

Cuddington Neighbourhood Development Plan

Response to Examiner's Clarification Note by Cuddington Parish Council

Policy CDN01

"This policy has been well-considered. It forms an effective spatial strategy for the neighbourhood area.

The final sentence of the policy (on development outside the settlement boundary) is more restrictive than the approach taken in paragraph 80 of the NPPF and in Policy S2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan. Did the Parish Council have particular evidence in mind in developing its policy approach"?

Response

We are content to remove the final sentence in policy CDN01 sentence and rely on NPPF and VALP policies. There have been recent applications for isolated homes in the countryside in the parish that have been adequately dealt with through this mechanism.

Policy CDN02

"I looked carefully at the proposed Important Local Views during the visit. Their importance was self-evident.

As submitted the policy reads in a negative way. I am minded to recommend so that it takes on a more positive approach (which would require development proposals to be designed and arranged so that they respect the identified views).

Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition"?

Response

We acknowledge the benefit of using a more positive approach to the wording of the policy but are wary of this being exploited to promote inappropriate development. Views into and out of the village are a critical part of its local distinctiveness and are highly valued. We often see architects justifying development using terms such as 'agricultural-style of building', 'local building materials', 'low ridge height' and 'screen planting'. This approach could potentially be used to convince the planning authority that developments 'respects' the view when, in reality, it merely partially mitigates the intrusion of development into the open countryside. We would like to see a more stringent test that supports policy CDN01 and protects the unique character and setting of the village.

Policy CDN03

"How does part of the policy relate to the distinction made between designated and non-designated heritage assets in Section 16 of the NPPF and the harm caused by development proposals?

Should the scope of the policy be broadened so that it balances any harm with the significance of the asset (as set out in paragraphs 202 and 203 of the NPPF and Policy BE1 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan)"?

Response

We are content for the policy to be reworded to bring it into line with the NPPF and VALP policy BE1

Policy CDN 04

“The policy takes a distinctive and very positive approach to Cuddington’s historic environment. The implementation of the policy will assist significantly in promoting new development that is distinctive to the character of the conservation area. The policy is impressively underpinned by Appendix D and the wider findings of the Conservation Area Character Appraisal.

For clarity within the Plan period, I will recommend a modification to the wording of criterion 7 so that it relates to the character of the conservation area and not to that of the wider village.

Accepted

“Criterion 18 reads as supporting text rather than as a policy. As such, I am minded to recommend that it is repositioned into the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition”?

Response

We are concerned that unless this statement is in the policy it will not be taken seriously and may not be provided as part of the application documentation. There is a current application in the Conservation Area where Bucks have asked for a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) to be provided as a condition (at the request of the PC). Although construction impacts are temporary the effects can last several years and cause acute disruption on the narrow streets, and the loss of amenity to residents. On-street parking is already an issue for the village and the additional load of construction traffic using excessively large vehicles, and a one man/one van approach, puts a real strain on how the village operates. In addition to effects on neighbours, construction activities affect the school run, access for emergency vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists and the increasing number of horses and riders that use the lanes within the village.

The wording of the Bucks condition for a CDTM is set out below for information :-

Prior to the commencement of any works on the site, a construction traffic management plan (CTMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The CTMP shall provide for the following:-

- The routing of construction vehicles.
- Construction access details, temporary or otherwise.
- The parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors.
- Loading and unloading of plant and materials storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development.
- Operating hours.
- The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate.
- Wheel washing facilities.
- Before and after construction condition surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused.

The approved CTMP shall be adhered to throughout the construction period.

Policy CDN 05

“The policy is an excellent local response to the National Design Guide and to the most recent version of the NPPF (2021) and results in bespoke design guidance for the built part of the neighbourhood area. The policy is very well-considered in the way in which it addresses the distinctive parts of the neighbourhood area. In addition, it is directly informed and underpinned by the findings of Appendix D: Built Environment.

Criterion 17 reads as supporting text rather than as a policy. As such, I am minded to recommend that it is repositioned into the supporting text. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition”?

Response

There is less justification for this to be included in the policy for the area outside the Conservation Area as the streets are wider and easier to manage. In this case it could be included in the supporting text although this might appear inconsistent with CDN04 ?