

CNP

Reg 14 consultation feedback / response

	Comment	Response
1	General support for the CNP	Noted
2	In App F 'Red Kite' should be 'Red Kite Radio'	Modify CNP
3	The appearance of the overhead cables needs mitigating	Not a planning issue. Comment passed to PC
	Improvements needed in mobile and Wi-Fi coverage	Not a planning issue. Comment passed to PC
4	CDN-003 best site for new housng	Noted
	Bias to small/medium houses supported	Noted
	Some social/low cost houses should be included to replace those sold by the housing association	Include comment in the housing and affordable housing section
	Local views should include local and distant views towards the village and the church tower in particular	Modify CNP
	Local heritage assets should include all stone walls and not just wychert	Modify CNP
	Thatched roofs tend to look better with a low eaves line, steeper pitches and lower ridge levels	Noted
	The design guidelines should include the avoidance of obstructing views of the church tower	Modify CNP
5	On behalf of St Nichols Church	
	The churchyard should be removed as a local green space	To be discussed by PC
	The CNP does not address the need for a new burial ground	Modify CNP
6	List of organisations making a contribution to the village should include St Nicholas Church	Modify CNP
7	Support for small/medium scale development and the inclusion of smaller. Lower cost homes for sale or rent.	See 4 above Modify CNP
8	Objection to 15 homes at Dadbrook Farm	Noted but no alternative as the allocation is a VALP strategic policy and must be included in the CNP
	The settlement boundary should exclude the Dadbrook farm site	It does
	Preference for a car park on the allotment site south of Bridgeway for use by residents and the school.	Comment passed to PC
9	Distant view towards the village alos need to be considered when assessing any new development.	Modify CNP
	Development must not obscure views of the countryside	Modify CNP
	Speed limits approaching the village should be reduced to 30 or 40 mph	Not a planning issue. Comment passed to PC
	HGV traffic should use the A41 and not cut through Cuddington	Not a planning issue. Comment passed to PC

	Bridleways need to be improved as well as footpaths and cycle ways	To be discussed with the PC
10	Imperative to have a safe pedestrian route to Haddenham	To be discussed with the PC
11	Dadbrook farm should have 12 and not at least 15 homes.	See 8 above Noted but no alternative as the allocation of a min of 15 is a VALP strategic policy and must be included in the CNP
	Houses at Dadbrook Farm need to match the low density of the adjacent houses. Roof lines should be low to take account of existing views and the elevated nature of the site.	The VALP allocation requirements include the stipulation that the housing density 'takes account of the adjacent settlement character and identity'.
	The ground should be lowered at Dadbrook Farm to minimise the effect on views of the countryside form within the village.	The effect on adjacent properties can be influenced through consultation once a planning application has been made.
	The Dadbrook farm will generate traffic flows for 30 to 40 cars. The absence of a pedestrian route to Haddenham will increase car use .	The PC will look into the provision of a pedestrian / cycle route to Kings Cross (A418) as part of the work of the Traffic Action Group (TAG)
	Housing at Dadbrook farm would have a detrimental effect on the amenities of adjacent properties.	Noted
12	Agrees more housing needed but must be in keeping with the village	Noted
13	There was no consultation before the allotments were designated as Local Green Space Why wasn't the CDN003 allocated site designated as Local Green Space? What is there to prevent the Dadbrook Farm allocation growing much larger ? The development at Dadbrook Farm would not preserve views to the open countryside ref CDN07 What has happened about the parking proposals at Palm Piece? The NP must be for all parts of the village not just the north (Conservation Area)	The PC will consult the Allotment Society prior to producing the next version of the CNP. The CDN003 allocation is a strategic policy in VALP and cannot be altered by the CNP. The Dadbrook Farm allocation is limited in extent by VALP to north of the site. The development can only get larger with the approval of Bucks Council , after consultation with the PC. Private views are not protected by planning. Public views towards the Chilterns from the playing fields (public open space) would not be significantly affected. No housing development is proposed at Palm Piece to support the provision of public car park. The PC will review the need for additional parking and potential locations a spart of a wider transport study. Agreed
14	CDN06 – security lighting is needed as there are no streetlights. Residents have a right to install lighting on their property if they wish to. It is not really a planning matter Appendix F _ The playground needs new investment through s106 or PC funds to improve the facilities.	Agreed , provided that the lighting is not intrusive or affects neighbour's amenity. Agreed. The PC is actively pursuing a policy of replacement and improvement. See December PC minutes.
15	CDN01 . Any new housing should only be smaller homes as there are sufficient larger ones CDN04 : Open views are very important, and the policy should be strong	Noted- see comments above Noted – see comments above

	Infrastructure – ped/cycle route to Kings Cross is supported. Additional parking facilities would help to reduce parking on pavements. A green initiative is supported	Noted – see comments above Noted
16	Traffic calming is supported but why isn't there a policy in the CNP for transport? Could we ask Arriva to split the 280 service between Dinton Castle and Cuddington?	Traffic is not a planning issue and is being addressed separately by the PC. The PC has already put this proposal to Arriva but never received a response. The PC will discuss if this need to be followed up.
17	The school should be referred to as either Cuddington and Dinton C of E school or a primary school (infant site). Is the ref to the EU in 1.6 still relevant?	Modify CNP Not sure – to be investigated
18	Development in the northern part of the village should be opposed if it generates traffic, Off-road parking should be provided within any new developments . Any new housing should include small one or two bed homes.	Noted.
19	CDN05: Definition of design requirements needs more clarity and acceptance that there is a degree of subjectivity by planning officers CDN06: Materials need to include modern alternatives so that the architecture of the village is not stuck in the past. Lack of street lighting conflicts with the need for a safe environment.	Modify CNP design policies for clarity Modern material can be appropriate provided that the design and quality of material is acceptable. Lack of street lighting is seen by many as a benefit (dark skies etc). There has been no evidence that the lack of street lighting has led to increases in crime.
20	CDN03 – need to protect the playing fields for future users CDN06 – new building in the Conservation Area should be a traditional design and not out of keeping modern designs as recently built	Agreed . The Local Green Space policy will do this. Traditional design is preferred but modern design can be acceptable if undertaken to a high standard.
21	CDN01 -Why was Dadbrook selected and the settlement boundary altered to accommodate it but other sites were not considered? CDN03 – why were the privately-owned allotments designated as Local Green Space when other land around the village were not? Why was the allotment society not consulted about this?	See 13 above. The Dadbrook Farm allocation was made by AVDC as a strategic policy in VALP. The CNP is obliged to include the allocation. Other sites were not considered as the Dadbrook allocation fulfills the outstanding housing requirement for Cuddington. No other sites are needed. The allotments meet the planning criteria for a Local Green Space and are already registered a Community Asset. The Allotment society will be consulted before the next version of the CNP is produced.
22	Concerns about parking and future infrastructure projects Would not want to see Palm Piece come forward as a central car parking area for the village even if was not part of a housing package.	Parking is to be addressed as part of a wider transport strategy for Cuddington.

	Developers should include adequate parking within developments and teachers / parents should be encouraged to park at the playing fields. Other options / sites should be considered before Palm Piece is looked at as a potential village car park. Any new development should include the cost of mitigation measures. The Dadbrook housing proposals should include (a double) chicane / build out to slow traffic.	Any new development will need to demonstrate how parking for residents and visitors has been accommodated within the development to avoid further on-street parking. The school considers that it would not be reasonable to ask the staff to park at the playing fields as they have to carry heavy school material and there is no street lighting. If a car park is required a range of sites will be assessed on their merits. New developmnet is required to mitigate the direct impacts of construction and occupation. It is not required to mitigate existing problems .
23	CDN 01 :Whys isn't Palm Piece being considered for housing as it offers a village car park? Why not consider the allotments for housing as a road access already exists ? CDN03 :Why is the allotments a Local Green Space when it is privately owned and has only a single public footpath. CDN04 :Why aren't views over the Dadbrook Farm site from adjacent houses as important as others?	See 13 above
24	Pedestrian access to the A418 is critically important for those without cars – to gain access to shops, education , healthcare etc. A wider range of local shops is needed. The access to the existing shop is via three steps and is not accessible to people with poor mobility. The crossing at the Crown is unsafe and needs improving. If its not possible to provide a pedestrian access along Dadbrook to the A418 could an alternative route be found eg through the proposed housing development . A new path here would have wonderful views. Dadbrook floods and has lots of traffic including farm vehicles. Additional comments – The view into the village form the Dadbrook approach needs to be preserved. If Dadbrook Farm site goes ahead maybe the residents could be asked not to drive into the village?	Noted= see above Noted, The PC will follow this up The highway authority (Transport for Bucks) have been consulted and are unable to come up with any proposals to improve the crossing. An alternative route could be considered but would need the approval of the landowner . Noted If Dadbrook Farm housing goes ahead many of the car journeys will be south , away form the village. There is no mechanism to control car journeys on public highways into the village centre
25	General support for the CNP Traffic calming measure are needed on Dadbrook and Bridgeway to complement those on Aylesbury Road because of increase in HGVs	Noted Noted . The initial traffic calming feasibility study by Ringway Jacobs concluded that build outs on Dadbrook and Bridgeway would be problematic and were not recommended.

	Landowners	
	Support for at least 15 homes at Dadbrook Farm	Noted
	Statutory consultees	
	<i>Natural England – general advice about the need for net ecological gain . No specific comments</i>	Noted
	<i>Environment agency- refers to protected watercourses and EA guidance</i>	Noted
	<i>Historic England are supportive but have the following suggestions :-</i> <i>Local survey of Listed Buildings</i> <i>Important Local Views – more detailed assessment needed of individual views. Need to identify views looking back towards the village</i> <i>Local Heritage assets – include list of assets in the policy text . Possibly expand the list and include more detail about why features are important. Bring the policy wording in line with NPPF.</i> <i>CDN06 and CDN07 – could include policies on traffic impacts and also the construction phase of development.</i>	To be considered in a separate detailed response
	<i>Buckinghamshire Council</i> <i>Detailed response submitted . Further clarification sought and received on housing issues.</i> <i>Recommendation to amend the Settlement Boundary policy CDN02 to be similar to Policy WAD1 for Waddesdon (see below) .</i> <i>Other comments affect the detail of CNP and will take time to assess and incorporate.</i> <i>Please note that new Modifications to VALP have been circulated for consultation.</i>	To be considered in a separate detailed response

	POLICY WAD1: WADDESDON SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY The Neighbourhood Plan designates a Waddesdon Settlement Boundary, as shown on the Policies Map, within which proposals for development will be supported. However, development within the Settlement Boundary will not be supported where the proposed development would not be in keeping with the historic character and development pattern of the village. Development proposals on land outside the defined Settlement Boundary will not be supported unless it is a rural exception housing site, necessary for the purposes of agriculture or forestry, or for enterprise, diversification, recreation or tourism that benefits the rural economy without harming countryside interests. Such proposals will be assessed in terms of their potential impact upon the visual setting and landscape features of the site and its surroundings, the potential impact upon the biodiversity of the area, the potential impacts of traffic, noise and illumination, and other relevant planning considerations including the policies in this Plan. Proposals which fail to demonstrate that these impacts can be satisfactorily addressed and mitigated will not be supported. New isolated homes in the countryside will not be supported unless there are special circumstances such as the need for a rural worker's dwelling.	
--	---	--