

Appendix 2

D-AGT1 South Aylesbury Supplementary Planning Document – North and Central Areas.
Consideration of Initial Representations.

Representations Made	Buckinghamshire Council Consideration of Representations	Proposed Modification
<p>Stoke Mandeville Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group set out that the Stoke Mandeville Neighbourhood Plan will establish a policy of focusing services and facilities into a Parish Centre serving the whole Parish which is to be located to the west of Lower Road outside of the AGT1 site.</p>	<p>There is no policy requirement for the provision of a Parish Centre. The proposed Parish Centre location is on land outside of the control of the developers. For these reasons, the Parish Centre cannot be part of the AGT1 Supplementary Planning Document. By locating the local centre more centrally within the site it will be located away from existing Asda supermarket and provision within Stoke Mandeville, both of which are in close proximity to the western parcel. It will be accessible to passing trade on both Wendover Road and lower road and accessible to existing residents of Stoke Mandeville and Stoke Grange.</p>	<p>Parish Centre can be provided in addition to an eastern local centre on AGT1. Parish Centre will not be provided by the proposals in the Supplementary Planning Document, but the Supplementary Planning Document will not hinder the delivery of a Parish Centre elsewhere in the future.</p>
<p>Issues were raised regarding the Gardenway (as presented in the Aylesbury Garden Town Masterplan), its alignment and design, and the need for it to be a green route of high quality design.</p>	<p>The Gardenway is not a policy requirement in the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) and the Supplementary Planning Document content needs to be in line with VALP policies. Nonetheless, the Gardenway has been an integral part of the developers thinking on this site. Conversations with the BC Gardenway Team held to establish a desired route along</p>	<p>The Supplementary Planning Document sets out the potential Gardenway route, indicative design and principles. Whilst the Gardenway will not be delivered as part of the Supplementary Planning Document proposals, the Supplementary Planning</p>

Representations Made	Buckinghamshire Council Consideration of Representations	Proposed Modification
	the southern edge of the site and through the green buffer.	Document will enable its future delivery.
A second railway crossing in addition to the SEALR would increase connectivity across the site.	A second railway crossing is not part of the policy requirements for AGT1. It is not necessarily practical due to cost, land take, visual impact/design and potential blight on new development.	The Supplementary Planning Document sets out an indicative future second railway crossing in the strategic buffer to be part of the Gardenway and safeguards the land required for it, but this will not be delivered through the Supplementary Planning Document proposals.
Accessibility to the land parcel north of the SEALR is essential for connectivity within the site.	Accessibility to the northern parcel is acknowledged as being important in the Supplementary Planning Document.	Three solutions are presented hierarchically in the Supplementary Planning Document. In order of priority they are: 1. Using an underpass under the SEALR to access the northern parcel, 2. The provision of a bridge over the SEALR to the western part of the site, and 3. Direct access onto to SEALR. The third option is prescribed in policy to be a last-resort solution if the northern parcel would otherwise be rendered undevelopable.
Issue around the alignment of the strategic green buffer between the site and Stoke Mandeville, it should be tapered around the edge of SM.	Policy is clear that the buffer should retain the character and identity of the settlement of Stoke Mandeville. On the eastern edge of AGT1, the existing development presents quite a hard edge, and so the buffer is set back from the boundary here to provide an opportunity to round off the settlement with some new	Buffer to be set back from part of the settlement edge of Stoke Mandeville to the south-east.

Representations Made	Buckinghamshire Council Consideration of Representations	Proposed Modification
	development. It would be detrimental to the built environment to not round off the edge of SM. It can bring better quality to the living space of the existing dwellings to the edge.	
Location of primary school.	The school should be located in an accessible location, ideally co-located with the local centre to achieve critical mass.	School shown to be located in the most central location within the site, which is the most accessible location to the majority of AGT1 residents. The location encourages walking and cycling to school from all areas of the site.
Drainage considerations along the existing brook will need to be considered.	The Supplementary Planning Document sets out that Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) will be used on site to manage flooding, as well as to increase the environmental capital of the water courses. Supplementary Planning Document also sets out indicative areas for SUDS.	None.
Question raised about pedestrian ramps to the SEALR and that they would appear to be too long to be DDA compliant - 250-300 metres at a 1:20 gradient, 10 metres high would not be disability accessible.	The Supplementary Planning Document does not specify the design of the SEALR on-ramps, this is for the planning application stage. The Supplementary Planning Document does, however, set out four key principles for the access points to be followed to achieve accessibility, safety, and good design.	None.
The masterplan proposes too dense of a development. Garden	The Supplementary Planning Document shows a way, not the only way, for the site to be	None.

Representations Made	Buckinghamshire Council Consideration of Representations	Proposed Modification
town settlements are not meant to be cramped. The development will feel too urban.	developed. The Supplementary Planning Document sets out principles that will apply to the planning application process to ensure appropriate density is achieved in accordance with policy whilst at the same time not precluding the ability to respond to future evidence.	
Concern raised regarding ridge and furrow discovered during initial works not being protected within the Supplementary Planning Document.	BC methodology for assessing ridge and furrow gives this particular feature a low rating. Whilst a heritage asset, it is not of sufficient quality to preclude development and to require its retention.	None.
Concerns about the justification for the location of the five gypsy and traveller pitches.	The location for the G&T pitches is indicative, and is shown on the basis that it is in a location with direct and independent access from the road network with the potential for good pedestrian links to the wider site. The vehicular access from the location onto Lower Rod and the SEALR is good.	None.
Concerns raised about the traffic impact of the development and the construction works.	The traffic impact of the site allocation was assessed in the evidence base of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan, which was examined by an independent planning inspector. The Supplementary Planning Document does not propose specific highway improvements, but it does acknowledge that the need for such improvements is being assessed through transport modelling. The delivery of these improvements will be set out in the Infrastructure Delivery	None.

Representations Made	Buckinghamshire Council Consideration of Representations	Proposed Modification
	Framework, which will be a living document that will accompany the AGT1 Supplementary Planning Document.	
In preparing the SEA/HRA for the Supplementary Planning Document, the Council's consultant spoke to Natural England who confirmed correct approach in the Supplementary Planning Document/HRA is to draw on recreational mitigation as set out in the VALP policies.	Noted and the HRA informing the Supplementary Planning Document does take account of the Footprint Ecology report evidence published by Dacorum BC in March 2022. The Supplementary Planning Document itself will ensure full compliance with VALP policies on what is ANGSt 50% of site area (Policy D-AGT1) and typologies set out through Policy I1.	Supplementary Planning Document proposals on Green Infrastructure updated since initial draft Supplementary Planning Document (September 2021) to accurately set out what is ANGSt-compliant GI.
Natural England responded to the HRA/SEA Screening report consultation. They agreed with the Council that the basis of the material supplied Natural England agree with the assessment that the proposal will cause significant effects and therefore a full SEA is required. They also referenced the evidence base on recreational pressures in production at Dacorum BC.	Consultation response taken account of in the final HRA/SEA. Scoping Report being prepared and the recreational pressures issue now evidenced by Footprint Ecology Report (March 2022) is being taken account of in full.	New paragraphs added to the delivery chapter agreed by Natural England to mitigate Chilterns Beechwoods SAC though policy compliant on 50% ANGst compliant Green Infrastructure.
Historic England confirmed they agreed with the Council's draft HRA/SEA Screening opinion that an SEA is required.	A full SEA has been prepared to inform the Supplementary Planning Document.	None. Consultation will take place as required for the SEA Scoping Report and further SEA Reports.
The Environment Agency responded to the HRA/SEA Scoping Report consultation informing this	Issues to be addressed in the final version of the SEA Scoping Report	Issues addressed in the final version of the SEA Scoping Report and all further SEA reports

Representations Made	Buckinghamshire Council Consideration of Representations	Proposed Modification
<p>Supplementary Planning Document. They responded (regarding the SEA element) that the SEA objective on 'water' should not be scoped out. There was also a query on the target indicators.</p>		<p>informing the Supplementary Planning Document.</p>
<p>Buckinghamshire Council Highways requested that access points on the keys to the illustrations should be labelled 'potential'. And that the infrastructure table in section five for Highways should be altered as: 'including link road improvements' to 'including link roads'.</p>	<p>The Lead Local Plan Consultant in consultation with the Deputy Leader agreed these changes to the consultation version of the of the Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	<p>Access points on the keys to the illustrations have labelled 'potential'.</p> <p>The infrastructure table in section five for Highways has been modified: 'including link road improvements' to 'including link roads'.</p>