NPPF is clear that LPAs should allocate land of the least environmental or amenity value (para 110), which will mean avoiding land in the AONB or its setting. The Board considers that the Council should focus development on sites outside, and which do not affect the setting or appreciation of, the Chilterns AONB. It will require a spatial distribution which avoids AONB land and involves care in the setting of the AONB. In the AONB development should invariably be small in scale and to meet identified needs. The proposed calculation method for each village is flawed by being based on the 2011 housing stock plus the proportional growth figure. Table 5g is inconsistent and confusing (why is Benson column B showing zero, why are allocations at Crowmarsh Gifford almost double the 134 homes shown?), and the approach does not seem to match the market towns calculations.</p> <p>The cumulative effects on the AONB need consideration, where multiple sites around a settlement are to be developed (eg Chinnor), where development will increase traffic levels and impact on air quality on roads through the AONB, or where recreation pressures on the AONB will increase.</p> <p><i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>          Make a distinction between AONB and non-AONB larger villages, reduce the numbers for AONB villages.</p> <p>Appropriate Assessment          Object          The Appropriate Assessment should not screen out recreation and traffic impacts where the housing distribution in the emerging local plan requires growth there e.g housing at Goring is likely to increase recreation pressure on Hartslock Wood Special Area of Conservation.  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>          Do not screen out recreation and traffic impacts</p> <p>Chapter 5 Policy H6          Object          The Chilterns Conservation Board objects to this allocation at Nettlebed which the Council's own study describes as having the potential to harm the AONB. This is a greenfield site in the AONB, the development of which would involve encroachment into the open countryside. The creation of access is likely to harm the AONB and involve crossing registered Common Land (please see information on Nettlebed Common here <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/about-chilterns/chilterns-commons-project/commons.html#id_373">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/about-chilterns/chilterns-commons-project/commons.html#id_373</a>). The landscape and ecological impacts (landscape setting of village, Common Land, mature trees, impact in Priest Hill SSSI, grassland ecology etc) have not been given weight or proper assessment. No assessment has been undertaken of whether this development would represent major development in the AONB, which is prohibited by para 116 except in exceptional circumstances and where it is in the public interest.  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>          Re-consider the allocation H6</p> <p>Chapter 5 Policy H7</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Comment                  The site in within the Chilterns AONB, the second bullet point should refer to the Chilterns AONB  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>                  Add words in bold                  "ii) A scheme of an appropriate scale and layout in a form that respects the Chilterns AONB , the listed building and its setting"                  Refer to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide in the supporting text.</p> <p>Chapter 5 Policy H8                  Object                  The proposed allocations for Crowmarsh Gifford, which is one of the smallest of the larger villages and is bounded to the south and east by the Chilterns AONB, a nationally protected landscape, amount to almost double the 15% proportional growth figure (134 homes but 250 are allocated under H8 and H9).                  The policy text should secure the land to the east of the footpath as green infrastructure in perpetuity, to avoid pressure for a later phase 2 housing development which would harm views from the AONB (CRO1 site and from higher land at Cox's Lane and AONB footpaths).  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>                  Amend bullet point ii)                  ii) A scheme of an appropriate scale and form that respects the surrounding Grade II listed buildings and their settings, including green infrastructure secured in perpetuity to form a landscape buffer to minimise the impact on the AONB</p> <p>Chapter 5 Policy H9                  Comment                  It is not clear why the proposed allocations for Crowmarsh Gifford, which is one of the smallest of the larger villages and is bounded to the south and east by the Chilterns AONB, a nationally protected landscape, amount to almost double the 15% proportional growth figure (134 homes but 250 are allocated under H8 and H9).</p> <p>Chapter 5 Policy H10                  Object                  500 homes in the smaller villages is too large a number. This includes infill and windfalls which could be anywhere in district , these should be accounted for separately, reducing the number in smaller villages downwards.                  Development of up to 10 dwellings is too large a scale of development for the smaller villages. Caveats are needed and cross references to other policies. It could involve major development in the AONB, which should be refused under para 116 of the NPPF.                  The policy jumbles up three sources of housing supply: smaller village allocations in NDPs, infill development (which could be anywhere - in Didcot, market towns, larger villages) and small site windfalls (up to 10 dwellings, again these could be anywhere).This is unsatisfactory.  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>                  Separate out into three separate policies.                  This policy H10 should just set out the scale of development that is acceptable in smaller villages. The total number of minimum of 500 is too high, suggest reduce to 200.The scale should be reduced to up to 5</p>	
--	---	--

	<p> dwellings (not up to 10 dwellings).The policy should not use "and/or" which is confusing.</p> <p>Chapter 5 Para 5.42-5.43 Object This section needs a policy, not just supporting text. It should explain that housing in other villages and wider countryside is strictly controlled and that planning permission for new housing will not be granted. The current para 5.42 implies that single isolated dwellings are permissible, this conflicts with para 55 which only allows new dwellings in very strict circumstances. <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i> Add new policy explaining that housing in other villages and wider countryside is strictly controlled and that planning permission for new housing will not be granted unless it meets NPPF para 55.</p> <p>Chapter 5 Policy H12 Object All the bullet points should be met for a scheme to be permitted. The conjunctions between the bullet points should be 'and' not 'or'. <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i> Change 'or' to 'and' between bullet points.</p> <p>Chapter 5 Policy H17 Comment There is an important word missing in the first line of the policy: authorised. As it stands the policy safeguards unauthorised sites and newly emerging traveller sites including those which the Council wishes to remove through enforcement powers. <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i> Amend to: "Proposals that result in the loss of an authorised site..."</p> <p>Chapter H18 Comment Support this policy but suggest specifying which size of village it applies to and excluding 'other' villages in the settlement hierarchy. Amend to "Proposals for housing on sites within the built-up areas of the towns and larger and smaller villages will be permitted provided that..."</p> <p>Chapter 5 Policy H20 Comment The policy should refer to nationally designated landscape as well as local landscape features Amend (v) to: "...protected species, nationally protected and local landscape features..."</p> <p>Chapter 5 Para 5.77 Comment Remove "normally" from the first sentence. It goes against good policy drafting to use normally, as it lacks clarity and gives room for developers to argue a case contrary to the policy. Delete "normally" from the first sentence.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Please state the chapter number and planning policy reference or paragraph number you are commenting on:</p> <p>Chapter 5 Para 5.81          Comment          Refer also to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide which the Council has adopted as SPG          Add to final sentence "... and in the Chilterns AONB, to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide"</p> <p>Chapter 6 Para 6.27          Comment          For consistency the first sentence should refer to the other two criteria in the Policy EMP3, not just economic viability.</p> <p>Chapter 6 Policy EMP11          Object          This policy is too permissive. It allows any business anywhere in the district, including isolated rural locations. It is not acceptable and would attract and cause harm to the AONB. Caveats are needed. The important messages in para 7.13 and Policy TRANS4 about the location of development need to re-shape this policy. Sustainability, landscape, residential amenity, heritage and natural environment need to be safeguarded.  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>          Add caveats as follows:          "Proposals for sustainable economic growth in the countryside and rural areas will be supported where it does not conflict with other policies in the development plan. We will..."</p> <p>Chapter 7 Policy TRANS1          Object          The provision in bullet point (v) for improvements in the Reading area including a new Thames Crossing should be removed. The Chilterns Conservation Board would object to any proposal that would increase vehicular traffic through the Chilterns AONB or affect the rural character of its roads and villages. A new crossing or park and ride would increase traffic, noise and air pollution in the AONB, reducing tranquillity and affecting habitats (see recent Plantlife report on effects on nitrogen pollution on flora <a href="http://www.plantlife.org.uk/our-work/policy/nitrogen">http://www.plantlife.org.uk/our-work/policy/nitrogen</a>). As well as volume, changes to the type of traffic (e.g. more HGVs or more through traffic cutting between motorways) would be of concern. A bus-only bridge would be likely to attract nuisance parking in AONB villages by commuters leaving their cars and catching bus across a new bridge into Reading, affecting the character and peace of villages.  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>          Delete (v) since adverse impacts on the AONB are inevitable.</p> <p>Chapter 7 Para 7.15          Comment          Typo, this incorrectly refers to the West Coast Mainline (which is not in South Oxfordshire and was electrified in the 1960s), it should read Great Western Mainline          Replace West Coast Mainline with Great Western Mainline</p> <p>Chapter 7 Policy TRANS3</p>	
--	---	--

	<p><b>Object</b>                  The proposal for a Watlington bypass lacks assessment of the impacts on the setting of the Chilterns AONB. Traffic through the Chilterns AONB on the B4009 on the route to the M40 is likely to increase. Upgrades to the B4009 could affect the rural character of the road. New junctions or roundabouts would bring lighting columns which would harm dark skies in the Chilterns. Our guidance note, prepared with the County Councils, Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Highways in the Chilterns  <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/uploads/files/ConservationBoard/Environmental_Guidelines_Highways.pdf">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/uploads/files/ConservationBoard/Environmental_Guidelines_Highways.pdf</a>                  summarises advice on how to avoid inappropriate changes and manage roads to conserve and enhance the special qualities of the AONB. The proposals should be informed by a landscape and visual impact assessment re: views from Chilterns AONB (especially Watlington Hill and the Ridgeway National Trail).  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>                  Delete "a new bypass for Watlington" until studies have assessed its effects, including on the Chilterns AONB</p> <p><b>Chapter 7 Policy INF4</b>  <b>Comment</b>                  This land safeguarded for the Chinnor reservoir may be in the setting of the Chilterns AONB, visible from Chinnor Hill and potentially from the Ridgeway. Consideration needs to be given to the AONB impacts, including opportunities this might offer for biodiversity and habitat creation.                  Add bullet point referring to the setting of the Chilterns AONB</p> <p><b>Chapter 8 Policy ENV1</b>  <b>Object</b>                  As it stand the policy is muddled and fails to reflect the hierarchy that is required under NPPF para 113 "Distinctions should be made between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites, so that protection is commensurate with their status and gives appropriate weight to their importance and the contribution that they make to wider ecological networks." The plan has good well constructed policies on biodiversity and watercourses, but just one bullet point on the AONB in a wider landscape and countryside policy. The bullet point only deals with major development in the AONB and is silent on non-major development. It fails to give great weight to the AONB (NPPF para 115).                  The Chilterns Conservation Board would like to offer assistance with the wording for a standalone policy on the AONB. One of the outcomes of a meeting of policy planners in January 2016 was a request to the Chilterns Conservation Board to propose a model Chilterns AONB policy, drawing on good practice and experience locally and from others AONBs. This model policy was refined at a workshop of policy planners from across the 13 local authorities of the Chilterns AONB, and adopted by the Board in October 2016 as the policy CCB would recommend to be incorporated in all the emerging Local Plans that cover the Chilterns AONB. This would provide consistency, save officer time, and represent a positive example of the duty to cooperate, with the local authorities working together to safeguard the future of a shared nationally protected landscape area.                  To achieve strong compliance with the purpose of the AONB, national planning policy and AONB management plan objectives, a local plan should cover:</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>1 Weight given to AONB                  2 Conserving and enhancing                  3 Setting                  4 Tranquillity and remoteness                  5 Cumulative impacts                  6 AONB Management Plan*                  7 AONB supporting guidance eg Design Guide*                  8 Local descriptive material e.g. special qualities of Chilterns*                  *Some LPAs may prefer to cover the final three in the supporting text to the policy                  The principles are met in the Model Policy and the associated supported text. The Chilterns Conservation Board recommends inclusion of this model policy and supporting text in the draft of the Local Plan.  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>                  Include a standalone policy in on the AONB, using the model policy (copy provided)</p> <p>Chapter 8 Policy ENV5                  Comment                  Add reference to the Chilterns AONB Management Plan</p> <p>Chapter 9 Policy DES1                  Comment                  Add reference to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide SPG, see <a href="http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/services-and-advice/planning-and-building/conservation-and-design/design/design-guide">http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/services-and-advice/planning-and-building/conservation-and-design/design/design-guide</a></p> <p>Chapter 9 Policy DES2 and DES3                  Comment                  Add reference to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide SPG, see <a href="http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/services-and-advice/planning-and-building/conservation-and-design/design/design-guide">http://www.southoxon.gov.uk/services-and-advice/planning-and-building/conservation-and-design/design/design-guide</a>  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>                  Add reference to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide SPG</p> <p>Chapter 9 Policy DES8                  Comment                  Add reference to AONB as a national protected landscape  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>                  Add "unless the concern relates to a designated heritage asset or the nationally protected AONB landscape..."</p> <p>Chapter 9 Policy DES10                  Object                  This policy is too permissive. It should, for consistency with the overall strategy STRAT1 and national policy, refer to the use of the building and restrict new buildings to agricultural or forestry use. This would protect the district from applicants claiming a demonstrable need for equine buildings etc in the AONB.  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>                  Add to first sentence "rural areas for an agricultural or forestry use, where..."                  and at the end a new bullet point "where meets other policies in the development plan"</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>Chapter 9 Policy DES11                  Object                  Add "or AONB" to (iv)  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>                  Add "or AONB" to criteria (iv)                  Chapter 12 section 7                  Comment                  Add an indicator on AONB development  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>                  Add an indicator about "Number of major developments permitted in the AONB" to track compliance with NPPF para 116 and ENV1</p> <p>Appendix 1 Glossary                  Comment                  The AONB definition is not accurate.                  The AONB Management Plan only refers to North Wessex Downs AONB and should also refer to Chilterns AONB Management Plan  <i>If you are objecting, please set out what change(s) are necessary to overcome your concerns:</i>                  1. Add reference to Chilterns AONB Management Plan                  2. Clarify that the definition of major development is not the same definition for major development in the AONB (ref NPPF para 116)</p>	
<p>Draft National Airports National Policy Statement</p>	<p>DfT</p>	<p>Question 1: The Government believes there is the need for additional airport capacity in the South East of England by 2030. Please tell us your views. Your response: The Chilterns Conservation Board has a duty to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and to increase the understanding and enjoyment by the public of the special qualities of the AONB, whilst also fostering the economic and social well being of communities within the AONB. The Board would objects in principle to any change in operations or development that would lead to an increase in the number and frequency of aircraft which fly over the Chilterns to and from Heathrow airport because of the detrimental impacts on the tranquillity of the nationally designated Chilterns AONB. The Chilterns is a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It serves as a valuable resource for recreation and peaceful enjoyment for an urban population of nearly 1 million people on its doorstep. Over flying, exacerbated by heavy road traffic, will seriously prejudice this amenity. The enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB by rural communities and visitors to the countryside is, and will continue to be, detrimentally affected by the over flying of the area by aircraft. This will become worse if expansion takes place at Heathrow airport.</p> <p>Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme                  Question 2: Please give us your views on how best to address the issue of airport capacity in the South East of England by 2030. This could be through the Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme (the Government's preferred scheme), the Gatwick Second Runway scheme, the Heathrow Extended Northern Runway scheme, or any other scheme. Your response: The Chilterns Conservation Board objects in principle to any change in operations or development that would lead to an increase in the number and frequency of aircraft which fly over the Chilterns to and from Heathrow airport because of the detrimental impacts on the tranquillity of the nationally designated Chilterns AONB.</p>	<p>25.5.17</p>

		<p>Assessment principles                  Question 3: The Secretary of State will use a range of assessment principles when considering any application for a Northwest Runway at Heathrow Airport. Please tell us your views. Your response: Not enough weight is given to the importance of minimising over-flying of protected landscapes (National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty).</p> <p>Impacts and requirements                  Question 4: The Government has set out its approach to surface access for a Heathrow Northwest runway scheme. Please tell us your views. Your response: The Chilterns Conservation Board is concerned that the impacts of growth at Heathrow are only being considered in relation to the local area around the airport, when the impacts are felt in a much wider area. The impacts will be particularly keenly felt in the Chilterns because the area currently has relatively low ambient noise levels and any increase in noise will therefore be much more intrusive. The proposed development will also encourage growth in road traffic on the M25 and M40 as well as other trunk and local roads through the Chilterns. This will also cause detrimental impacts on the tranquillity of the Chilterns AONB. With the majority of passengers arriving by car there will continue to be massive numbers of vehicles on the roads which will have wider detrimental impacts on the environment. This has to be added to what would be a huge increase in the numbers employed at the airport that would require housing in the vicinity. The associated development would also have impacts over a wider area as some people will clearly choose to live further away from their place of work.</p> <p>5.1. Air quality supporting measures Your response: Air quality assessment should consider the deleterious effects oxides of nitrogen and particulates have on human health and the natural environment. The recent report by Plantlife <a href="https://www.plantlife.org.uk/uk/our-work/campaigning-change/nitrogen">https://www.plantlife.org.uk/uk/our-work/campaigning-change/nitrogen</a> has revealed the harm that nitrogen deposited directly from the air and in rain does: nitrogen enriches the soil, creates acidic conditions and causes direct damage to our flora. Over two thirds of wild flowers, plants like harebell (<i>Campanula rotundifolia</i>) and betony (<i>Betonica officinalis</i>) require low or medium levels of nitrogen. Only robust species, such as nettle (<i>Urtica dioica</i>), cleavers (<i>Galium aparine</i>) and hemlock (<i>Conium maculatum</i>) thrive in nutrient enriched soils. Air pollution over the Chilterns AONB harms the internationally important beechwoods, chalk grasslands and rare flora which are key elements of the special qualities and natural beauty for which the AONB was designated in 1965.</p> <p>5.2. Noise supporting measures Your response: Noise measures should address impacts of noise on habitats and species, many of which in the Chilterns AONB are rare and protected. It should give importance to having quiet spaces accessible from noisy urban places to provide people with opportunities for mental and physical wellbeing. The measures should consider background noise levels, it is much more important to keep tranquil rural areas in nationally protected landscapes quiet than it is to reduce noise in urban areas which already experience high levels of background noise from traffic, aircraft etc so that airspace changes are less noticeable.</p> <p>5.4. Compensation for local communities Your response: If nationally protected landscapes (National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) are to be impacted, consideration should be</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>given to compensation for that harm through an environment fund for management and enhancement of that nationally protected landscape.</p> <p>Question 6: The Government has set out a number of planning requirements that a Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme must meet in order to operate. Please tell us your views. Are there any other requirements the Government should set out? Your response: Conserving and enhancing the nationally protected landscapes including the Chilterns AONB.</p> <p>Draft Airports NPS Appraisal of Sustainability          Question 7: The Appraisal of Sustainability sets out the Government's assessment of the Heathrow Northwest Runway scheme, and considers alternatives. Please tell us your views. Your response: Options analysis should include an assessment of harm to nationally protected landscapes (National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty). The options analysis should look at all aspects of potential impact including: - noise over the AONB - loss of tranquility in the AONB - introduction of motion to the AONB - light pollution over the AONB - air pollution, with its effects on AONB and habitats below.</p> <p>It should take into account direct and indirect impacts, and also cumulative effects. The Chilterns AONB is facing changes on many fronts which are cumulatively eroding its ecological resilience and its ability to provide recreation, health and well-being. 10 million people live within an hour of the Chilterns, it is a major strategic greenspace resource for London and South-East England. Its importance cannot be overstated. Overflying from Luton and Heathrow airports, and the presence of the Bovingdon stack over the AONB, are major sources of harm, along with the planned construction and operation of HS2, growth in traffic across the AONB, major housing development, unsustainable levels of water abstraction from rare chalk stream habitats and other proposed threats.</p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board is concerned that the impacts of growth at Heathrow are only being considered in relation to the local area around the airport, when the impacts are felt in a much wider area. Any increase in overflying of the Chilterns AONB would be a real cause for concern.</p> <p>The opportunity should be taken to re-prioritise the AONB and re-organise airspace to reduce overflying. For example Luton airport flights are currently held down at lower altitudes over the Chilterns AONB to allow stacking for Heathrow and other overflights. Airspace change must address this and bring better protection the Chilterns AONB as a strategic greenspace resource and one of the nation's finest landscapes. The DfT and CAA are subject to a statutory duty under section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way 2000 to have regard to conserving and enhancing the AONB when making decisions.</p> <p>Question 8: Do you have any additional comments on the draft Airports National Policy Statement or other supporting documents? Your response: The Chilterns Conservation Board is concerned that the impacts of growth at Heathrow are only being considered in relation to the local area around the airport, when the impacts are felt in a much wider area. The impacts will be particularly keenly felt in the Chilterns</p>	
--	--	--

		AONB because the area currently has relatively low ambient noise levels and any increase in noise will therefore be much more intrusive.	
Consultation on UK Airspace Policy	DfT	<p>Chapter 4</p> <p>Q1a. Please provide your views on the proposed call-in function for the Secretary of State in tier 1 airspace changes and the process which is proposed, including the criteria for the call-in and the details provided in the Draft Air Navigation Guidance Your response: The Chilterns Conservation Board agrees that a call-in function is sensible because this is a larger than local issue. The Secretary of State is in a good position to have regard to nationally protected landscapes like National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Great weight should be given to avoiding airspace changes which would generate noise and harm the tranquillity of the country's finest landscapes.</p> <p>Q1b. Please provide your views on the proposal that tier 2 airspace changes should be subject to a suitable change process overseen by the Civil Aviation Authority, including the Draft Air Navigation Guidance (opens in a new tab/window) and any evidence on costs and benefits. Your response: Where nationally protected landscapes are to be impacted, the decision-making process should include liaison with the public sector bodies responsible for Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, including the Chilterns Conservation Board.</p> <p>Q1c. Please tell us your views on the proposal that tier 3 airspace changes should be subject to a suitable policy on transparency, engagement and consideration of mitigations as set out by the Civil Aviation Authority. Your response: Where nationally protected landscapes are to be impacted, the decision-making process should include liaison with the public sector bodies responsible for Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, including the Chilterns Conservation Board.</p> <p>Q1d. Please tell us your views on the airspace change compensation proposals. Your response: If nationally protected landscapes (National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) are to be impacted, consideration should be given to compensation for that harm through an environment fund for management and enhancement of that nationally protected landscape.</p> <p>Chapter 5</p> <p>Q2a. Please provide your views on the proposal to require options analysis in airspace change processes, as appropriate, including details provided in the Draft Air Navigation Guidance Your response: Options analysis should include an assessment of harm to nationally protected landscapes (National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty). The options analysis should look at all aspects of potential impact including: - noise over the AONB - loss of tranquillity in the AONB - introduction of motion to the AONB - light pollution over the AONB - air pollution, with its effects on AONB and habitats below.</p> <p>It should take into account direct and indirect impacts, and also cumulative effects. The Chilterns AONB is facing changes on many fronts which are cumulatively eroding its ecological resilience and its ability to provide recreation, health and well-being. 10 million people live within an hour of the Chilterns, it is a major strategic greenspace resource for London and South-East England. Its importance cannot be overstated. Overflying from Luton and Heathrow airports, and the presence of the Bovingdon stack over the AONB, are major sources of</p>	25.5.17

	<p>harm, along with the planned construction and operation of HS2, growth in traffic across the AONB, major housing development, unsustainable levels of water abstraction from rare chalk stream habitats and other proposed threats.</p> <p>The opportunity should be taken to re-prioritise the AONB and re-organise airspace to reduce overflying. For example Luton airport flights are currently held down at lower altitudes over the Chilterns AONB to allow stacking for Heathrow and other overflights. Airspace change must address this and bring better protection the Chilterns AONB as a strategic greenspace resource and one of the nation's finest landscapes. The DfT and CAA are subject to a statutory duty under section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way 2000 to have regard to conserving and enhancing the AONB when making decisions.</p> <p>Q2b. Please provide your views on the proposal for assessing the impacts of noise, including on health and quality of life. Please provide any comments on the proposed metrics and process, including details provided in the Draft Air Navigation Guidance Your response: The Chilterns Conservation Board objects to the proposals in the Draft Air Navigation Guidance for how to treat National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Not enough weight is given to the importance of minimising over-flying of protected landscapes. It gives most priority to avoiding noise over populated areas, and last (3rd tier) priority to reducing overflying over AONBs and National Parks. It is a watering down compared with the previous approach for AONBs and National Parks, it is now triple caveated: "where practicable, it is desirable...seek to avoid..."</p> <p>The hierarchy sets out: Below 4000ft: minimise overflight of densely populated areas; Between 4000ft and 7000ft: reducing fuel burn takes precedence; and thirdly "Where practicable, it is desirable that airspace routes below 7,000 feet should seek to avoid flying over Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and National Parks" but this is effectively meaningless because of the two higher priorities which also concern overflying below 7000 feet.</p> <p>A more appropriate hierarchy based on the guidance (and the DfT and CAA's statutory duty towards the AONB under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 Section 85) would be: Below 4000ft: minimise overflight of densely populated areas; Between 4000ft and 7000ft: minimise overflight of AONBs and National Parks; Above 7000ft: reducing fuel burn takes precedence.</p> <p>The proposed assessment methodology makes distinctions based on aircraft height, this is a poor proxy for aircraft noise. The height bands (4000 ft, 7000ft) are measured from sea level and take no account of the fact that high land like the Chiltern Hills has hilltops over 850ft above sea level. Visitors and residents on the top of the Chiltern Hills at 850ft will experience aircraft passing lower than those on the plains. WebTAG is focused on human receptors, it fails to address impacts of noise on habitats and species, many of which in the AONB are rare and protected. It does not consider the importance of having quiet spaces accessible from noisy urban places to provide people with opportunities for mental and physical wellbeing. The methodology should consider background noise levels, it is much more important to keep tranquil rural areas in nationally protected landscapes quiet than it is to reduce noise in urban areas which already experience high levels of background noise from</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>traffic, aircraft etc so that airspace changes are less noticeable. The height bands (4000 ft, 7000ft) seem arbitrary and do not consider harm or impacts on the AONBs.</p> <p>Chapter 6          Q3a. Please provide your views on the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise's (ICCAN's) proposed functions. Your response:          The protected landscape community (National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty officers) should be represented on ICCAN to ensure that noise, tranquillity and cumulative effects on the nation's strategic greenspaces is given appropriate weight.</p> <p>Q3b. Please provide your views on the analysis and options for the structure and governance of ICCAN given in Chapter 6, and the lead option that the Government has set out to ensure ICCAN's credibility. Your response: An independent chairperson is important.</p> <p>Chapter 7          Q4a. Please provide your views on the proposal that the competent authority to assure application of the balanced approach (image opens in new tab/window) to the adoption of operating restrictions at airports in England should be as set out in Chapter 7 on Ongoing Noise Management and further information at Annex F Your response: There are cases where a local authority owns the airport (eg Luton Airport) and should not be the competent authority in order to avoid conflicts of interest.</p> <p>Q4b. Please provide your views on the proposal that responsibility for noise controls (other than noise-related operating restrictions) at the designated airports should be as set out in Chapter 7 on Ongoing Noise Management. Your response: Allowing an airport to sets its own noise controls is unlikely to instil public confidence in impartial decisionmaking. ICCAN is unlikely to have the resources to oversee or review individual airport decisions, or the powers to intervene if something goes wrong.</p> <p>Q4c. Please provide your views on the proposal that designated airports should publish details of aircraft tracks and performance. Please include any comments on the kind of information to be published and any evidence on the costs or benefits. Your response: We support publishing data on departure routes. This should be presented in map-based form, as well as providing tables of figures. Figures should be presented in a format which will allow comparison over time and should include a baseline of pre and post airspace review . In addition: 1) Arrival routes should be published 2) The heights that aircraft fly should be recorded and published. 3) Noise data should be published</p> <p>Q4d. Please provide your views on whether industry is sufficiently incentivised to adopt current best practice in noise management, taking into account Chapter 7 on Ongoing Noise Management, and the role of the Independent Commission on Civil Aviation Noise in driving up standards in noise management across the aviation sector. Your response: Under these proposals airports will have the power to set their own controls and monitor their own performance. This is unlikely to instil public confidence in impartial decision-making or monitoring. ICCAN is unlikely to have the time, resources or power to intervene with the performance of a particular airport.</p> <p>Draft Guidance</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Q5. Comments on Chapter 1: Air Navigation Guidance to the CAA on the Government’s environmental objectives Your response: The Chilterns Conservation Board objects to the proposals in the Draft Air Navigation Guidance for how to treat National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Not enough weight is given to the importance of minimising over-flying of protected landscapes.</p> <p>The objectives (page 6) put environmental factors at the bottom of the list, and caveated so as to convey low priority: "the environmental impact or aviation must be mitigated as much as it practicable and realistic to do so, within the context of balanced decision making".</p> <p>The key environmental objectives (page 8) are focused on number of people affected by noise, this is a social rather than an environmental objective. The environmental objectives should include impacts of noise on habitats and species, and protecting tranquillity in nationally protected landscapes.</p> <p>Q5. Comments on Chapter 3: Development and assessment of airspace change options Your response: The guidance gives most priority to avoiding noise over populated areas, and last (3rd tier) priority to reducing overflying over AONBs and National Parks. It is a watering down compared with previous approach for AONBs and National Parks, it is now triple caveated: "where practicable, it is desirable...seek to avoid..."</p> <p>The hierarchy sets out: Below 4000ft: minimise overflight of densely populated areas; Between 4000ft and 7000ft: reducing fuel burn takes precedence; and thirdly "Where practicable, it is desirable that airspace routes below 7,000 feet should seek to avoid flying over Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and National Parks" but this is effectively meaningless because of the two higher priorities which also concern overflying below 7000 feet.</p> <p>A more appropriate hierarchy based on the guidance (and the DfT and CAA's statutory duty towards the AONB under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 Section 85) would be: Below 4000ft: minimise overflight of densely populated areas; Between 4000ft and 7000ft: minimise overflight of AONBs and National Parks; Above 7000ft: reducing fuel burn takes precedence.</p> <p>The proposed assessment methodology makes distinctions based on aircraft height, this is a poor proxy for aircraft noise. The height bands (4000 ft, 7000ft) are measured from sea level and take no account of the fact that high land like the Chiltern Hills has hilltops over 850ft above sea level. Visitors and residents on the top of the Chiltern Hills at 850ft will experience aircraft passing lower than those on the plains. WebTAG is focused on human receptors, it fails to address impacts of noise on habitats and species, many of which in the AONB are rare and protected. It does not consider the importance of having quiet spaces accessible from noisy urban places to provide people with opportunities for mental and physical wellbeing. The methodology should consider background noise levels, it is much more important to keep tranquil rural areas in nationally protected landscapes quiet than it is to reduce noise in urban areas which already experience high levels of background noise from traffic, aircraft etc so that airspace changes are less noticeable. The height bands (4000 ft, 7000ft) seem arbitrary and do not consider harm or impacts on the AONBs.</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>The section on local air quality (3.24 - 3.26) is brief and makes no mention of the deleterious effects oxides of nitrogen and particulates have on human health and the natural environment. The recent report by Plantlife <a href="https://www.plantlife.org.uk/uk/our-work/campaigning-change/nitrogen">https://www.plantlife.org.uk/uk/our-work/campaigning-change/nitrogen</a> has revealed the harm that nitrogen deposited directly from the air and in rain does: nitrogen enriches the soil, creates acidic conditions and causes direct damage to our flora. Over two thirds of wild flowers, plants like harebell (<i>Campanula rotundifolia</i>) and betony (<i>Betonica officinalis</i>) require low or medium levels of nitrogen. Only robust species, such as nettle (<i>Urtica dioica</i>), cleavers (<i>Galium aparine</i>) and hemlock (<i>Conium maculatum</i>) thrive in nutrient enriched soils. Air pollution over the Chilterns AONB harms the internationally important beechwoods, chalk grasslands and rare flora which are key elements of the special qualities and natural beauty for which the AONB was designated in 1965.</p> <p>Q5. Comments on Chapter 6: The role of Government in the Airspace Change Process Your response: The opportunity should be taken to re-prioritise the AONB and re-organise airspace to reduce overflying. For example Luton airport flights are currently held down at lower altitudes over the Chilterns AONB to allow stacking for Heathrow and other overflights. Airspace change must address this and bring better protection the Chilterns AONB as a strategic greenspace resource and one of the nation's finest landscapes. The DfT and CAA are subject to a statutory duty under section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way 2000 to have regard to conserving and enhancing the AONB when making decisions.</p>	
<p>Luton Local Plan Main Modifications</p>	<p>Luton BC</p>	<p>Main modification MM47. The Chilterns Conservation Board is concerned that the wording “conserve or enhance” is not consistent with government guidance in NPFF para 115, which is “conserve and enhance”. The proposed policy LP29 does well in providing a tiered approach with different weight to designations based on a hierarchy, but by grouping all the national designations together, the wording is now incorrect for the AONB. Please change back to “conserve and enhance”.</p> <p>It would be better to have a standalone policy for the Chilterns AONB, and the Chilterns Conservation Board has a suggested model policy which was developed jointly by the Board with local policy planners from across the 13 local authorities covering the Chilterns AONB. Using the model policy would give cross boundary consistency and be an example of positive cooperation to look after this nationally protected landscape. I am attaching the model policy.</p> <p>Main modification MM49 The Chilterns Conservation Board objects to the new text in para 11.2 concerning the East Luton Circular (North) Road. It is not appropriate for a local plan to safeguard land in another district, and the road proposal would have implications for the Chilterns AONB and raise pressure for future road connections and development which have not been subject to public or stakeholder scrutiny or an assessment of the AONB impacts. Land East of Luton is an area for which the Chilterns Conservation Board has applied to Natural England for an AONB boundary review, this process should be completed first before decisions are taken on development, allocations or safeguarded land.</p> <p>Main modification MM50</p>	<p>26.5.17</p>

		The Chilterns Conservation Board objects to the new text in Policy LP31E concerning the East Luton Circular Road. It is not appropriate for a local plan to refer to this proposal, which covers land in another district. The road proposal would have implications for the Chilterns AONB and raise pressure for future road connections and development which have not been subject to public or stakeholder scrutiny or an assessment of the AONB impacts. Land East of Luton is an area for which the Chilterns Conservation Board has applied to Natural England for an AONB boundary review, this process should be completed first before decisions are taken on development, allocations or safeguarded land.	
Draft Network Options Assessment Methodology	National Grid	The Chilterns Conservation Board questions why national protected landscapes (National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Broads) do not feature in the assessment process. If a project would pass through a nationally protected landscape, this should be identified and weight should be given to this in the consideration of options, to avoid harm to Britain's finest landscapes. National Grid is subject to the duty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (see <a href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/section/85">http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/section/85</a> ) to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of areas of outstanding natural beauty. So far there is no evidence of this regard in your assessment methodology. Currently all landscapes (nationally protected and not protected) are treated the same, and you risk breaching this legal duty.	14.6.17
Wording for M40 noise barriers specification	WSP	Following a stakeholder meeting, met with consultants WSP and proposed wording on AONB for inclusion in the works specification re: design of noise barriers and incorporation of bat/bird boxes and small mammal connectivity	4.07.17

**APPENDIX 3****Current Development Plan Consultations**

Consultation document	Consulted by	Stage	Deadline for CCB responses
South and Vale Draft GI Strategy	SODC	Draft GI Strategy	13.7.17
East West Rail Western Section Phase 2 Round 2 Consultation	Network Rail	Round 2 consultation pack	11.8.17
Draft DPD Masterplan Guidance for Two Waters	Dacorum BC	Draft SPD	16.8.17
Cholsey Neighbourhood Plan pre-submission draft	SODC	Pre-submission neighbourhood plan	21.8.17
Central Beds draft Local Plan	Central Beds	Draft Local Plan	29.8.17
Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan	AVDC	Draft Local Plan	28.9.17
M40 noise barriers consultation	Highways England	<a href="http://www.highways.gov.uk/m40-junction-3-to-8">www.highways.gov.uk/m40-junction-3-to-8</a>	Unspecified

**Item 12**                      **Planning Applications Update**

**Author:**                              Mike Stubbs Planning Advisor

**Lead Organisations:**              Chilterns Conservation Board

**Resources:**                          Staff time

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

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

**Background**

1.      News on the outcome of previous planning application the Board has made representations on is summarised in Appendix 4.
2.      Since the last Planning Committee papers for the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2017 meeting, the Board has made 28 formal representations on planning applications and participated at one Public Inquiry relating to a planning appeal for the CABI site (at Crowmarsh Gifford, South Oxfordshire). The formal representations are summarised in Appendix 5.
3.      Current live casework is listed in Appendix 6.

**Recommendations**

1.      **That the Committee notes and approves the responses made in connection with the applications listed in Appendix 5.**

**APPENDIX 4****Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented on**

Location	LPA	Development	Ref. No.	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded
Land West of Cockernhoe / Land East of Copthorne, Cockernhoe.	NHDC	Erection of 660 dwellings	16/02014/1	Pending	<b>CCB Comments</b> This land is not AONB, but shares a similar landscape character and may have potential to be incorporated within the nationally protected landscape. CCB dealt with landscape character issues and plan-led system.	05.03.16
Woodcote Garden Centre	SODC	9 dwellings	P16/S0375 /FUL	Granted 29 <sup>th</sup> June 2017	<b>CCB Comments</b> CCB comments dealt with northern boundary treatment, to improve screening.	11.03.16
Highlands Farm, Henley-on-Thames	SODC	Residential development - Amended plans	P16/S0077 /O	Outline granted 22/12/16	<b>CCB Comments.</b> Comments related to amended masterplan and Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.	21.04.16
Park Mill Farm, Princes Risborough	Planning Inspectorate	Planning application (same scheme) under 16/05846/OUTEA  Appeal - Residential development of up to 500 dwellings, dismissed.	APP/K042 5/W/16/31 46838	Inquiry held Jan 2017. Dismissed 24 <sup>th</sup> March 2017	<b>CCB Qualified objection.</b> Need to follow the plan-making process and consider the cumulative impact of development. CCB Committee to note a similar application was granted in November 2016 subject to a section 106. This appeal dealt with traffic objections.	17.06.16
Hunts Farm Harpsden Bottom Harpsden	SODC	Refurbishment & extension of existing farm house, conversion of two farm outbuildings & yard to residential use,	P16/S2359 /FUL	Full planning permission granted 3 <sup>rd</sup> March 2017	<b>CCB Comments / Objection to the extension</b> CCB objected on grounds that the extension is inappropriate and the historic significance of the entire farm must be given attention and due weight in any decision to convert buildings and refurbish the site.	18.8.16

Valentine Farm Shogmoor Lane Skirmett	WDC	Demolition of existing dwellinghouse, stables and former farm buildings and erection of a new private equestrian yard alterations	06/0617/F UL	Pending	<b>CCB Comments, revised to objection 25<sup>th</sup> November 2016</b>  Revised objection on the basis that the proposed revisions to the schemes, in pre-application, were not incorporated by the applicant and the size and profile of the equestrian buildings were too large within the AONB.	11.11.16
Lower Wood Farm Sundon Road Harlington Dunstable LU5 6LN	SODC	CB/16/02011/RM	Reserved matters for Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale attached to outline permission CB/13/347 7/OUT	Granted 5 <sup>th</sup> April 2017	<b>CCB Comments</b>  Noted that the revised details of reserved matters are far easier to orientate and CCB noted the roof plan (15163 D 083 Rev E 020217) showing grey slate and red clay roof tiles and revised boundary treatment together with tree planting (SJA323.03A).  These details have taken account of previous CCB comments.	13/2/17
Princes Risborough School Merton Road Princes Risborough	BCC	CC/01/17	Creation of new 2 storey entrance block with classrooms and kitchen extension, central atrium and lift access in phase 1; creation of 3 storey link block	Pending	<b>CCB Comments</b>  The various extensions sit within the framework of the existing school as identified by option 2 in the pre-application scoping of options as set out in the Design and Access statement. This maintains the existing relationship to the setting of the AONB by containing the visual impact within the existing built form.  The opportunity to improve materials is beneficial and we would support the architects design and materials (brick).  CCB recommends greater detail on surfacing and consideration of 'terram' or similar systems that reduce impact and conceal the visual impact of surfacing. This could appropriately be controlled by condition.	10/2/17

Buildings 1,2,4,5,6 and 7 Lys Mill, Howe Road near Watlington,	SODC	Use of former feed mill as mix of B1,B2,B8 and outside storage (additional supplementary details August 2016 and originally submitted 2013)	P13/S0561 /FUL	Pending	<b>CCB Comments.</b>  Comments dealt with reductions in traffic movements by rationalising floor space in favour of less intensive uses. Noted improvements to the access track to improve the amenity of walkers on the Ridgeway.	14.10.16
Chiltern Farm Barn Main Road North Dagnall	AVDC	16/04099/APP	Conversion and alterations of existing barn to create 5 dwellings with access, parking	Refused 14th June 2017 (Green Belt grounds) - AONB mentioned in officer's report.	<b>CCB Objection</b>  The current application is a material departure from the previous consent in (1) involving residential development in the open countryside / AONB and (2) resulting in a far larger developed area including gardens and parking and a feeling of urbanisation within the countryside.  <b>Application refused</b>	30.12.16
The Orchard, Bedford Road, Houghton Regis,	CBC	CB/17/00501/OUT	Outline: Demolition of existing buildings/structures and redevelopment of site to provide 21 dwellings, an estate road, landscaping and associated works	Pending	<b>CCB Comment</b>  This application appears to raise similar issues to the application at Bury Spinney Thorn Road Houghton Regis for outline approval up to 100 dwellings (CB/16/02086/OUT).  For that application CCB commented that the site falls within the Houghton Regis Northern Framework Plan (October 2012) and that this is used for development management purposes together with the adopted joint Core Strategy. CCB promoted a consideration of cumulative impacts here, accepting its distance away from the statutory boundary of the nationally protected landscape.	13/2/17
Land to the south of Newnham Manor, Crowmarsh Gifford	SODC	P16/S3852/FUL	Hybrid planning application for the erection of 100 new residential	Pending	<b>CCB Qualified Objection</b>  (1) Given the value of the AONB, the great weight that should be given to conserving and enhancing its natural beauty, and the moderate	8/2/17 Amended plans address objects

Planning Application			<p>dwellings including new access road off the A4074, public open space (full application) and the provision of school land (outline application)</p>		<p>adverse – minor adverse impacts identified in the applicant's LVIA, the Chilterns Conservation Board suggests that the Council asks the applicant to prepare, as a supplement to the LVIA, verified photomontages showing the impact on views from the Ridgeway (viewpoint 33) and the public footpath between Cox's Lane and the A4074 (viewpoint 32). This should help assess the significance of the effects. (2). Design – While the designs have improved over previous draft proposals, some house types are not in sympathy with the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide, adopted by SODC as SPG e.g. the integral garages/ large openings for undercroft parking in plots 18, 90, 50, 51 should be avoided. The asymmetrical roof structure give plots 50, 51, 24, 87, 95 a top-heavy look. Black weather-boarding is not a traditional Chilterns material for housing, and red clay plain tiles are normally preferred to brown clay plain tiles. The use of smooth white render on a number of the houses is likely to exacerbate their visibility from the AONB views on higher ground. (3) For the AONB enhancements and public benefits to the community to be realised, the land to be given to the school should be cleared, laid out and provided for the school, rather than left to be resolved later. This is important because the enhancement of this currently run down area of AONB is a key reason for the Chilterns Conservation Board not objecting in principle to this major development.</p>	<p>n CCB objection withdrawn 22.6.17</p>
Hazeldene Farm Asheridge Road Asheridge	CDC	CH/2016/2407/FA	Change of use of farm land for the stationing of 3 no.	Refused 19th April 2017 – reason 2 deals with	<p><b>CCB Comment</b></p> <p>The site is visually prominent and sensitive within the nationally protected</p>	13.2.17

			timber and canvas lodges for tourist accommodation, formation of track hardstanding and turning area	impact on the AONB	<p>landscape. In this case CCB accepts the point that a promotion of tourism and enjoyment of the landscape is consistent with the second purpose of the Conservation Board but that where a conflict arises then the main purpose (i.e. conserving and enhancing the natural beauty) shall prevail.</p> <p>This approach would be consistent with the AONB Management Plan which deals with economic and social well- as well as relevant development issues</p> <p>This application cannot be deemed to conserve or enhance the landscape.</p> <p><b>Application refused</b></p>	
Land to rear of Cleeve Cottages Icknield Road Goring	SODC	P16/S3001/O	Erection of 10 new dwellings. (As amended and amplified by information received 7, 26 & 31 October 2016 to address tree and ecology concerns and submission of landscape visual impact assessment	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>CCB noted that the application is submitted outside the formal Development Plan process and that the Goring Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared but is still at an early stage</p> <p>We recommend that careful attention is given to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and Supplementary Technical notes in the construction of any planning conditions governing design and detailed layout and boundary treatment, in the event that the LPA were minded to recommend this application.</p>	27.1.17
Land west of Chaul End Road, Caddington	CBC	CB/16/04593	Change of use of the land from agricultural to land for recreational use.	Withdrawn 13 <sup>th</sup> February 2017	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>This large greenfield site lies within the AONB. The planning application seeks to change the use of agricultural land to recreation use, but offers no details on the recreation uses proposed. The application is lacking sufficient</p>	24/11/16

					information to allow the impacts on the Chilterns AONB to be assessed.	
Former Molins Sports Ground, Mill Lane and The Haven, Crowbrook Road, Monks Risborough.	WDC	APP/K0425/W/16/3149747	Appeal by Molins PLC against non-determination of the outline application for the demolition of existing dwelling, formation of new vehicular access onto Crowbrook Road, erection of up to 140 new dwellings	Appeal decision due summer 2017	<p><b>CCB Objection.</b></p> <p><b>Note for CCB Planning Committee.</b> This application was a Secretary of State recovery and a decision is expected summer 2017 but is delayed by a legal challenge against the Neighbourhood Plan (which itself was made by Wycombe DC in June 2017).</p>	CCB evidence presented on 2/2/17
Land to the east of Benson Lane, Crowmarsh Gifford	SODC	P16/S3608/O	Outline planning application for up to 150 dwellings together with associated access, public open space, landscaping and amenity areas	Refused 4 <sup>th</sup> April 2017 – reason one being the impact on the setting of AONB	<p><b>CCB Comment</b></p> <p>CCB considers that the most appropriate mechanism for determining the best development site at Crowmarsh Gifford is a planned process allowing comparison across site options, public consultation and sustainability appraisal</p> <p>The site is visible from the rising land of the Chilterns escarpment to the south and south east of the site. This is explored in the 2014 Landscape Capacity Assessment for Sites on the Edges of the Larger Villages in South Oxfordshire, carried out by Kirkham Landscape Planning Ltd/ Terra Firma for SODC</p> <p><b>Application refused</b></p>	21/12/17
CABI Wallingford Site.	SODC	P16/S3800/O	Re-development of CABI (renewal of 2014 consent)	Pending (decision expected September 2017)	<p><b>CCB Objection</b></p> <p>This application harms the special qualities of the AONB. The application constitutes major development and does</p>	12/1/17

					<p>not satisfy the National Planning Policy Framework at its paragraph 115 and does not satisfy the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraph 116.</p> <p><b>Note for CCB Planning Committee.</b> The residential scheme at CABI as refused in June 2016 is now appealed and set for an Inquiry for 4<sup>th</sup> July 2017.</p>	
Land off Peppard Road Emmer Green	SODC	P16/S3630/0	Residential development of up to 245 residential dwellings (including up to 40% affordable housing), structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space and children's play areas, vehicular access from	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>This application site falls within a location which we have suggested to Natural England for consideration in an AONB boundary review.</p> <p>Permitting this planning application would have the effect of prejudicing this AONB boundary review application. Once permitted for housing, there is no prospect that the land would become part of the nationally protected landscape.</p> <p>The applicant's planning statement makes the point that the land is not the subject of any landscape quality designation (its 4.6.1). The LVIA reports that views from the AONB are limited (paragraph 3.17) and development will result in '<i>very limited impact on the wider landscape character including the sensitive landscape of the AONB, due to the proposed development</i>' (paragraph 5.33). We would contend that these paragraphs miss the point as to landscape character, as is confirmed in the South Oxfordshire Landscape Character Assessment.</p>	17/1/17

**APPENDIX 5****New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee**

Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Bellingdon Brickworks Chesham Road Bellingdon Chesham	CDC	CM/14/17	Extraction of approximately 5699 tonnes of Brick Earth with restoration to Grassland and Woodland	Decided – no objections	<p><b>CCB Support</b> CCB supports the principle of the sustainable use of local natural resources and retention of the local brick making industry within the Chilterns. These objectives are consistent with the AONB Management Plan policies at its D3 and D4 and the Minerals and Waste Local Plan at CS 21 as relates to small scale workings for local brickworks within the Chilterns.</p> <p>CCB promoted a suitably agreed landscape restoration condition and noted that no transport would be generated due to the proximity of the location to the existing brickworks.</p>	31.3.17
Highlands Farm Highlands Lane Rotherfield Greys RG9 4PR	SODC	P17/S0024/R M	Reserved matters 170 dwellings	Granted 24.5.17	<p><b>CCB Objection</b> The Board's overall impression of the plans is that they are not yet achieving the quality required in the AONB. The development should possess the character of a Chilterns village, with modest scale low density development. Attractive buildings should sit gently in a green framework of grassed areas and trees which link to the wider countryside of the AONB. Materials should match the palate of a rural farmstead and traditional village. Sadly the impression of this development is one of a mismatch of character areas, where cars and parking will detract, and where buildings are grossly out of scale with the rural village domestic. This same advice has been</p>	29.3.17 and 11.5.17 (revised plans)

					provided by the Board to the applicant at preapplication stage Revised plan: objections not addressed, CCB objections stands 11.5.17	
Land off Crowell Road, Chinnor.	SODC	P17/S1867/F UL	Full planning application for residential development comprising 58 dwellings, new vehicular and pedestrian access, internal roads and footpaths, car parking, public open space, landscaping, drainage and other associated infrastructure	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b> Recommends an updated landscape and visual impact assessment to consider the cumulative impacts of neighbouring 120 house scheme (P14/S1586/O) and the 2 and a half to three storey elements, to assess the impact upon the setting of the escarpment when viewed from the north of the current site.</p> <p>CCB Planning Committee to note - the focus on setting when viewed from the Vale to the escarpment.</p>	14.6.17
Tring Park School	DBC	4/00883/17/M FA	Updated master plan for Tring Park School including rationalisation of parking and detailed proposals for two new buildings.	Granted 28th June 2017	<p><b>CCB Comments</b> The removal of some structures, such as the swimming pool enclosure and parking to the south-west of the main complex of buildings serves to enhance the designed relationship to the late 18th Century parkland and its pastoral setting of the designated heritage assets of the II* Mansion and II* clock house.</p> <p>The merits of the application here combine design and siting improvements to improve the landscape setting and the sustaining of heritage value consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Historic England (2008) Conservation Principles (at pp 28-31).</p> <p>Application granted</p>	9.04.17

Land Lower Icknield Way Chinnor. Development to the rear of of 79a - 83	SODC	P17/S1587/O	Outline application to provide up to 60 dwellings, with associated open space, landscaping, vehicular access and footpath links	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b>  Recommends an updated landscape and visual impact assessment to consider the cumulative effects of the neighbouring 89 dwellings scheme granted on appeal (reference P15/S0154/O and appeal decision APP/Q3115/W/15/3097666, dated 23rd March 2016. The Inspector focused on the views from the escarpment and not the views to the escarpment and the impact on setting at this point.</p> <p>CCB would now ask that weight is given to the wider views towards the escarpment and that further details are sought in an updated LVIA, together with commentary.</p>	14.6.17
Forest Glade Kennels Chinnor Hill	SODC	P17/S1268/F UL	Proposed demolition of two dwellings, kennel blocks, kennel runs and office, and erection of six dwellings at	Withdrawn 6th June 2017	<p><b>CCB Objection</b>  This application is positively harmful to the conservation and enhancement of the special qualities of the Chilterns AONBs, which include the steep chalk escarpment, woodlands and tranquil areas of the AONB.</p> <p>Refusal is recommended due to the suburbanisation of the landscape.  Application withdrawn</p>	21.4.17
Land at School Lane & Rectory Hill Amersham	CDC	CH/2017/058 4/FA	Construction of a new single storey band hall, creation of new vehicular and pedestrian gated accesses from Rectory Hill with associated parking and landscaping	Pending	<p><b>CCB Objection</b>  CCB has sympathy with the applicant and their need for accommodation locally. Their agent in the supporting planning statement sets out the many alternative locations that have been considered. We have to give greater weight to the duty to conserve and enhance natural beauty. This site is clearly within the AONB and at a boundary with a strong division between rural and urban areas. This land is unimproved chalk grassland and the impacts of development result in a large loss of this part of the Rectory Hill / School Lane area. The</p>	16.5.17

					new access to Rectory Hill will create an urbanising feature and result in a significant loss of hedgerow planting, to the detriment of the landscape. .	
Steps Hill car park Beacon Road Ivinghoe  Dockney Wood car park  Beacon Road Ivinghoe  Ling Ryde Beacon Road Ivinghoe	AVDC	17/00990/AA D  17/00991/AA D  17/00992/AA D  17/00993/AA D	Applications for non-illuminated welcome and orientation signs CCB	Granted 11th May 2017	<b>CCB Support</b>  The proposed signs and their content promote high quality information and interpretation, consistent with the AONB Management Plan at its policy UE6 'Understanding and appreciation of the area's special qualities should be promoted'. The design treatment proposed here is appropriate. Applications granted	3.4.17
Lilas Wood, Hastoe near Tring	DBC	4/00224/17/FUL	Retention of existing structures and material change of use of land to allow for use as wedding venues for 15 weddings per year.	Pending	<b>CCB Comments</b> A selection of temporary structures may reasonably be considered for 3 year consent, to allow appropriate review. We would want to prevent any incremental change within the AONB landscape beyond the details shown in the application. We are aware that the applicant has permitted development rights to use the land for a period as specified in the General Permitted Development Order	29.3.17
St Clement Danes School Chenies Road Chorleywood WD3 6EW TRDC reference 3th April 2017	TRDC	17/0448/FUL	Construction of two storey block with lower ground level and external stair case	Granted 8th May 2017  Applicant agreed to review the use of white render	<b>CCB Comments</b> CCB would recommend that the Local Planning Authority consider the proposed use of materials, to be satisfied that a white render is acceptable in this location and with reference to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide. CCB is, however, content that the decision on materials can be appropriately dealt with by the LPA with regard to the merits of this particular application.	3.4.17

Millbrook Power Limited, near Millbrook, Beds.	PINS under NSIP approval (LPA being Central Beds)	n/a info@millbrookpower.co.uk	– Proposed gas fired power plant at Rookery South Pit near Millbrook Beds. Statutory consultation under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 – Phase 2 Statutory Consultation (29th May – 2nd July 2017)	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>The nearest part of the AONB to the immediate south and some 12/13km.</p> <p>CCB would seek further detail on: (1) The implications for this project on the skyline view and reassurances that the skyline would not be ‘broken’ by the proposed 35 metres stack tower structure associated with this proposal. The cumulative impact of this would also require commentary within the scope of the Infrastructure Planning (EIA) Regulations 2009; and (2) Any proposed materials or landscaping which will serve to mitigate any visual impact in the wider view, or reassurances that these matters can be taken into account when considering the impacts on the AONB.</p>	30.5.17
Land adjacent Eyres Lane and Eyres Close Ewelme	SODC	P17S/1539 LDC	Use of land for open storage (Class B8) of any or all of the following: a). Topsoil - not exceeding 4000 tonnes in quantity to be held at any time. b). Material with similar storage characteristics of bulk topsoil such as compost, bark, sand, gravel, aggregates, reclaimed aggregates, hardcore and similar combined quantity of any materials under sub heading a) and b) not to exceed 4000 tonnes in total quantity to be held at any time. c). Any other materials, items	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>These activities and operations are not lawful and (1) no evidence is advanced to justify their existing use and (2) of themselves they constitute either a material change of use or operational development under section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The portacabin /caravan may constitute a building operation (under section 336 of the TCPA 1990) and the other proposed uses constitute material changes of use because they involve a change in the character of the land. It is important when making any assessment of the character of land to examine the relevant uses and their consequences in terms of planning factors, such as noise and traffic generation. These also point to a change of use as the storage of other material and its bagging and collection creates a wholly new activity with commercial</p>	19.5.17

			or chattels capable of outdoor storage.		implications and associated vehicle movements.	
Hawkins Farm House Frieth Road Marlow Bucks	WDC	17/05523/FUL	Change of use of land to residential, retention of detached animal housing / enclosure and retention of 4 x satellite dishes (retrospective)	Pending	<b>CCB Objection</b>  These structures are associated with a domestic curtilage and inappropriate within the landscape. The visually apparent 'spillage' of structures and ephemera such as the satellite dishes beyond the farms established curtilage, the retention of these buildings and structures would be harmful to the scenic beauty of the AONB.	22.5.17
Upper Little London Farm Little London Wendover	AVDC	17/00148/AO P	Outline application for the demolition of the existing metal barns and outbuildings, conversion of four historic brick barns into one single dwelling, provision of three open fronted parking barns, replacement of existing farm house and erection of 10 new dwellings and details of alterations to existing access only	Pending	<b>CCB Objection</b>  (1) The planning history for the site reveals a number of refused certificates of lawful use for existing development and it appears that a number of uses are either unlawful or that the curtilage lawfulness is in dispute. Either way it is difficult to know what remains as lawfully agricultural or what is deemed lawful.  (2). The application land is located within a sensitive part of the AONB as recognised in the Buckinghamshire Landscape Character Assessment (2011) - Landscape Character Area (LCA 13.1 -Wendover Gap)  (3) CCB would expect a commentary on the use of design and materials proposed as far as they interpret the Design Guide, Supplementary Notes on materials (especially roofing) and on the Management Plan.  The application is wholly deficient in that there is no landscape and visual impact assessment of its visual impact on the highly sensitive	10.4.17

					landscape receptor of the AONB.	
Airport Way - Century Park, Luton	LBC	17/00405/EI	Request for scoping opinion	In general agreement as issued 19 May 2017	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>Attention is required to focus on the direct and indirect effects of the development. . These effects should cover secondary and cumulative impacts, which will require an assessment of how the development contributes to, and integrates with, the vision for the airport and its associated estate of some 245 hectares. CCB promotes a separate chapter in the environmental statement dealing with both indirect and cumulative impacts, to assist an understanding of how the application may, or may not, impact upon the AONB.</p> <p>In particular CCB would draw attention to the current Management Plan 2014-2019 'A Framework for Action' and the point dealing with 'tranquillity is conserved and where noise is a problem, peace and quiet is restored, in particular by reducing noise generated by road traffic, overflying aircraft and trains'.</p>	27.3.17
Arrewig Lane The Lee Bucks	CDC	CH/2009/0892/BCC	<p>Proposed extraction of loam and backfilling and restoration to original ground levels of phases 1, 2 and 3, void created to be planted with trees.</p> <p>Aftercare restoration proposed within the discharge of condition 33 of planning permission 2009/0892/BCC</p>	No objection - conditional	<p><b>CCB Support</b></p> <p>Support for the restoration and aftercare regime (5 years) involving the waste and minerals authority and Natural England. CCB made reference to AONB Management Plan policy D3 (sustainable use of local natural resources) and D4 (the retention of the local brick-making industry).</p>	31.3.17

22 Chapel Road And Land To Rear, Flackwell Heath,	WDC	APP/KO425/W/17/3167425	Planning Appeal to relinquish all the commercial uses on the site and redevelop the site for residential purposes (outline application).	Appeal Dismissed June 2017	<p><b>CCB Appeal Representation</b> (in objection)</p> <p>Many parts of the AONB landscape in this location are thus concealed and hidden, but that does not in any way devalue their importance. From the appeal site to the north and west, beyond Sheepridge Lane, this landscape character type predominates. Development as proposed would be harmful to the landscape character type.</p> <p>Note for CCB Planning Committee. This appeal was dismissed on 5th June 2017 on green belt grounds. The Inspector concluded 'On the other side of the balance, I have found that the proposed development would not undermine the character and appearance or scenic beauty of the AONB but rather, on balance represent an enhancement by comparison with what is presently found here and would build on brownfield land, both of which are matters of moderate weight in its favour'.</p>	5.04.17
Satwell House nr Rotherfield Greys	SODC	P17/S1260/LDP	Application for a lawful development certificate for proposed use or development for the installation of an external lighting scheme to the parkland and wooded areas.	Withdrawn	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>The nature of this proposal requires the supervision of an engineer and we conclude that this constitutes development under the Act and that planning permission will be required. Any subsequent planning application will have to be assessed against its impacts on the special qualities of the AONB. Application withdrawn</p>	21.4.17

Fairway Cottage and Coombe Cottage Nuffield RG9	SODC	P17/S0488/FU	Demolition of two dwellings and erection of two new dwellings  Amended plans submitted 22 June showing reinstatement of the Ridgeway national trail to original line.	Pending – amended plans 22/6/17	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>The application proposes a diversion of the Ridgeway National Trail, which is a popular long distance recreational route.</p> <p>This proposed change would diminish the user's appreciation of the current route and CCB would seek that the existing configuration is reinstated. CCB would seek reinstatement of the Ridgeway Path as the most appropriate way to comply with the AONB Management Plan.</p>	29.03.17
Heatherlands Naphill Common Naphill Bucks	WDC	7/05586/FUL	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 3 x 4 bed detached dwellings with double detached garages and creation of new access	Pending	<p><b>CCB Objection</b></p> <p>Lack of information dealing with ecological impact nor any landscape and visual impact assessment to assess the visual impact on the AONB beyond the urban edge. It is clearly preferable that no further vehicular access is created across Naphill Common.</p>	21.4.17
Land at 44 Kennylands Road, Sonning Common SODC reference CCB Comments (on amended plans)	SODC	P16/S3707/O	Outline planning application for residential development of 30 dwellings together with associated landscaping, and public open space (with layout and access for determination at this stage).	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>9th March 2017, CCB asked for more detailed landscape plans. Revisions as submitted in May 2017 denoted levels and tree/understorey planting. (Indicative landscape plans KR003A and landscape strategy notes 206-7, dated April 2017). CCB welcomed these details and recommended further discussions surrounding the future management plan for this proposal.</p>	19.5.17

The Mulberry Bush Dawes Lane Sarratt Rickmansworth	TRDC	17/0488/FUL	Erection of agricultural workers dwelling with associated curtilage	Refused 22.6.17  Green belt reasons for refusal	<p><b>CCB Comments</b> (8th April 2017 on revised application)</p> <p>CCB noted the revised location of the dwelling. The new location within area 1 (c) would not be visible in the wider landscape and within the Chess Valley or from nearby footpaths. Any approval here must also be combined with wider benefits to the landscape by application of a section 106 agreement to restrict agricultural permitted development and residential permitted development, an occupancy condition, the avoidance of an appearance redolent of a residential curtilage and the revocation of the temporary permission under 14/0034/FUL and removal of that structure.</p> <p>CCB supports a combination of planning restrictions to reduce the number of structures and offer control in the future, together with an appropriate design. This application presents an opportunity to give longer term controls to the LPA and to conserve the AONB (which includes the temporary consent that expires in 2017)</p> <p>Application refused</p>	8.5.17
Little Studdridge Farm Ibstone Road Stokenchurch Bucks WDC reference 26th May 2017	WDC	17/05663/OUT	Outline application (including details of access) for the erection of up to 140 dwellings (10 of which will be specialist accommodation for older people) communal hub for older persons' accommodation, up to 230sqm of retail space (use class A1), public open space and landscaping	Pending	<p><b>CCB Objection</b></p> <p>CCB objection in principal.</p> <p>Major development that would fail to protect and enhance this valued AONB landscape.</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to policy L1 of the consolidated Wycombe Local Plan and is contrary to paragraph 109, 115 and 116 of the NPPF.</p>	26.5.17

<p>Conway Farm Satwell Rotherfield Greys SODC reference CCB Comments. 27th May 2017</p>	<p>SODC</p>	<p>P17/S0917/F UL</p>	<p>Proposed redevelopment of site to provide new two storey country house with ancillary garaging, pool house and annex/store. Erection of replacement office accommodation to be used as home office with 4 or 5 employees at</p>	<p>Granted 13th June 2017</p>	<p><b>CCB Comments.</b>  CCB Comments on materials.  The Georgian features of the building exert a strong presence and when consideration is given to the grand houses in prominent landscapes within the AONB (reaching their peak around the 1820s) then a very good case can be made for brick. To source a brick redolent of the SW Chilterns type would add to that local distinctiveness. Brick of an appropriate type would be more typical of the grand houses in designed park lands that predominated in the early 19th century.  Materials reserved by condition, with officer report supporting CCB position.</p>	<p>21.4.17</p>
<p>197 - 207 Aylesbury Road Wendover</p>	<p>AVDC</p>	<p>17/01756/AP P</p>	<p>Erection of ten dwellings.</p>	<p>Pending</p>	<p><b>CCB Objection</b>  In the submitted papers we could find no explanation of AONB planning policy and no explanation as to how this application addresses those policies. There appears to be no landscape and visual impact assessment and we could find no design and access statement. The application lacks any detail or depth of understanding as to its wider impacts. The high tests that apply within an AONB require the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty.  This backland development is harmful to the relationship between the urban edge of Wendover and the AONB is permanently altered in a manner that unacceptably alters this landscape context.</p>	<p>6.06.17</p>

New relief road between the A355 / Maxwell Road and Wilton Park on land to the east of Beaconsfield. Within land East of Beaconsfield	BCC	CC/65/16	New relief road	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>CCB made comments with a view to future cumulative impacts and (a) 19 new LED columns at the northern roundabout is the absolute minimum and (b) Looking at cumulative impacts it is important that this new road does not further increase this audible and visual impact as a consequence of design and/or increased flows. This would serve to erode the character of the AONB (c) The peer review of the LVIA does not affect AONB matters in this case. The County may deem it equally useful to peer review lighting design in respect of current best practice in rural environments and again with respect of minimal interventions</p> <p>Note for CCB Planning Committee The deletion of the works at Gore Hill (within the AONB) and at the Ledborough Lane / Longbottom Lane junction (adjoining – near the AONB boundary) represent a significant change to the potential impacts arising from this project. CCB comments therefore now confined to cumulative impacts, including those arising from greater traffic volumes traversing the AONB/urbanising pressures as a result of these works.</p>	26.4.17
---	-----	----------	-----------------	---------	--	---------

Westcroft Stables Slad Lane Speen Bucks (The Horses Trust)	WDC	17/05266/FUL CCB	Erection of a barn structure incorporating indoor equine training facility, learning centre and tractor shed. Extension to an existing barn and creation of covered area adjacent. Demolition of existing buildings and erection of replacement structure to provide an archive/office/storage facility, erection of a structure for the storage of small maintenance equipment, demolition of existing and erection of replacement field shelter and associated hardstanding, creation of three sand paddocks , insertion of an external door into the south elevation of a Grade II	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>The application has been the subject of a detailed pre-application opinion and the detailed submission focuses the development form within the existing farm structures and curtilage. The rationale and design ethos is explained and is justified appropriately. Policy D7 of the AONB Management Plan supports the retention of agricultural buildings for rural enterprise, accepting that the applicant is a charity it follows that this application helps to foster the economic and social well-being of communities within the AONB.</p> <p>Again, the proposed design of the new barn, equipment store and overnight shelter acceptably proposes timber cladding and boarding with some profiled metal roof cladding. In the final discharge of these materials it will be important to ensure that the colours and textures ensure a harmonious relationship between the various buildings. CCB is very content that the LPA can determine these matters.</p> <p>We would recommend that the new parking area is screened and screened from the wider landscape and that a suitably soft material, such as a Breedon gravel or similar, is used. Again, this can be controlled by suitable conditions and discharge of details by the LPA.</p>	26.6.17
---	-----	---------------------	---	---------	---	---------

**APPENDIX 6****Current Live CCB Planning Application Casework**

Location	LPA	Ref number	Development	Deadline
CABI Appeal	Planning Inspectorate	APP/Q3115/W/16/3 165351	Hybrid application for the redevelopment of the CABI Wallingford site. Demolition of existing buildings and creation of a new headquarters for CABI. Erection of 91 dwellings comprising open market and affordable housing. Provision of open space, landscaping and parking and other associated works.	Further representations 27/2/17 and Inquiry sat 4 <sup>th</sup> – 12 <sup>th</sup> July.
Land South of Britwell Road Britwell Road Watlington	SODC	P17/S1737/FUL	For the erection of 28 residential dwellings (C3) plus associated car parking, landscaping and new access to be created off Britwell Road.	16.7.17
Land south and north-west of Cockernhoe and east of Wigmore (Stubbocks Walk), Brick Kiln Lane, Cockernhoe	NHDC	17/00830/1	Mixed use application for demolition of existing buildings and construction of up to 1,400 new dwellings (C3 use) together with retail, educational and community facilities (A1-A5, D1 and D2 uses).	2.08.17 (revised)
OS Parcels 6232 and 7428	WDC	17/06562/REM	Reserved matters for 43 dwellings, relates to outline permission 15/08455/OUT	11.07.17
Land NE of Benson	SODC	P17/S1964/O	240 dwellings	12.7.17
Mayland Hemel Hempstead Pedestrian Improvements	DBC	G-I1601.55	Common land sec 16 highway works	12.7.17
Land to rear of 126 and 106 Dunstable Road, Studham	CBDC	CB/17/02411/OUT	6 dwellings	5.7.17
The Mulberry Bush Dawes Lane Sarratt	TRDC	17/1361/FUL	Temporary consent (3 years) for mobile home for use as an agricultural dwelling	27.7.17
The Orchard, Bedford Road,	CBDC	CB/17/00501/OUT	Amended plans residential	20.7.17

Houghton Regis, Dunstable, LU5 6JJ				
---	--	--	--	--