

**September to November 2022 - Taking account of the Publics Representations -**

SPD D-AGT1  
Reference: Simon Meecham

Response From	Ref	Comment	Consideration of Representation	Modifications to the SPD
Thames Water	466 467 Response	Water / Waste Water Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>recommend early engagement to determine; demand for water supply infrastructure, demand for sewage / wastewater treatment and network infrastructure both on and off site, surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site</li> <li>provision of waste water / sewerage and water supply infrastructure to service development proposed</li> <li>specific text is recommended to be included within the SPD</li> </ul>	Add Thames Water requested text (with slightly amendments so that it reads coherently) to the SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add to Section 4.5.6: The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve the new development. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, agree phasing with Thames Water to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development.</li> <li>Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades.</li> </ul>
		Water Efficiency / Sustainable Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>support mains water consumption target of 110 litres per head per day (105 litres per head per day plus an allowance of 5 litres per head per day for gardens). Noted as a condition request to any planning approval</li> <li>specific text is recommended to be included within the SPD</li> </ul>	Add Thames Water requested text (with slightly amendments so that it reads coherently) to the SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add to Section 4.5.6: Development must be designed to be water efficient and reduce water consumption. Residential development must reflect Building Regulations at the time with planning conditions will be applied to any new residential planning permissions to ensure that the water efficiency standards are met.</li> </ul>
		Flood Risk / Sustainable Drainage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>approach to SuDS that limits as far as possible the volume of and rate at which surface water enters the public system</li> <li>specific text is recommended to be included within the SPD</li> </ul>	Add Thames Water requested text (with slightly amendments so that it reads coherently) to the draft SPD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add to Section 4.5.3: It is the responsibility of a developer to ensure drainage follows the SuDS hierarchy. Where infiltration is not possible it is expected that surface water will be discharged to the local watercourses. Drainage should not be discharged to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding in the area.</li> <li>Move from Section 2.8 to Section 4.5.3: The AGT-1 policy sets out requirements for drainage, flooding and associated infrastructure which will require consideration by forthcoming planning applications.</li> </ul>
Representation	444 445 Response	Green Buffer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGT-1 non-compliant with the adopted VALP as it requires a buffer between the new development (Area 4) and Stoke Mandeville to maintain the setting and individual identity of Stoke Mandeville</li> </ul>	Whilst some residential development is identified adjacent to the existing properties in Stoke Mandeville the proposed buffer follows the natural line of existing field boundaries, hedges and Bedgrove Brook where surveillance from both sides would be available creating a new northern edge of Stoke Mandeville. It will therefore create a break utilising the natural land features, whilst allowing visual and ecological connection between the buffers on the eastern and western side of the railway line. In addition it will ensure the rear gardens of as many existing properties are contained by providing appropriate distance back to back relationships to the existing houses aiding security.	None proposed
		Vehicle Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it is unclear how the vehicle access point from Castlefields to the east will be a secondary access point</li> <li>an increase in vehicle movements will cause an adverse effect on the safety of vehicle access into Wendover Road</li> </ul>	The draft SPD (inc. Section 3.2.3) notes that the access point taken from Castlefields may be able to serve a small selection of new dwellings, but would not be connected to the wider street network in the site except by way of potential pedestrian/cycle links. However, further clarification text will be provided.	Amend / add to Section 3.2.3: An access point taken from Castlefields on the eastern side of the site may be able to serve a small selection of new dwellings but would not connect the wider street network in the site, except by way of potential pedestrian/cycle links. This access, which would provide vehicle connection to a limited number of units, would be subject to further / full details at the planning application stage.
Representation	483 583	Green Buffer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGT-1 non-compliant with the adopted VALP as Stoke Mandeville requires a buffer between Aylesbury in order to maintain the identity of Stoke Mandeville and will lead to urban sprawl</li> <li>moving the strategic buffer will not provide security and privacy to existing rear gardens</li> </ul>	See response to 444 & 445	N/A
		Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>access from Castlefield is inappropriate as they are very small roads and turning on to Wendover Road is already difficult during peak periods.</li> </ul>	See response to 444 & 445	N/A
Historic England	880 Response	Heritage / Conservation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SPD should further consider how the area's heritage will inform the design of this site. A heritage assessment is required for Magpie Cottage, whilst the SPD needs to advance plans to deliver AVLP's requirements for Magpie Cottage</li> <li>in relation to archaeological remains a desk based assessment (supported by field evaluation where necessary) is needed to support the SPD</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments noted and additional text in relation to Magpie Cottage, its heritage status and need to protect its setting included within the SPD. Need for a Heritage Asset Assessment to accompany any application in the vicinity also added.</li> <li>Further text added in relation to archaeological deposits / assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add to Section 2.5.2: Magpie Cottage's listing description notes that it is of 17th century date, altered and extended, and restored in the 20th century. It includes a timber frame with white painted infill, a half-hipped thatch roof with two eaves dormers in the south slope. The building is considered to be of significance as a rural vernacular building of pre-1700 date which retains a significant proportion of its original fabric. The agricultural setting of the building is considered to contribute to its significance. Any planning application for development within the vicinity of the property should be accompanied by a Heritage Asset Assessment, with an appropriate and justified buffer of undeveloped land provided to ensure development is set back from the property and its boundary in order to protect its setting.</li> </ul>
		Further Details / Specific Text Recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>set out within appendices A and B within the formal comments (pages 4-9).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comments noted and additional / amended text included within Section 2.5.3.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amendments to 2.5.3.</li> </ul>
Smith Jenkins Planning and Heritage obo Hayfield Homes Construction Ltd	883 Response	Gypsy and Traveller Allocation Within Area 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the land at Redhouse Farm is not an appropriate location and there are other sites that would reasonably achieve suitable access. The SPD fails to consider alternative sites. The pitches are located next to proposed housing and existing dwellings thus aren't independent, unacceptable visual harm, unacceptable noise impacts upon existing and future occupiers, conflict between settled and travelling community</li> </ul>	Various locations with the allocation were considered as part of the masterplanning exercise. However, no other location was able to provide such a discrete (separate) location with such immediate and independent access onto the highway network and in particular the SEALR, a key connection. All other sites would be located near proposed housing and / or existing dwellings, whilst visual harm isn't noted within the draft SPD as a reason for their location. Whilst the properties being located adjacent to the SEALR may be more sensitive to noise it is not uncommon for such accommodation to be located adjacent to major transport routes. The proposed location is therefore considered compliant with VALP Policy D11.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend Section 4.5.2: Whilst several locations within South Aylesbury were considered, all were equally adjacent to existing / proposed dwellings and accessible to existing / new services. The pitches will be provided on the western parcel adjacent to the SEALR / Lower Road where the most appropriate independent, immediate, and good access from Lower Road and the SEALR can potentially be provided. The area will be provided to the required size and will incorporate appropriate access and good quality landscaping in line with Policy D11 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan. Add to Section 4.5.7: In compliance with Policy D11 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan.</li> </ul>
		Phasing of Development Including Chiltern Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Redhouse Farm should be identified as a short term development site in the phasing of AGT1, as it's located outside of the Chiltern Beechwoods SAC.</li> </ul>	The draft SPD phasing plan in Section 5.2 notes that the timeframes for the areas identified are indicative. Whereas the illustrative phasing (Section 5.1) provides dwelling completion numbers as opposed to location of units. The draft SPD notes that delivery of residential units is also subject to the delivery of the necessary infrastructure, which smaller parts of the wider allocation will not be able to provide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend Indicative Phasing Plan (Section 5.2) so that the Redhouse Farm land is, as is the adjacent land, noted as being 'medium term'.</li> </ul>
		Delivery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council's preference for a single planning application is unrealistic considering 2no applications have already been submitted.</li> </ul>	Whilst the Council's preference is for a single application, the draft SPD acknowledges that multiple outline and/or full planning applications for individual land parcels may be made	None required
Representation	878	Residential Edge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>development of Area 4 should extend to the existing settlement edge in the south-east corner of AGT1. This is unlike other parts of AGT1 where the buffer is located between AGT1 development and Stoke Mandeville, however this does ensure that the buffer has a positive frontage which is overlooked. Locating the buffer along the rear boundary could create a space prone to crime that is not overlooked.</li> </ul>	Development in this location is seen as an extension to the existing settlement and forming a link in townscape terms (rather than a gap) to the existing settlement. The strategic buffer is best located to follow the Bedgrove Brook where surveillance from both sides would be available creating a new northern edge of Stoke Mandeville. Through appropriate planting privacy and security of adjacent properties can be provided.	None required
		Block of Flats Proposed by Cala Homes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>fails to respect the privacy of occupiers within existing residential dwellings and are out of character with Peterfield .</li> </ul>	The comment relates to a submitted planning application as opposed to the draft SPD	N/A
		Access / Parking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>proposed access to Area 4 from Castlefield will significantly increase traffic and road safety issues for those cars turning in to Castlefields from the Wendover Road,</li> </ul>	See response to 444 & 445	N/A

Aylesbury Society	875	<p>Access / Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>need to detail physical linkages (bus routes, cycle/pedestrian routes and highways network)</li> <li>disagrees with incorporation of parking courtyards</li> <li>Provision of transport / mobility hubs and railway crossing welcomed</li> <li>impact of the development on Walton Triangle road junction needs to be considered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further information relating to the connections from the site to the wider area to be included in Section 3.2.4</li> <li>Where side / rear courtyard parking is referenced within section 4.3 this is noted as being only appropriate where there is no alternative practicable solution</li> <li>Positive comment noted</li> <li>Regarding the impact on the local road network (including Walton Triangle) is noted within the draft SPD, whilst highway / traffic movement impacts will also need to be considered as part of any planning application</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add to Section 3.2.4: Wendover Road (A413) is located to the east of the site, with Lower Road (B4443) located to the west. The SEALR, when constructed, will run to the north of / through the South Aylesbury site. These all connect the South Aylesbury to the wider area, including Aylesbury town centre, Wendover, Princes Risborough and beyond.</li> <li>The local topography within the wider area lends itself to walking and cycling with the existing pedestrian and cycle infrastructure in the area considered to be suitable. Footways are provided on both sides of Wendover Road and Lower Road, whilst the Amber Way and Jet Way cycle routes, part of the Aylesbury active travel route network, run adjacent connecting South Aylesbury to Stoke Mandeville, Aylesbury town centre and Wendover.</li> <li>There are also several local Public Rights of Way (PROW) and bridleways which cross South Aylesbury, with others in the vicinity, provide alternative traffic-free routes to the surrounding area. Whilst access to the National Cycle Network (NCN) Route 57 is available within Princes Risborough located approximately 10km to the southwest.</li> <li>The nearest existing bus stops are located on Wendover Road and Lower Road providing regular services into Aylesbury for connection onwards and to Wendover, Princes Risborough, and High Wycombe.</li> <li>Stoke Mandeville Railway Station is located to the south, providing regular direct services to several local and regional destinations including Aylesbury, Aylesbury Vale Parkway, Amersham, Harrow-on-the-Hill, and London Marylebone.</li> </ul>
		<p>Retail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>proposed local centre on Wendover Road could negatively impact upon the Elm Farm Road shops. Has a retail impact study been carried out? A local centre near the western hub seems more appropriate.</li> </ul>	<p>No specific impact assessment has been undertaken as part of the SPD process. Policy AGT1 requires the provision of a local centre but doesn't require it's exact location. Given the presence of the Asda adjacent to the hospital, the location of the store on Station Road and the Parish Council's ambitions for a Parish Centre to the west of the site, it was deemed that a location on the eastern side of the railway line was the most appropriate. Moreover to ensure the viability / vitality of the centre, it should be located on a through route</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
Juniper Investments	893 894 895 Response	<p>Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>proper and full engagement by Council and principal parties with Juniper is required if Juniper Land is required for the master planning and delivery of the allocation (Juniper has not been treated as a principal landowner) OR Juniper Land should be left as 'white land' for consideration, at a future date, for residential development as an extension to Stoke Mandeville (as the Juniper land is obviously not considered necessary to the masterplan and delivery of the allocation)</li> <li>the strategic buffer and connectivity sought by the masterplan can only be delivered if there is proper and full engagement with Juniper.</li> </ul>	<p>All landowners have been aware of the consortium and, should they have wished to, been allowed to formally join. They were invited to attend the workshops relating to the preparation of the draft SPD, with some, including Juniper, attending the workshops either directly or via a third party. Landowners or their agents were, where requested, regularly updated in relation to the progress of the drafting of the SPD.</p>	<p>None required</p>
		<p>Land Use Budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>no land use budget contained in the draft SPD to confirm the uses and how they will achieve the 50% ANGST compliant green infrastructure and on which land holdings. Instead, the land use figures in the draft SPD just identify the overall AGT1 allocation (90.45 hectares) and the green infrastructure required (45.23 hectares). It is clear by the masterplan the draft SPD can only realistically deliver the required 50% ANGST compliant green infrastructure at South Aylesbury by including the Juniper land holding.</li> </ul>	<p>The draft SPD (inc. Section 4.5.3) notes that 50% ANGST compliant green infrastructure will be provided within each application parcel.</p>	<p>None required</p>
Aylesbury Old Town Residents Association	896	<p>HS2 and D-AGT2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>general comments relating to the expansion of Aylesbury, the development of RAF Halton Camp and Aylesbury Town Centre</li> <li>in proposals for D-AGT-2 land needs to be reserved and protected to eventually build an 'Aylesbury International Railway Station'</li> </ul>	<p>Comments made are not directly applicable to the draft SPD</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Buckinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service	890 Response	<p>Parking / Traffic / Roads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>following elements should be incorporated; new roads wide enough for fire LGV appliance, traffic management systems, strategically placed fire hydrants, adequate off-street parking and pinch points where emergency vehicles need to travel.</li> </ul>	<p>The draft SPD indicates a road hierarchy which it is acknowledged will need to meet fire and rescue requirements. These issues will be considered and dealt with at either Reserved Matters or Full application stage.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
		<p>Residential Dwellings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Automatic Fire Detection (AFD) should be fitted and promote installation of sprinkler systems</li> </ul>	<p>These issues will be considered and dealt with at either Reserved Matters of Full application stage.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
		<p>SuDs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SuDs need to be incorporated</li> </ul>	<p>The draft SPD indicates the use of SuDs</p>	<p>None required</p>
Stoke Mandeville Parish Council	891 892 Response	<p>Local Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>further consultation required for proposed Parish Centre which is many years from fruition. Facilities in AGT1 should not be deferred to a future Parish Centre</li> <li>the following facilities should be provided: civic hub (inc meeting space); adventure playground and play facilities; public toilets; landscaped car parking; innovation and business start-up centre; nursery and early years provision; on-site medical facilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appropriate reference to the Neighbourhood Plan and the proposed Parish Centre should be noted within the SPD.</li> <li>Infrastructure requirements for the AGT1 site, together with others, were considered and justified as part of the local plan process. Policy D-AGT1 of the VALP requires the provision of a school, local centre and a community building, all of which are provided for within the draft SPD. The draft SPD also notes the requirement for financial contributions to other off-site facilities, including health.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 3.2.6 amended: provides a third location to reflect the aspirations within the first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan, which suggests a potential location for a Parish Centre on the western side of Lower Road. However, the proposal for a Parish Centre is many years from fruition.</li> <li>None proposed</li> </ul>
		<p>Green Buffer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>needs to be expanded throughout AGT1 and proportionately distributed across the entire Parish/AGT1</li> <li>as a minimum it must protect identity of existing housing. The green buffer must not be reduced to gardens of adjoining properties and existing properties must not be subsumed into the new housing planned as part of AGT1</li> <li>should provide walking routes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See response to 444 &amp; 445</li> <li>Potential future walking and cycling routes, including through the green buffer, are identified within the draft SPD.</li> </ul>	<p>None required</p>
		<p>Housing Density</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>dense housing is unsuitable for any part of AGT1 as it is incompatible with the rural setting / identity of Stoke Mandeville</li> <li>1000 new residential units is excessive and does not appear to be in line with ambition of green infrastructure and Garden Town</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A range of densities is proposed across the AGT1 site, ranging from 25-29dph (lower), through 30-39dph (medium) to 40+dph (higher). These densities are considered appropriate for the area whilst making the best use of the available land, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework and local planning policy.</li> <li>Policy D-AGT1 of the VALP requires the provision of at least 1,000 dwellings. The draft SPD is therefore complying with the VALP.</li> </ul>	<p>None proposed</p>
		<p>Proposed School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SPD proposes the School in a slightly different location to that which has been proposed by the Neighbourhood Plan, which has the school closer to the Lower Road entrance to mitigate traffic and so the school fields could serve as a green buffer for the existing properties on Lower Road</li> </ul>	<p>The consultation period of the first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan ended in August 2021. It is understood that since then no subsequent drafts have been issued / progressed and therefore it isn't currently a material consideration. The proposed school has been indicatively located towards the centre of the site to improve accessibility from the development to the east of the railway line. Whilst it is also the common desire of local education authorities not to locate schools on main roads, which the Neighbourhood Plan proposes.</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
		<p>Inappropriate Location</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>all environmental indicators show that it is the wrong place for development. All new residential developments should be relocated to north of the County</li> </ul>	<p>The site (AGT1) is allocated for residential development as part of the adopted VALP (Policy D-ADT1)</p>	<p>N/A</p>
Representation	829	<p>Affordable Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>new housing should be for social housing and not market-led.</li> </ul>	<p>The VALP requires the provision of both market and affordable housing within Buckinghamshire.</p>	<p>None required</p>
Representation	862	<p>Character and Identity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>insufficient regard for retaining the Stoke Mandeville village identity and will lead to the development of a sprawling conurbation, the housing styles depicted do not define identity</li> </ul>	<p>See response to 444 &amp; 445. Local reference properties within Section 4.4.4 are taken from Stoke Mandeville, whilst other images reference movement and buffer edges, rather than house types. Text to be made more explicit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Area Building Typology for Areas 1 to 4 (4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 &amp; 4.4.4): Text overlaid on the images to be positioned below, with the text associated with the bottom images changed to "Local Reference (Property Type) - XXXX".</li> </ul>
		<p>Flood Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>insufficient consideration for environmental impact with risk of flooding being downplayed</li> </ul>	<p>The risk of flooding has been considered as part of the drafting of the SPD and will be subject to more detailed considered / mitigation methodology as part of any outline or detailed planning applications</p>	<p>None proposed</p>
		<p>Community Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>no thought regarding the impact on healthcare system or the increase to the existing transport issues</li> </ul>	<p>Infrastructure requirements for the AGT1 site, together with others, were considered and justified as part of the local plan process. Policy D-AGT1 of the VALP requires the provision of a local centre and a community building, both of which are provided for within the draft SPD. The draft SPD also notes the requirement for financial contributions to off-site health facilities. Regard to the impact on the local road network (including Walton Triangle) noted within the draft SPD, whilst highway / traffic movement impacts will also need to be considered as part of any planning application</p>	<p>None required</p>
		<p>Ecology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>little evidence of conservation and natural habitats on the site</li> </ul>	<p>In line with the policies of the VALP the proposal at AGT1, as identified within the draft SPD, will provide a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), 50% ANGST compliant green infrastructure, and open space</p>	<p>None required</p>
Woodland Trust	885 886 887 888 889	<p>Ecology / Trees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>supports the overall landscape-led masterplan including the retention and enhancement of existing vegetation and habitats where practicable including the creation of linkages with surrounding wildlife assets. Would like to see explicit mention made of established woodland, including ancient woodland, and of trees (particularly ancient, veteran and notable trees) outside woods as part of this</li> <li>should seek to protect and increase the use of trees and woodland within the various development areas. Existing ancient woodland and individual ancient, veteran or notable trees outside woods should be mapped, identified and protected. Where ancient woodland or veteran trees are lost or damaged there will always be net loss of biodiversity and it is impossible to secure net gain.</li> <li>welcomes the commitment to secure ANGST compliant green infrastructure throughout the scheme. It is important that the delivery of the green infrastructure keeps pace with the release and occupation of the residential phases of the project and is not all left to the end.</li> <li>recommend linking to the pilot Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) and future LNRS. Recommend considering setting a tree canopy cover target for the area, to address loss of trees to disease and development and to contribute to the uplift in tree cover needed in response to climate change.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Positive comment noted</li> <li>Amendments proposed to Section 4.2 to address comments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add to Section 4.2: An overarching Green and Blue Infrastructure plan has been developed for AGT1, which will form the basis for forthcoming designs of each area. Within this the landscape areas have been characterised to set out their differing typologies and design principles. In addition to the retention of existing vegetation and habitats, including the creation of linkages with surrounding wildlife assets, additional trees and woodland will be planted where appropriate.</li> <li>Given the integrated nature of green and blue infrastructure within the scheme, the majority of the typologies below represent both kinds to some degree. The importance of the delivery of the green infrastructure is acknowledged and that it should keep pace with the release and occupation of the residential phases of South Aylesbury.</li> <li>Strategies will be implemented, where appropriate and timely with development of South Aylesbury.</li> </ul>
		<p>Community Facilities and Shops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>unacceptable impact upon existing schools / hospitals</li> </ul>	<p>Infrastructure requirements for the AGT1 site, together with others, were considered and justified as part of the local plan process. Policy D-AGT1 of the VALP requires the provision of a local centre and a community building, both of which are provided for within the draft SPD. The draft SPD also notes the requirement for financial contributions to off-site health facilities.</p>	<p>None required</p>
Representation	897	<p>Green Buffer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>development is much larger than originally told with a lack of green buffer</li> </ul>	<p>See response to 444 &amp; 445</p>	<p>N/A</p>
		<p>Community Facilities and Shops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>unacceptable impact upon existing schools / hospitals</li> </ul>	<p>Infrastructure requirements for the AGT1 site, together with others, were considered and justified as part of the local plan process. Policy D-AGT1 of the VALP requires the provision of a local centre and a community building, both of which are provided for within the draft SPD. The draft SPD also notes the requirement for financial contributions to off-site health facilities.</p>	<p>None required</p>

Representation	905	Greenfield Development • disagrees with green field development	The site (AGT1) is allocated for residential development as part of the adopted VALP (Policy D-ADT1)	N/A
		Traffic / Highways • road links within the town need to be improved	Regard to the impact on the local road network (including Walton Triangle) noted within the draft SPD, whilst highway / traffic movement impacts will also need to be considered as part of any planning application	None required
Representation	912	Brownfield Land • housing should be built on brownfield land. Development shouldn't be taking place on the countryside	The site (AGT1) is allocated for residential development as part of the adopted VALP (Policy D-ADT1)	N/A
		Community Facilities and Shops • Aylesbury town does not have access to retail facilities. Town centre looks like a disused market town	Comments made are not directly applicable to the draft SPD	N/A
The Environment Agency	898 899 900 901 902 903 904	Ecology • supports proposal as it provides a net gain in biodiversity in line with policy NE1 and seeks opportunities to improve ecological status of all watercourses by retaining buffer zones adjacent to all watercourses	Positive comment noted	None required
		Drainage / Flood Risk • parts of the site are at risk from both fluvial and surface water flooding. Development should follow a sequential approach in line with NPPF and within east region and west region - flood zones 2 and 3 should be preserved for greenspace and flood zone 1 should be used for built development • to provide floodplain storage, with an allowance for climate change, reducing flood risk elsewhere ideally an undeveloped buffer zone of at least 10m wide measured from top of bank should be provided. Planting should be locally native species; lighting to reduce spill into the watercourse; paths should be made of permeable materials and set towards the rear of the buffer, with more formal access to the top of the bank at a limited number of points; fences must be open in design so they don't block flood flow paths and allow wildlife movement; and bridge crossings need to be a clear span design and the soffit set above the 1 in 100 year plus climate change flood event • recommend that new ponds/lakes are created off line from any existing watercourses • impacts on groundwater quality should also be considered when designing the surface water drainage scheme for the site • concerned about water treatment and sewerage infrastructure, due to the risk of adverse impacts on water quality if water treatment works are overloaded or operating beyond capacity	• Positive comments noted. • Some amendments made to section 2.8 and 4.2.8.	• Amendments to Sections 2.8 and 4.2.8:
		Infrastructure • policy S5 of the adopted 2021 Aylesbury Vale Local Plan requires new development to provide appropriate on and off site infrastructure. We support the stated intentions in the first paragraph of 4.5.6 regarding the provision of water, foul water and drainage utilities. We also support the stated aims to comply with C3, especially regarding water efficiency • in relation to foul water drainage, regard should be had to the Local Plan, particularly paragraphs 3.43 – 3.45 and the Aylesbury Vale Water Cycle Study as some waste water treatment works are currently at capacity. The final sentence of paragraph 3.45 applies here: "There must be adequate capacity in foul waste infrastructure to accommodate the proposed development in order to prevent the deterioration in current water quality standards".	• Positive comment noted • Add Environment Agency requested text to the SPD	• None required • Add to Section 4.2.8 (box): There must be adequate capacity in foul waste infrastructure to accommodate the proposed development in order to prevent the deterioration in current water quality standards.
		Water Efficiency • support mains water consumption target of 110 litres per head per day (105 litres per head per day plus an allowance of 5 litres per head per day for gardens)	Add Environment Agency requested text to the SPD	• Add to Section 4.5.6: Site design should seek to deliver sustainable water usage features such as rainwater harvesting, grey water systems, with mains water consumption target of 110 litres per head per day (105 litres per head per day plus an allowance of 5 litres per head per day for gardens) being the target.
		Biodiversity Net Gain • no reference in the SPD (Section 67) to Biodiversity net gain, but assume this will be addressed via future planning application.	In line with the policies of the VALP, as identified within the draft SPD, the proposal at AGT1 will need to provide a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), 50% ANGST compliant green infrastructure, and open space. Within Section 6.1 reference is made to the requirement of a Biodiversity report as part of any planning application.	None required
Representation	884	Green Buffer • AGT-1 non-compliant with the adopted VALP as Stoke Mandeville requires a buffer to maintain its identity. East of the railway (Area 4) there is no separation, with the buffer too far north and of inadequate width. Development on Area 4 should be precluded	See response to 444 & 445	N/A
Representation	906	Access • new access road via Castlefields is too narrow and will be dangerous	See response to 444 & 445	N/A
Representation	907	Ecology • skylarks which are ground nesting birds exist in area and require open space - how will they be protected	In line with the policies of the VALP, as identified within the draft SPD, the proposal at AGT1 will provide a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), 50% ANGST compliant green infrastructure, and open space. Any applications will need to specifically address any existing species noted on the land.	None required
Representation	908	Ecology • the proposal will destroy important habitat and not enough trees	In line with the policies of the VALP the proposal at AGT1, as identified within the draft SPD, will provide a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), 50% ANGST compliant green infrastructure, and open space.	None required
		Open Space • the proposal will place the existing and new residents into a built up cramped area lacking green space and diminishing the mental health of residents as a result	The site (AGT1) is allocated for residential development as part of the adopted VALP (Policy D-ADT1). In line with the policies of the VALP the proposal at AGT1, as identified within the draft SPD, will provide a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), 50% ANGST compliant green infrastructure, and open space.	None required
		Community Facilities and Shops • the new school is welcome but not enough supporting infrastructure proposed such as doctors surgeries	See response to 897	N/A
		Urban Sprawl • understand need for new homes but cramming people into increasingly unpleasant locations does nothing for the value of our market town	The site (AGT1) is allocated for residential development as part of the adopted VALP (Policy D-ADT1)	N/A
Representation	909	Traveller / Gypsy Site • concerned as to why this is being provided amongst new estate. The gypsy campe should be put somewhere more isolated	Infrastructure requirements for the AGT1 site together with others were considered and justified as part of the local plan process. Policy D-AGT1 of the VALP requires the provision of a local centre and a community building, both of which are provided for within the draft SPD. The draft SPD also notes the requirement for financial contributions to off-site health facilities.	None required
Tiddington with Albury Parish Council	911	Access • concerned with proposal's impact upon the A418, which already experiences substantial traffic and accidents	Regard to the impact on the local road network (including the A418 and its junctions) is noted within the draft SPD, whilst highway / traffic movement impacts will also need to be considered as part of any planning application	None required
Representation	913	Impact on Magpie Cottage • the property is the only existing dwelling encompassed within the AGT1 allocation boundary. What are the implications • the proposed buffer is to protect the Grade II listed property LPA Ref. 22/02772/APP • this application contradicts the proposed landscape buffer included in the AGT1 plan	See response to 880  Application has been withdrawn	N/A  N/A
		Stoke Mandeville Village Plan • the proposal is not in accordance with the Stoke Mandeville Village Plan	The consultation period of the first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan ended in August 2021. It is understood that since then no subsequent drafts have been issued / progressed and therefore it isn't currently a material consideration.	None proposed
Representation	914	Housing Density • is too high and there is not enough green space. No details are shown it just says 1,000 houses	In line with the policies of the VALP, as identified within the draft SPD, the proposal at AGT1 will need to provide a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), 50% ANGST compliant green infrastructure, and open space. The draft SPD follows the policy requirements as noted in the VALP.	N/A
		Community Facilities and Shops • No evidence of doctors surgery or shops or conveniences, pubs, community centre meeting places	Infrastructure requirements for the AGT1 site, together with others, were considered and justified as part of the local plan process. Policy D-AGT1 of the VALP requires the provision of a local centre and a community building, both of which are provided for within the draft SPD. The draft SPD also notes the requirement for financial contributions to off-site health facilities.	None required
		Ecology • The area, currently fields, is essential for drainage, wildlife habitats, hedgerows (which are in serious decline). Intensive human occupation which brings pollution, noise and all sorts of disturbance, local habitats will be lost, not protected and enhanced. Loss of Two Major Footpaths • At least 2 major footpaths, free from urbanisation, are currently enjoyed by walkers wanting to get away from urban sprawl and traffic noise and pollution, right through the centre of the proposed development	In line with the policies of the VALP, as identified within the draft SPD, the proposal at AGT1 will need to provide a Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), 50% ANGST compliant green infrastructure, and open space  The site (AGT1) is allocated for residential development as part of the adopted VALP (Policy D-ADT1). In line with the policies of the VALP the proposal at AGT1, as identified within the draft SPD, will provide 50% ANGST compliant green infrastructure, and open space, which will include footpaths / cycleways	None required  None required
Representation	915	Conservation • grade II listed Magpie Cottage in its natural rural surroundings should be maintained with a retained generous margin free from development	See response to 913	N/A
		Flood Risk • concern that the proposal will increase flood risk. The flood risk to not only the immediate area, but also the knock-on increased flooding impact to the rest of Aylesbury, especially with climate change	See response to 862	N/A
		Representation	826 827 828	Green Buffer • Stoke Mandeville Neighbourhood Plan shows the green buffer between the existing village and AGT1. The plan shows the green buffer away from the existing edge of the village. Strongly object to this change which will severely impact the individual identity of Stoke Mandeville
Representation	910	Vehicle Access • vehicular access to Area 2 and 4 is inadequate. No access is possible at the south and west of the site so all access must come through Castlefields or the north of the site. The many journeys from the north to south and east of the site which will be a safety issue.	See response to 444 & 445	N/A
		Community Facilities • not enough supporting infrastructure proposed - the hospital is unable to cope now and one primary school is not enough	Infrastructure requirements for the AGT1 site, together with others, were considered and justified as part of the local plan process. Policy D-AGT1 of the VALP requires the provision of one primary school which is provided for within the draft SPD. The draft SPD also notes the requirement for financial contributions to secondary school and special educational needs schools	None required

		Environment - concern about negative impact upon environment. Land should be retained for growing food, green areas with woodland to replace that which has been destroyed	The site (AGT1) is allocated for residential development as part of the adopted VALP (Policy D-ADT1)	N/A
--	--	---	--	-----