



Intelligent Plans
and examinations

Report on Edlesborough Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2013 - 2033

An Examination undertaken for Aylesbury Vale District Council with the support of the Edlesborough Parish Council on the April 2017 submission version of the Plan.

Independent Examiner: Patrick T Whitehead DipTP(Nott), MRTPI

Date of Report: 28 July 2017

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

Contents

	Page
Main Findings - Executive Summary	3
1. Introduction and Background	3
• Edlesborough Neighbourhood Plan 2013 – 2033	3
• The Independent Examiner	4
• The Scope of the Examination	4
• The Basic Conditions	5
2. Approach to the Examination	6
• Planning Policy Context	6
• Submitted Documents	6
• Site Visit	7
• Written Representations or Public Hearing	7
• Modifications	7
3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights	7
• Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Area	7
• Plan Period	7
• Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation	7
• Development and Use of Land	8
• Excluded Development	8
• Human Rights	9
4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions	9
• EU Obligations	9
• Main Matters	11
• General Issues of Compliance of the Plan Policies	11
• Regard to National Policies and Advice	11
• Contribution to the Achievement of Sustainable Development	12
• General Conformity with Strategic Policies in the Development Plan	12
• Specific Issues of Compliance of the Plan Policies	13
• Issue 1 – Settlement Boundaries	13
• Issue 2 – Housing Policies	14
• Issue 3 – Policies to Guide Commercial and Economic Development and the Expansion of Services	20
• Issue 4: Policies for the Retention, Protection and Enhancement of Green Spaces, Facilities and Buildings of Local Interest	21
5. Conclusions	23
• Summary	23
• The Referendum and its Area	23
Appendix: Modifications	25

Main Findings - Executive Summary

From my examination of the Edlesborough Parish Neighbourhood Plan and its supporting documentation including the representations made, I have concluded that subject to the modifications set out in this report, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- The Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – the Edlesborough Parish Council;
- The Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – the Parish Council area shown in Plan A of the Neighbourhood Plan;
- The Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect – 2013 - 2033; and
- The policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to Referendum on the basis that it has met all the relevant legal requirements.

I have considered whether the referendum area should extend beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates and have concluded that it should not.

1. Introduction and Background

Edlesborough Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2013 - 2033

- 1.1 Edlesborough is a rural parish situated at the foot of the Chiltern Hills approximately 14 miles north east of Aylesbury, 6 miles south east of Leighton Buzzard and 4 miles south west of Dunstable. It adjoins Bedfordshire to the north and east and Hertfordshire to the south. The Parish comprises three settlements: Northall (population 440), Dagnall (population 510) and Edlesborough, the largest with a population of 1,654. Northall and Dagnall are located on the A4146, the only main road passing through the Parish, whilst Edlesborough is to the north-eastern side of the road, although the Parish Church of St Mary the Virgin is located to the south west of the road. Part of the Parish lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Whipsnade Zoo borders the eastern edge of Dagnall.
- 1.2 The Parish Council (PC) carried out a Neighbourhood Plan Survey in 2011 following the introduction of neighbourhood planning. However, it was decided not to proceed with a neighbourhood plan at that time since very limited growth, favoured by the parishioners, was not considered appropriate by Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC). The Parish Council

revised its view during 2015, accepting the requirement for more housing in exchange for a stronger voice in the development of the village. AVDC approved the entire Parish as being in the designated neighbourhood area in November 2015.

The Independent Examiner

- 1.3 As the Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the Edlesborough Parish Neighbourhood Plan (the NP) by AVDC, with the agreement of the Edlesborough Parish Council.
- 1.4 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector, with more than 20 years experience inspecting and examining development plans. I am an independent examiner, and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

The Scope of the Examination

- 1.5 As the independent examiner I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
- (a) that the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
 - (b) that modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or
 - (c) that the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 1.6 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) ('the 1990 Act'). The examiner must consider:
- Whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions;
 - Whether the Plan complies with provisions under s.38A and s.38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ('the 2004 Act'). These are:
 - it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body, for an area that has been properly designated by the Local Planning Authority;
 - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
 - it specifies the period during which it has effect;

- it does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development';
- it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area;
- whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the Plan proceed to referendum; and
- Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 ('the 2012 Regulations').

1.7 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

The Basic Conditions

1.8 The 'Basic Conditions' are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the neighbourhood plan must:

- Have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- Be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
- Be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations; and
- Meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.

1.9 Regulation 32 of the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the neighbourhood plan should not be likely to have a significant effect on a European Site (as defined in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2012) or a European Offshore Marine Site (as defined in the Offshore Marine Conservation (Natural Habitats etc.) Regulations 2007), either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

2. Approach to the Examination

Planning Policy Context

- 2.1 The Development Plan for this part of AVDC, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, is the adopted Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan (AVDLP) 2004. The saved policies from this Local Plan provide the relevant strategic policy background for assessing general conformity, although it is now considerably dated as the plan period was to 2011. The AVDLP will be replaced by the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) a draft of which was published for consultation in July 2016. The latest timetable for submission of the VALP for examination is January 2018. Depending on the progress of the examination, adoption could potentially take place later in 2018. The VALP will set the spatial and growth strategy for the District for the plan period 2013 – 2033.
- 2.2 The planning policy for England is set out principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented. PPG makes clear that whilst a draft neighbourhood plan is not tested against the policies in an emerging Local Plan, the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process is likely to be relevant to the consideration of the Basic Conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested. It cites, as an example, that up-to-date housing needs evidence is relevant to the question of whether a housing supply policy in a neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development¹. Paragraph 184 of the NPPF also provides, “*The ambition of the neighbourhood should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area*”. On this basis, I make reference to the emerging Local Plan in this report.

Submitted Documents

- 2.3 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents I consider relevant to the examination, including those submitted which comprise:
- the draft Edlesborough Parish Neighbourhood Plan 2013 -2033, April 2017;
 - Plan A of the Plan which identifies the area to which the proposed neighbourhood development plan relates;
 - the Consultation Statement, April 2017;
 - the Basic Conditions Statement, March 2017;
 - all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation;
 - the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) prepared by Edlesborough Parish Council;
 - the Site Assessments Report 2017; and

¹ PPG Reference ID: 41-009-20160211.

- the Local Green Space Report 2017.

Site Visit

- 2.4 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the neighbourhood area on 19 June 2017 to familiarise myself with it, and visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the Plan and evidential documents.

Written Representations or Public Hearing

- 2.5 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. There were no requests to be heard and I considered hearing sessions to be unnecessary as the consultation responses clearly articulated the objections to the Plan, and presented arguments for and against the Plan's suitability to proceed to a referendum.

Modifications

- 2.6 Where necessary, I have recommended modifications to the Plan (**PMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For ease of reference, I have listed these modifications separately in the Appendix.

3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights

Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Area

- 3.1 The Edlesborough Parish Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by Edlesborough Parish Council which is a qualifying body. The neighbourhood area covering the whole of the Parish of Edlesborough was designated by AVDC on 2 November 2015.
- 3.2 It is the only neighbourhood plan for Edlesborough, and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area.

Plan Period

- 3.3 The Plan specifies clearly the period to which it is to take effect, which is from 2013 to 2033.

Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation

- 3.4 Following the earlier decision not to proceed with a neighbourhood plan, the view of the PC changed during 2015 as the process became clearer. There was also recognition of the need to accept more housing in exchange for the village having a strong voice in its development. The decision to make

a formal approach was taken in July 2015 and the Consultation Statement indicates that an application was made to ADVC on 1st September 2015 for the PC, as the qualifying body, to prepare a plan for the entire parish to be designated as the neighbourhood area.

- 3.5 For the initial stages a Core Group was formed with all discussions and decisions taking place at monthly PC meetings. The Core Group also met with consultants, rCOH, for assistance with scoping and timetabling, following which the consultants held a workshop with Parish Councillors during January 2016. Publicity was undertaken through an article in the local FOCUS magazine (reproduced as Appendix 4.2 in the Consultation Statement) which also carried reports of monthly PC meetings and separate articles on the NP.
- 3.6 Two major events were organised prior to publication of the Pre-Submission Plan. The first major event was to establish local residents' views and recruit volunteers to the Steering Group and individual task groups. Information was shared – for example, ADVC's Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) - and 160 questionnaires were completed, asking for views, comments and concerns. The second major event was held in July 2016 to consult on such matters as the Vision and Objectives, Policies, Sites and Options. Three separate public meetings were held and a total of 220 questionnaires were returned. Throughout the process the Core Group engaged with AVDC Forward Planning representatives.
- 3.7 The Regulation 14 Pre-Submission Consultation took place between 7 December 2016 and 27 January 2017 with feedback leading to revisions to the Plan. A third major event took place during this period with a leaflet summarising the key elements of the Plan delivered to every household, and five public meetings were held during January. Amendments were made to the Plan as a consequence of the consultation, mostly of a minor nature although one or two were significant. The Plan was submitted to AVDC in April 2017 and the Regulation 16 Consultation lasted for a 6 week period, closing in May, producing 130 responses, the majority in support of the Plan but 19 were objections to policies within the Plan. I take account of the responses in my assessment of the Plan. I confirm that the consultation process has met the legal requirements for procedural compliance on neighbourhood plans and has had regard to the advice on plan preparation in the PPG.

Development and Use of Land

- 3.8 The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with s.38A of the 2004 Act.

Excluded Development

- 3.9 The Plan does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development'.

Human Rights

- 3.10 Section 6.2 of the Basic Conditions Statement states that the Neighbourhood Plan has had regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention of Human Rights and complies with the Human Rights Act 1998. Those commenting on the Plan have not alleged that the Plan breaches Human Rights and from my independent assessment I see no reason to disagree.

4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions

EU Obligations

- 4.1 The neighbourhood plan was screened for SEA by AVDC which concluded that as the policies had some potential for significant environmental effects that it was necessary to undertake SEA.
- 4.2 The screening opinion does not detail the potential effects of the NP policies but indicates they may be *"..beyond those expected by 'strategic' district-wide policies of the Local Plan, although the magnitude and location of these effects is difficult to ascertain at this stage of the plan making process"*². The PC chose to meet the requirement for SEA by preparing a SA incorporating the SEA ('the SA/SEA') obligation under the Environmental Assessment of Plans & Programmes Regulations 2004. The report is based on a Scoping Report agreed with AVDC and statutory bodies and they have made no adverse comments in respect of the SA/SEA.
- 4.3 However, there has been criticism of the SA/SEA which, it is argued, is analogous to the situation at nearby Haddenham, the NP for which was subject to a High Court order³, 7 March 2016, quashing the Housing and Development chapter. The focus of the challenge related to the consequences of specific errors in scoring individual sites but, as AVDC chose not to contest the claim, firm conclusions cannot be drawn on its outcome. Reference has also been made to the High Court judgement in relation to the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan⁴. In this context, reading Mrs Justice Patterson's judgement, I note paragraph 100 points to the undertaking of environmental assessment and consideration of

² Final Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment Report, Appendix A, para 5.1.

³ R. (Lightwood Strategic Limited) v. Aylesbury Vale District Council and Haddenham Parish Council.

⁴ R. (Stonegate Homes Limited and another) v. Horsham District Council and Henfield Parish Council [2016] EWHC 2512 (Admin).

alternatives, when settlement boundaries are drawn up. The SA/SEA has assessed alternatives to the extent of either having or not having a settlement boundary policy option, or by considering alternative allocations, including those promoted by land owners or prospective developers. The environmental impacts of the proposed allocations have been tested through the SA/SEA, and in doing so inherently considered their potential impact in terms of a concomitant settlement boundary, so it does not seem to me to be entirely irrational or unreasonable to conclude that this is to a largely similar end. This coupled with the measure of proportionality advocated in the PPG, stating that SEA “*does not need to be done in any more detail, or using more resources, than is considered to be appropriate for the content and level of detail in the neighbourhood plan*” points to consideration of reasonable alternatives within the specific context of this Plan.

- 4.4 So far as the adequacy of the SA/SEA is concerned there is no requirement for a NP to have a sustainability appraisal as set out in Section 19 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, although the qualifying body must demonstrate how its plan will contribute to achieving sustainable development. The methodology of the SA/SEA process is outlined in the Final Report (April 2017) Section 2. I am satisfied that the methodology has assessed the Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Objectives and the Plan Policies against SEA objectives in an appropriate manner, proportionate to the scope of the Plan and the scale and nature of its policies.
- 4.5 The criticisms have suggested that reliance on a ‘tick-box’ exercise is contrary to best practice and that the SA/SEA fails to give adequate reasons for selecting the preferred option. However, the allocated sites and alternatives derived from the AVDC’s Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) Report V3, produced to inform the draft VALP (May 2016), were also given detailed consideration in the Site Assessments Report. As a consequence, I consider the alternatives have been given proper consideration using an appropriate level of information and reasoning.
- 4.6 Overall, I am content that the SA/SEA is robust and comprehensive, giving a proportionate level of assessment of the environmental effects of the policies and proposals in the Submission Plan.
- 4.7 The Edlesborough Parish Neighbourhood Plan was further screened for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), which also was not triggered. The NPA is not in close proximity to a European designated nature site. Natural England had no objections to the Plan and from my independent assessment of this matter I have no reason to conclude that HRA should have been undertaken.

Main Matters

- 4.8 I have approached the assessment of compliance with the Basic Conditions of the Edlesborough Parish Neighbourhood Plan as two main matters:
- General issues of compliance of the Plan, as a whole; and
 - Specific issues of compliance of the Plan policies.

General Issues of Compliance of the Plan

Regard to National Policies and Advice

- 4.9 In broad terms, the Plan provides land-use policies focussing on a relatively small number of key development issues in the area. These include the identification of Settlement Boundaries for Edlesborough and Northall (EP1 and 8); the designation of sites for residential development (EP2, 3 4 and 9) and guidance for housing mix and design (EP13); guidance for commercial and retail development (EP5), economic development (EP6) and the expansion of local services (EP7); and policies designed to retain, protect, and potentially enhance local green spaces (EP10), community facilities (EP11) and buildings of local interest (EP12).
- 4.10 The Plan sets out the planning policy context within which it has been developed, identifying the relevant parts of the NPPF to which it has had particular regard (paragraph 3.3). Provision is made for an adequate supply of housing and support is provided for a prosperous local economy. The Plan also seeks to support local facilities and services, making provision for expansion and improvement to meet future needs. It focuses on a relatively small number of policies in order to avoid repeating national and local planning policies.
- 4.11 The NP does not contain specific policies relating to the village of Dagnall. This is in line with the NP's declaration to avoid repeating national and local planning policies. The reasoning here is that the village and surrounding area is contained within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and so is subject to the strict policy limitations regarding development. These include saved Policy RA6 in AVDLP and Policies S4 (Green Belt) and NE4 (Chilterns AONB) in the submission VALP, together with national policy and advice in the NPPF, Sections 9 (Green Belt) and 11(AONBs).
- 4.12 The NP also includes proposals for improvements to infrastructure to be prioritised for investment using finance from Section 106 agreements and

from future Community Infrastructure Levy. In accordance with PPG advice⁵ these proposals are identified separately as non-land use matters.

- 4.13 In all of these matters, subject to the detailed comments and modifications I recommend in relation to individual policies and proposals, I am satisfied that the Plan has had regard to national policies and advice to meet the Basic Conditions.

Contribution to the Achievement of Sustainable Development

- 4.14 There is an underlying conflict between the expressed wishes of residents, exemplified in survey results tabulated on p19 of the Plan, showing little or no appetite for more development in the Parish, and national planning policy in the NPPF which indicates a presumption in favour of sustainable development and a requirement for local planning authorities to “*boost significantly the supply of housing*” (paragraph 47). However, the PC has shown determination to make allocations to fully meet the residual housing requirement in line with the emerging VALP and, in addition, make a reserve allocation to meet the eventuality of an increased housing need.
- 4.15 The Plan has sought to identify the most sustainable locations for new housing which will support community facilities and services. It also seeks to support and aid the growth of employment opportunities through the expansion of local enterprises. Subject to the detailed comments I make below about individual policies I am satisfied that the Plan makes a contribution to the achievement of the economic, social and environmental aspects of sustainable development.

General Conformity with Strategic Policies in the Development Plan

- 4.16 As I have already stated (paragraph 2.1) the saved policies from the AVDLP provide the relevant strategic policy background for assessing general conformity, although it is now considerably dated as the plan period was to 2011. The NP clearly states the particular policies considered to be most relevant (paragraph 3.5).
- 4.17 The adopted Plan will, in due course, be replaced by the VALP, currently in draft form with its submission for examination anticipated, as previously noted in early 2018. There is no statutory requirement for the NP to be in general conformity with the emerging Plan but the NP identifies the most relevant strategic policies in the draft VALP at paragraph 3.7. There has also been close continued collaboration with AVDC as advocated by PPG advice⁶ with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) working closely with the

⁵ PPG Reference ID: 41-004-20140306.

⁶ PPG Reference ID: 41-009-20160211.

qualifying body in sharing evidence, particularly in respect of the changing housing supply requirement in the emerging Local Plan.

- 4.18 A key consideration for conformity with the local development plan is the degree to which the NP provides allocations to meet the housing requirement for the village. The VALP will set the spatial growth strategy for the Plan period 2013 – 2033 and in this context the housing requirement for the NP was based on the Buckinghamshire Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA). More recently, the HEDNA has been updated to reflect the latest Government population and household projections, and there has also been continued dialogue with other authorities, resulting in the overall housing requirement for AVDC being revised downwards. However, work is continuing and the requirement has not been finalised.
- 4.19 In the circumstances, and in line with the PPG advice referred to above, the PC has included a reserve allocation for a further 40 dwellings adjacent to the Slicketts Lane allocation. This could be brought forward in the event that the housing requirement for the Parish is subsequently revised upwards, or development fails to materialise on other allocations. The reserved allocation should minimise potential conflict with the emerging Local Plan.
- 4.20 For all of these reasons I am satisfied that the ENP has taken account of the policies in the adopted development plan and the emerging Local Plan, and is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area.

Specific Issues of Compliance of the Plan Policies

Issue 1: The Settlement Boundaries

- 4.21 The Plan establishes and defines settlement boundaries for Edlesborough (EP1) and Northall (EP8). In doing so it makes explicit reference to these policies replacing saved AVDLP policies RA3, RA13 and RA14. To be clear, AVDLP does not define settlement boundaries as such, and those policies provide for the control of specific developments within or on the edge of built-up areas – defined as “*land within the settlement framework principally occupied by permanent buildings*”. It is argued by representors that the AVDLP policies encompass the national policy of rural restraint which “*has long since been abandoned*”. This is not a convincing argument since paragraph 55 of the NPPF quite clearly indicates that in rural areas housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural settlements and that new isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided.

- 4.22 An additional argument - that the NP cannot satisfy the Basic Conditions (i) to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan and (ii) have regard to national policies and advice assumes there is an inherent conflict that has no route to resolution. However, the PPG⁷ seeks to mitigate this by advising that the qualifying body and the local planning authority should agree a relationship between policies in the emerging NP, the emerging Local Plan, the adopted development plan, and have regard to national policy and guidance.
- 4.23 Nevertheless, the policies are restrictive, both in extent and in the constraints imposed on development and amendments will be necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions. The first of these concerns the inclusion of the term "*infill housing development*". The term "infill" is commonly used to describe the infilling of small gaps in developed frontages with one or two dwellings. Indeed, this is the definition used in AVDLP Policy RA13. The term is too restrictive in the context of defined settlement boundaries and having regard to the approach to sustainable development embraced by the NPPF. Accordingly, the word "*infill*" should be deleted in both policies as shown in proposed modification **PM1**.
- 4.24 A second concern is that developments within the settlement boundary are limited to up to 5 houses and a site area not exceeding 0.20 hectares. These limitations are not properly justified in the supporting text and do not accord with NPPF policy and advice to promote sustainable development in rural areas (paragraph 55) and optimise the potential of a site to accommodate development (paragraph 58). Revised wording to meet the Basic Conditions is included in proposed modification **PM1**.
- 4.25 The remaining concern with the policies relates to the final paragraph. There is a lack of clarity concerning what exactly will be supported under these policies in terms of development outside settlement boundaries. Paragraph 6.9 provides clarification which should be included within the policy statement to assist users of the Plan. Proposed modification **PM1** includes an amended paragraph to have proper regard to national policy and advice and to meet Basic Conditions.

Issue 2: Housing Policies

- 4.26 Advice in PPG⁸ indicates that up-to-date housing needs evidence is relevant to the question of whether a housing supply policy in a neighbourhood plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. Whilst adopted AVDLP provides information on the housing requirement only to 2011, evidence contained in the emerging VALP provides a more up to date indication of housing targets. The total figure

⁷ PPG Reference ID: 41-009-20160211.

⁸ PPG Reference ID: 41-009-20160211.

for housing need contained in the draft plan is 33,300, based on the January 2016 Housing and HEDNA. Edlesborough is classified as a 'large village' for which the housing requirement is calculated to be 164 over the plan period 2013 – 2033 – a growth of 22% in the baseline housing stock. As at March 2017, there were 107 dwellings committed or completed in the village leaving a residual requirement of at least 57 dwellings.

- 4.27 Since the publication of the draft VALP, the HEDNA has been updated to take into account the latest Government population and household projections with a new version published in October 2016. This has revised the total housing requirement downwards to in the region of 26,850, with implications for the spatial strategy and distribution of housing across the district. An update on the situation has been published on the AVDC website (21 June 2017) indicating a change in approach, from a percentage approach to apportioning development to settlements, to a capacity-led approach with allocations made on the basis of where there are suitable sites in sustainable locations. Clearly, the position to be adopted in the VALP with regard to future housing growth in Edlesborough is not yet finalised and it may be liable to further change following examination of that Plan.
- 4.28 The NP includes specific allocations with a total capacity of 71 – 76 dwellings (although see paragraphs 4.38 - 4.40 below, relating to Deans Farm, Northall), marginally in excess of the requirement of 57. Additionally, and to take account of the uncertainty regarding the number of dwellings required to meet the VALP total housing requirement, the NP sensibly reserves an additional site for a further 40 dwellings adjacent to the Policy EP4, Slicketts Lane, allocation. The intention is that this would only be released for development if the VALP requires a greater number of dwellings to be met by the NP in the period to 2033, or if there is a failure to deliver on the part of the allocated sites within the NP period.
- 4.29 To summarise, there has been continued collaboration between the PC and AVDC to meet the requirement for up-to-date housing needs evidence in the context of an emerging local plan. As a consequence, whilst the strict legal test requires conformity with the adopted local plan (AVDLP), I am satisfied that in this instance every effort has been made to minimise potential conflict between the Neighbourhood Plan and housing supply policies in the emerging local plan as advised in PPG, referred to above.
- 4.30 There are 4 policies allocating individual parcels of land for housing development, 3 within the Edlesborough Settlement Boundary and a fourth located at Northall but outside and detached from the Settlement Boundary. The first 3 allocations provide for a total 61 dwellings as shown by the table included in the Foreword to the NP. The Basic Conditions Statement suggests that the fourth allocation is primarily driven by the

local community's desire to see a current (perceived) eyesore site turned into beneficial use.

- 4.31 Policy EP2 allocates a site for redevelopment at The Green, Edlesborough an existing residential plot which, following demolition of the existing property could deliver approximately 6 dwellings, taking access from The Green. The proposal has not drawn specific adverse comment and, from my visit, appears to be a sensible proposal for development in a sustainable location. There is a minor error in the text of criterion (ii) which makes reference to Policy EP14 rather than the revised number EP13, whilst criterion (iii) makes reference to "*sustaining the character of the setting*" of a listed building. The principal act, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 66, refers only to the setting and so, to be correct in legal terms, the Policy should do the same. Proposed modification **PM2** includes appropriate modifications to ensure the Basic Conditions are met.
- 4.32 Policy EP3 allocates additional greenfield land for approximately 15 dwellings adjacent to a consented scheme for residential development fronting on to Cow Lane. The development is presently under construction. As with the previous allocation there has been no specific adverse comment and, from my visit to the area, this appears to be a suitable extension to the adjacent site, close to the village centre and other facilities. The criteria included with the Policy are appropriate to the site, its location and the proposal for development. The erroneous reference to Policy EP14 is repeated for this Policy at criterion (ii) and requires rectifying as shown in proposed modification **PM3**.
- 4.33 The final allocation in Edlesborough, identified by Policy EP4, is an altogether larger and more controversial proposal. The site is on the edge of the village, adjacent to Slicketts Lane which has residential development along its south-western side. It presently forms part of a large field in agricultural use and is currently under cultivation. The Site Assessments Report identifies the land as EDL021A and the Steering Group's assessment suggests "*the site would extend the village beyond the existing settlement boundary and its size and location could have an adverse effect on the rural character of that edge of the village*". Nevertheless, the Group accepted that the allocation is necessary in order to accommodate the required growth and that it is preferable to the only identified alternative – site EDL001, land to the north side of Ford Lane. To be clear, site EDL001 is also referred to as Swallowfields in the assessment of reasonable alternatives in the SA/SEA, and is subject to an outline planning application⁹ by CALA Homes for 68 new homes currently pending consideration. Its current use is as horse stables.

⁹ Application reference number: 17/01467/AOP.

- 4.34 The HELAA carried out by AVDC included both sites and, in brief, concluded that the Slicketts Lane site is the better option. The assessment determined that Swallowfields is unsuitable because of its importance in the landscape and village character, and because of poor highway infrastructure, whilst Slicketts Lane was determined to be partly suitable for up to 80 dwellings on the northern part of the site subject to appropriate access being achieved. The PC's site assessment concluded that the size and location of Swallowfields would have an adverse effect on the rural character as well as on views into and out of the nearby Area of Attractive Landscape (AAL). It was also assessed as being remote from the village centre with poor pedestrian links. Whilst acknowledging the negative aspects of the Slicketts Lane site, such as remoteness and potential adverse effect on the rural character of this edge to the village, the PC's assessment concluded that it would be preferable to Swallowfields as a location for up to 40 dwellings.
- 4.35 I have given careful consideration to the representations made by the prospective developers of the Swallowfields site, and those of local residents opposed to the Slicketts Lane site. It has been suggested that the Site Assessments Report is inadequate and contrary to available professional evidence, and that the SA/SEA is a simple 'tick-box' exercise which has artificially biased the assessment towards those sites proposed for allocation. Taking these points in turn, the PPG advice¹⁰ requires proportionate, robust evidence to support the choices made and that a qualifying body should carry out an appraisal of options against clearly identified criteria¹¹. The Site Assessment Report produced by the PC has similarities with the methodology used for AVDC's HELAA and assesses the alternative sites using the physical characteristics and context of each site. The 6 criteria or 'factors' are clearly indicated and each site is subject to a similar evaluation against these. In respect of the SA/SEA, I have already determined that the alternatives were given proper consideration using an appropriate level of information and reasoning (paragraph 4.6, above).
- 4.36 In order to meet the residual housing requirement for the Plan period, identified at paragraph 4.26, above, it is necessary to allocate a site or sites capable of development for 40 or more dwellings. Taking account of the form and characteristics of Edlesborough this is not an easy task and from my site visit, which included an exploration of the periphery of the settlement, I concur with the view that there are in reality only two potentially suitable sites – the Slicketts Lane site and the Swallowfields site. I have concluded that the former site is marginally the better location. In coming to this view, I have noted that the Swallowfields site is visually more exposed in a wider landscape – whether or not any impact

¹⁰ PPG Reference ID: 41-040-20160211.

¹¹ PPG Reference ID: 41-042-20140306.

on the AAL is taken into account. In addition, from my time spent walking and driving around the settlement, the Swallowfields site does appear more remote than the Slicketts Lane site, and less accessible from the village centre and facilities, particularly on foot. For these reasons, I believe that the methodology used has led to the selection of the better site.

- 4.37 Turning to Policy EP4, the erroneous reference to Policy EP14 has been repeated, as has the reference to sustaining the character of the setting to a listed building. Proposed modification **PM4** includes appropriate amendments to the text in order to meet the Basic Conditions. I have noted that criterion (ii) has been modified from the pre-submission version of the Plan, replacing "*predominantly*" with "*the majority*" in reference to the housing mix and height. Whilst this is an improvement, it remains a significant constraint on the form and character of the development. This does not reflect the advice in the NPPF, paragraph 60, that policies should not stifle initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to "*..conform to certain development forms or styles*". I appreciate that existing nearby development may well have a predominant form including lower roof heights. However, the site is expected to deliver a mix of dwellings including a proportion with up to five bedrooms at a density of more than 20 dph (40 dwellings on a 1.8ha site - which must also include a habitat corridor and riverside walk along its northern boundary). This suggests to me that criterion (ii) in its present form is too onerous and an amendment to "a proportion" is a more appropriate requirement as shown in the replacement criterion at proposed modification **PM4**. For consistency, it is also necessary to replace the first criterion related to the reserve land with the same text. Finally, the numbering of criteria includes duplicate numbers (vi) and (vii) leading to potential confusion. The proposed modification addresses the error and with these amendments the Policy meets the Basic Conditions, including specifically having regard to national policy and advice.
- 4.38 Policy EP9 allocates redundant agricultural land at Deans Farm, Northall for approximately 10 to 15 dwellings. The purpose of the allocation is to remove what is perceived by local residents to be an eyesore through the process of redevelopment. The Plan acknowledges that previous proposals to secure redevelopment of the site have failed because of its location outside the built-up area of the village. However, it is argued that it continues to harm the amenities of local people and the site is claimed to be "*..well suited to a scheme to meet the housing needs of local households wishing to downsize..*" (paragraph 6.26).
- 4.39 Whilst acknowledging the expressed good intentions, the argument is flawed in land-use planning terms. The Plan acknowledges that the site does not meet the planning definition of brownfield land. It is a remote location in open countryside at some distance from the defined Settlement

Boundary for Northall and accessed from South End Lane, a single track road without defined passing places. The Site Assessment Report acknowledges that the land is entirely separate from the built development of the settlement and “*..is not entirely consistent with the preferred spatial strategy..*” but concludes that it should nevertheless be allocated to “*..provide a mix of down-sizer, starter and affordable homes*”. It is clearly an unsustainable location, the development of which would be contrary to advice in the NPPF, paragraph 55, that local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances.

- 4.40 I am also concerned that encouraging development as a means of removing a perceived local eyesore could be seen as a precedent resulting in pressure to develop other, similar sites in open countryside - potentially encouraging dereliction as an instrument for circumventing normal planning control over development in open countryside. The allocation does not appear to be a necessary component of the 61 dwellings provided by the Plan, as indicated in the table on page 3 of the Plan. In order for the Plan to meet the Basic Conditions, specifically having regard to national policies and advice and ensuring a contribution to the achievement of sustainable development, and for the reasons given above, I am compelled regrettably to delete the proposed allocation in its entirety together with the supporting text as stated in proposed modification **PM5**. Reference to the proposal at paragraph 5.33 should be amended by deletion of the final two sentences, whilst the final bullet point in the objectives for Northall at paragraph 6.2 will also require deletion, and the identification of the site on Inset A should be deleted. The amendments are shown in proposed modification **PM5**.
- 4.41 The NP identifies a series of design criteria for new residential development through Policy EP13 which seek to address matters of greatest concern to local people. In principle, the Policy is in accord with the intention that neighbourhood plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies regarding the quality of development (NPPF, paragraph 58). However, the NPPF (paragraphs 59 and 60) also advises that design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail, and should not include unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. In this context, some aspects of the criteria do not have regard to national policy and advice. In particular the specification of a minimum width of access roads, and details of parking arrangements are not justified in the accompanying text and seek to constrain the form and layout of development contrary to NPPF advice. In any case, the adopted AVDLP includes Policy GP24, requiring vehicular parking to be in accordance with the Council’s operative guidelines.
- 4.42 The requirement that a scheme should not obscure listed buildings from public view is imprecise and does not accord with national advice

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

regarding the assessment of the significance of harm, including to the setting of a heritage asset (paragraph 129). In any event local planning authorities are required to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 66. The criterion simply duplicates that requirement and so should be deleted. The final criterion goes beyond the advice in the NPPF in seeking to preserve sites of historic or archaeological importance. That advice, in paragraph 129, indicates that an assessment of the importance of any heritage asset should be taken into account when considering the impact of a proposal. Accordingly, and in the absence of a substantive justification for the criteria requirements, the amendments contained in proposed modification **PM6** are necessary to meet Basic Conditions by ensuring regard is had to national policy and advice and general conformity is achieved with saved local planning policies.

Issue 3: Policies to Guide Commercial and Economic Development and the Expansion of Services

- 4.43 Policy EP5 defines the Village Centre for Edlesborough and provides policy guidance for the change of use of existing retail and commercial units, the location of new retail and commercial uses, and for the protection of farm shops and public houses which are seen as valued social assets. In general, the Policy is compliant with saved AVDLP Policy GP32 which seeks the retention of shops, public houses and post offices. It also has regard to national policy and advice in the NPPF, paragraph 28, in seeking to retain local services and facilities in a rural village. In consideration of proposals for changes of use, Policy GP32 requires consideration of the viability of the existing use. However, Policy EP5 simply requires that the premises have been "...suitably marketed at a reasonable price". The results of such an exercise could be questionable unless the marketing is undertaken at an appropriate value and in a manner agreed with the LPA. The proposed modification **PM7** provides an amendment which would clarify the basis for the marketing exercise. The modification also provides a suggestion for amendment to the final sentence to clarify the reason for seeking to resist changes of use of farm shops and public houses. These modifications will ensure the Basic Conditions are met.
- 4.44 The Plan provides for an extension to the Sparrow Hall Farm Industrial Area provided certain specified criteria are met. The enterprise, which I noted during my visit is described properly as a Business Park rather than an industrial area, appears to be a successful venture located alongside the A4146 giving it good access. The site is located away from the built-up area of the village and has land currently vacant within the site boundary. The principle of expansion therefore appears well founded and would comply with NPPF advice at paragraph 28, giving support to the sustainable growth and expansion of enterprises in rural areas. It is also

in accord with saved Policy GP17 in AVDLP and so meets the Basic Conditions.

- 4.45 Support for the expansion of local services is the subject of Policy EP7. It seeks to protect land outside the Settlement Boundary to ensure that the Primary School and Health Centre are able to expand in the event that new development, including any development in the adjacent village of Eaton Bray, creates an additional need for these community facilities. The Policy is in accord with saved Policy GP94 in AVDLP and follows NPPF advice that planning policies should ensure that facilities are able to develop and that weight is given to the need to expand or alter schools (paragraphs 70 and 72) and meets the Basic Conditions.

Issue 4: Policies for the Retention, Protection and Enhancement of Green Spaces, Facilities and Buildings of Local Interest

- 4.46 The NPPF, paragraph 76, provides for neighbourhood plans to identify for special protection green areas of particular importance to the local community and to designate them as Local Green Spaces. This allows local communities to rule out development except in very special circumstances and the NPPF makes it clear (paragraph 78) that local policy for managing development should be consistent with policy for Green Belts. The PC has identified a number of local green spaces and provided for their protection through Policy EP10. I looked critically at the 8 areas on my site visit. I found that they are all reasonably close to the community that they serve and are demonstrably special, in so far as they have attractive vegetation and views, or are allotments or playing fields. AVDC questioned the inclusion of land known as the Village Green at Northall as a consequence of which the PC has amended the Policy to exclude the land from the designation. However, a request that the land off High Street, Edlesborough be excluded was not accepted by the PC, a decision supported by Historic England since designation was seen as a means of protecting the setting of a scheduled ancient monument. An extant planning permission for the site (identified as EDL009) requires the land in question to be used as public open space, so its inclusion as a EP10 designation is entirely reasonable.
- 4.47 However, the key policy statement contained in the final sentence does not comply with the NPPF advice, that local policy for managing development “...*should be consistent with policy for Green Belts*”. The text should be clear that for development proposals to succeed, very special circumstances should be demonstrated. In order to meet the Basic Conditions and ensure the Policy has regard to national policy and advice amendment to the text is necessary, as shown in proposed modification **PM8**.
- 4.48 Policy EP11 supports development proposals intended to secure the future of community facilities important to the local community. This follows

advice in the NPPF, paragraph 28, which indicates that neighbourhood plans should promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages. It is also in general accord with advice on the promotion of healthy communities, including the need to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities, and is compliant with policies GP32 and GP93 in the adopted AVDLP. AVDC, in its formal response to the pre-submission version of the Plan, suggested a possible inclusion to the Policy, indicating that development resulting in the loss of a community asset/facility will only be supported if provisions were made by the developer for a replacement facility to be constructed. The PC has taken the suggestion on board and included a section within the Policy reproducing AVDC's text verbatim.

- 4.49 The logic of the argument is difficult to follow and potentially self-defeating since the Policy indicates that proposals involving the loss of facilities have to demonstrate through a viability assessment that they are no longer viable. In those circumstances, a requirement to provide a replacement facility could not be justified. The suggestion that the replacement should be "*to an equal or higher value & quality*" appears to ignore the requirement to prove that the existing facility is not viable. For these reasons, the additional paragraph should not be included in the Policy. A further addition, suggested by AVDC, requires that the facility which would be lost should be subject to an 18 month marketing period. In itself, this is a useful tool for demonstrating the potential future of the facility, but it could produce meaningless results unless the marketing is undertaken at an appropriate value and in a manner agreed with the LPA. For clarity, and to meet the Basic Conditions the text should be amended as shown in proposed modification **PM9**.
- 4.50 Policy EP12 seeks to protect buildings and structures of local interest in order to inform decision-makers of their presence as non-designated heritage assets when judging the effects of development proposals. This conforms to advice in the NPPF, paragraph 135. Whilst there is no relevant saved policy in AVDLP, the submission VALP indicates that development proposals affecting identified non-designated heritage assets will be subject to the NPPF requirements at paragraphs 131 and 135¹². Policy EP12 provides a list of significant assets of local interest to merit consideration in planning decisions, consistent with VALP advice relating to non-designated heritage assets.
- 4.51 The Policy refers to proposals "*..that will result in a scale of harm..*", making direct use of terminology in NPPF, para 135. However, the phrase can be misconstrued when used out of context since that advice refers to the requirement for a balanced judgement in respect of the scale of harm. For clarity, the phrase should be amended to indicate that significant

¹² VALP, paragraph 8.11, p153.

harm is the criterion for a balanced judgement as proposed in modification **PM10**.

- 4.52 The list includes, item (vi), St Mary's Church, Edlesborough, which is a Grade 1 Listed Building. As the intention is to list buildings of local interest in the context of NPPF, paragraph 135, regarding non-designated assets, the Church should not be included in the list. Historic England has requested that further evidence should be provided to support the inclusion of the identified assets, and a separate report on Buildings of Local Interest has been produced to support the Policy. This indicates the local desire to include St Mary's Church for completeness. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, specifically having regard to national policies and advice, the reference to St Mary's Church should be deleted as shown in proposed modification **PM10**.

5. Conclusions

Summary

- 5.1 The Edlesborough Neighbourhood Plan has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has investigated whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements for neighbourhood plans. I have had regard for all the responses made following consultation on the neighbourhood plan, and the evidence documents submitted with it.
- 5.2 I have made recommendations to modify a number of policies and text to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum.

The Referendum and its Area

- 5.3 I have considered whether or not the referendum area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. The Edlesborough Neighbourhood Plan as modified has no policy or proposals which I consider significant enough to have an impact beyond the designated neighbourhood plan boundary, requiring the referendum to extend to areas beyond the plan boundary. I recommend that the boundary for the purposes of any future referendum on the Plan should be the boundary of the designated neighbourhood area.
- 5.4 The initial view of parishioners, favouring very limited growth, was not supported by AVDC resulting in the decision not to proceed with a neighbourhood plan. Overcoming this initial setback to finally produce a well thought out Plan has shown a determination on the part of the Parish Council to have a strong voice in the development of the village. The task was made harder because the emerging VALP has yet to be submitted for

examination and the adopted AVDLP is now out-of-date and has a limited number of saved policies. The Parish Council is to be commended for the thorough approach it has taken to developing policies in consultation with AVDC and the hard work necessary to involve the local community in the task. The resulting plan should provide an effective basis for planning decision making.

Patrick T Whitehead DipTP (Nott), MRTPI

Examiner

Appendix: Modifications

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
PM1	Pages 31 and 35	<p>Policies EP1 and EP8 (for both policies)</p> <p>Amend the second sentence by deleting the word "infill" as follows:</p> <p><i>"Proposals for infill development within the Settlement Boundary will be supported, provided:"</i></p> <p>Amend the first criterion as follows:</p> <p><i>"i. They comprise <u>generally up to 5 houses on a site not exceeding 0.20 hectares, unless evidence can be provided to support a larger scheme;</u>"</i></p> <p>Amend the final paragraph to read as follows:</p> <p><i>"Development proposals on land outside the defined Settlement Boundary will not be supported other than for rural housing exception schemes, barn conversions, uses that are suited to a countryside location <u>such as appropriate leisure and recreational uses, or community right to build schemes, unless it. Well designed proposals for employment, necessary for the purposes of agriculture or forestry and tourism that may help the rural economy will be supported. New isolated homes in the countryside will not be supported, but the creation of new homes through the conversion of barns may be acceptable in principle."</u></i></p> <p>The final sentence in paragraph 6.8 of the supporting text will require amendment to delete the word "infill".</p>
PM2	Page 32	Policy EP2

		<p>Amend criterion (ii) as follows:</p> <p>"...making provision for homes in line with Policy EP143;"</p> <p>and amend criterion (iii) as follows:</p> <p>"The design of the scheme has regard to sustaining the character of the setting to the Bramley Cottage listed building..."</p>
PM3	Page 32	<p>Policy EP3</p> <p>Amend criterion (ii) as follows:</p> <p>"...making provision for homes in line with Policy EP143;"</p>
PM4	Page 33	<p>Policy EP4</p> <p>Replace criterion (ii) and criterion (vii) relating to the reserve land with the following:</p> <p>"In order to harmonize with existing nearby development, a proportion of the dwellings should be 1 and 1½ storey with a mix of 2 to 5 bedroom types, making provision for homes in line with Policy EP13;"</p> <p>Amend criterion (iv) as follows:</p> <p>"The design of the scheme has regard to sustaining the character of the setting to The Grove listed building..."</p> <p>Renumber the four criteria related to the release of the reserve land as follows:</p> <p>"vi., vii., viii. and ix." replaced with "viii., ix., x. and xi."</p>
PM5	Pages 29, 31 and 36	<p>Delete Policy EP9 together with the supporting text at paragraphs 6.24 – 6.27, and the depiction of the site on Inset A.</p> <p>Delete the final two sentences of paragraph 5.33.</p> <p>Delete the final bullet point of the objectives for Northall in paragraph 6.2.</p>

		<p>Additional amendments as a consequence of the deletion of Policy EP9 should be made as follows:</p> <p>Page 3 - Modify Table 3 to reflect the deletion of EP9.</p> <p>Page 4 - Modify the list of Land Use Policies to reflect the deletion of EP9.</p> <p>Page 34 Criterion ix, Policy EP4 - Line 3, retains the reference to Policy EP13 which should be amended to read "Policy EP12".</p> <p>Page 35 Policy EP8 – Delete With the exception of the scheme provided for in Policy EP9 of the Neighbourhood Plan to reflect the deletion of EP9.</p> <p>Page 36 paragraph 6.23 – Delete in favour of proposals promoted in Policy EP9 at Deans Farm to reflect the deletion of EP9.</p> <p>Pages 32–38 - As a consequence of the deletion of EP9 all subsequent policies should be renumbered.</p> <p>Pages 37-39 – To reflect the deletion of paragraphs 6.24 – 6.27 subsequent paragraphs should be renumbered.</p>
PM6	Pages 38 & 39	<p>Policy EP13</p> <p>Amend criteria ii – iv as follows:</p> <p><i>"ii. Access roads serving new developments <u>must be at least should preferably be 5.5m wide unless circumstances suggest otherwise, with a footpath that is a minimum of 2m wide;</u>"</i></p> <p><i>"iii. Access from main thoroughfares of the village to new developments of more than 3 houses <u>must should not seek to utilise existing service roads that are less than 5.5m in width;</u>"</i></p> <p><i>"iv. New homes with more than 1,2 or 3 bedrooms <u>must be provided with at least two off-street parking</u>"</i></p>

		<p><u>spaces, those with 4 or more bedrooms must have at least 3 off-street parking spaces in accordance with the Local Planning Authority's operative guidelines, unless there is evidence of specific local circumstances justifying a more generous provision, for example a requirement for parallel off-street spaces for highway safety reasons".</u></p> <p>Criterion (v) should be deleted, and criterion (vi) amended as follows:</p> <p><u>"New development must seek to preserve minimise the impact of proposals on sites of historic or archaeological interest and the use of natural features including green infrastructure assets should be maximised, and if possible, endeavour to make them more visible and accessible to the public".</u></p>
PM7	Page 34	<p>Policy EP5</p> <p>Amend the final part of the first paragraph as follows:</p> <p><u>"...unless it can be demonstrated with viability evidence that their location and premises are no longer viable and that the premises have been suitably marketed at a reasonable price an appropriate valuation and in a manner agreed with the Local Planning Authority for at least 18 months for that and any other suitable commercial use."</u></p> <p>Amend the final sentence of the Policy as follows:</p> <p><u>"Outside the Edlesborough Village Centre, proposals for a change of use of resulting in the loss of a farm shop or public house will be resisted...."</u></p>
PM8	Page 37	Policy EP10

		<p>Amend the final sentence of the Policy as follows:</p> <p><i>"Proposals for development on the land designated as a Local Green Space will not be supported unless it can be demonstrated that it will <u>must demonstrate that there are very special circumstances supporting the development, for example through benefit its to the existing use by the Community and that <u>by retention of the open character of the land is preserved.</u>"</u></i></p>
PM9	Page 37	<p>Policy EP11</p> <p>Amend the second sentence of the Policy as follows:</p> <p><i>"Proposals involving the loss of facilities will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated through a viability assessment that they are no longer viable and that they have been subjected to an 18 month marketing period <u>at an appropriate valuation and in a manner agreed with the Local Planning Authority.</u>"</i></p> <p>And by deletion of the final sentence commencing "Any development which..."</p>
PM10	Page 38	<p>Policy EP12</p> <p>Delete item (vi):</p> <p><i>"vi. St Mary's Church, Edlesborough"</i></p> <p>Amend the first part of the final sentence to the Policy as follows:</p> <p><i>"Proposals that will result in a scale of significant harm to, or unnecessary loss of, a Building of Local Interest, will be resisted, unless..."</i></p> <p>Page 38 Policy EP12 – As a result of the removal of St. Mary's Church from the Buildings of Local Interest list subsequent</p>

		items in the list should be renumbered.
--	--	---