



Buckinghamshire Council: Further proposed modifications to the Hazlemere Neighbourhood Plan

Note: These modifications are proposed **in addition** to the Examiner's modifications contained within the Examiner's report. The consultation is asking for comments on the proposed modifications in this document only, however the Examiner's report has been provided as a consultation document where it is needed to make sense of the proposed modifications in this document

Page no. and policy / paragraph of submission plan	What the submission plan says	Whether or not the Examiner has modified it	Reason for change / Why we think it does not meet the basic conditions	The changes we propose to make
Page 32 policy HAZNP5 First paragraph Policies Map page 45	"The main site as shown on the Policies Map is allocated in the Wycombe District Local Plan for residential use (Policy HW8). The Neighbourhood Plan includes some additional parcels of land to bring the policy up to date."	No Examiner modification; however, it can be inferred from the Examiner's report that there should have been one at para 4.43 of his report as follows: "and to show the amended boundary of the Amersham	The submission document Policies Map does not show the correct HW8 site boundary. This is contrary to the strategic site policy and therefore the plan does not meet the Basic Conditions. As the Examiner has recommended that Plan E should include all the land in the development brief (PM19), it is therefore an additional proposed consequential change that the line for the site on the NDP policies map should also reflect this. The Examiner intended for this.	Change to policy text: "The site as shown on the Policies Map is allocated for residential use." Change to the Policies Map: Change boundary to reflect HW8 allocation and additional land parcels as per the development brief.

Page no. and policy / paragraph of submission plan	What the submission plan says	Whether or not the Examiner has modified it	Reason for change / Why we think it does not meet the basic conditions	The changes we propose to make
		Road/Tralee Farm site.”	Policy HW8 is not out of date; as the Examiner set out, the decision maker will have to look at both policies HW8 and HAZNP5, as well as the development brief.	
Page 34 Supporting text Para 5.33	<i>‘HAZNP5 brings HW8 up to date. At the time HW8 was adopted, it was envisaged that land in Chiltern District – adjacent to the north-eastern boundary of the site – would be allocated for housing. Since then, the Chiltern District Local Plan has fallen away (with the merger of the local authorities in Buckinghamshire), and the adjacent land remains within the Green Belt. Once HW8/HAZNP5 is developed, the new homes will therefore not form part of Holmer Green. Instead they need to integrate into Hazlemere. The layout illustrated on Diagram 14 accompanying HW8 is therefore out of date’.</i>	No Examiner modification	Policy HW8 is not out of date as the policy is written in relation to the site allocated in the Wycombe District Plan only. To ensure that there would be no policy conflict between the WDLP and the HNP. This is to ensure the HNP meets the basic conditions test relating to general conformity with national planning policy.	Modify the plan to make it clear that Policy HW8 is not out of date. Replace para 5.33 with the following text: “HAZNP5 supplements HW8 adding extra detail to the policy approach.”

Page no. and policy / paragraph of submission plan	What the submission plan says	Whether or not the Examiner has modified it	Reason for change / Why we think it does not meet the basic conditions	The changes we propose to make
Page 32 policy HAZNP5 Clause B1)	B. in respect of its transport proposals 1) "To provide vehicular access from the A404"	Yes - PM18 Modify Clause B1 to read: To provide vehicular access from the A404 and Wycombe Road;	To ensure general conformity with the strategic policy (HW8), the phrase "and Wycombe Road" needs to be inserted. The Council proposes as an additional consequential change to reinstate the word "vehicular" to ensure clarity. This helps to meet the basic conditions relating to the clarity of plans as set out in the NPPF.	Change to policy: Modify Clause B1 to read: To provide vehicular access from the A404 and Wycombe Road; Change to supporting text: Para 5.47 first sentence to say Clause B1 sets out that access is required on to the A404 and Wycombe Road. Change to Plan E: Change the width of the arrow on Plan E to that denoting vehicular access
Page 37, paragraph 5.50	"Clause B2 addresses the potential vehicular access to the north, to Wycombe Road – as a minimum pedestrian and cycle access will be needed here. This pedestrian and cycle access needs to be of a strategic nature because this is the main route to	No Examiner modification	Clause B2 does not address potential vehicular access and therefore this needs to be modified to reflect Policy HW8 and Neighbourhood Plan Policy 5.	Amend paragraph 5.50 to state: " Clause B2 addresses the need for pedestrian and cycle connections to be made to Wycombe Road to essential services. This pedestrian and cycle access needs to be of a strategic

Page no. and policy / paragraph of submission plan	What the submission plan says	Whether or not the Examiner has modified it	Reason for change / Why we think it does not meet the basic conditions	The changes we propose to make
	<p>buses and to other community facilities. It needs to be the dominant function of the street. Some vehicular use may also be able to be accommodated, depending on the exact design of the street. Regardless of the vehicular mix, in order to achieve a safe access that achieves appropriate design standards including active frontages and natural surveillance, it is not enough to only include 20 Wycombe Way. The Neighbourhood Plan therefore indicates adjacent land as also being required.”</p>			<p>nature because this is the main route to buses and to other community facilities.”</p>
<p>Page 32 policy HAZNP5 Clause C4</p>	<p>“C4) To enhance Green Infrastructure along the south-western boundary of the site connecting existing isolated pockets of green infrastructure, including the off-site woodland between Badger Way and the A404, and the off-site woodland near the play area at Badger Way, and the larger back gardens with</p>	<p>No Examiner modification</p>	<p>C4, in combination with C5 and in addition to HW8 part 3 will result in a much-reduced land parcel for development, which in turns impacts on the overall quantum of development that the strategic site would be able to deliver. Although the policy itself does not allocate a specific number, the supporting text indicates that the site is allocated for 350 homes. This figure forms part of the strategic housing figure for the Wycombe District Local Plan as set out in CP4. C4 does not meet the basic conditions</p>	<p>Change to the policy</p> <p>Delete clause C4 from the policy</p> <p>Delete supporting text relating to clause C4 of the policy</p> <p>Change to Plan E</p>

Page no. and policy / paragraph of submission plan	What the submission plan says	Whether or not the Examiner has modified it	Reason for change / Why we think it does not meet the basic conditions	The changes we propose to make
	mature trees to the rear of Lacey's Drive;"		as it is not in general conformity with HW8 and with CP4 Delivering Homes. Paragraph 29 of the NPPF states that Neighbourhood Plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies. Therefore part C4 is in conflict with Paragraph 29 of the NPPF as it would not be possible to deliver 350 units within HW8.	Remove clause C4 from Plan E
Page 32 policy HAZNP5 Clause C5 Page 33 Plan E	"C5) to provide a strategic Green Infrastructure link along the north-eastern boundary of the site, connecting the orchard adjacent the site to the north to the wider countryside to the south, as part of the provision of a sense of separation;"	No Examiner modification	<p>Policy HW8 does not seek to determine how a sense of separation should be provided through the development of the site other than through supporting text and the concept diagram at Figure 14 of the WDLP which does not carry the same status as the policy wording itself. Criterion C5 introduces a specific way separation is to be achieved within the policy wording itself, and on Plan E.</p> <p>Since the Local Plan, it has been made clear through the development brief and the Inland Homes public inquiry that the sense of separation between the two settlements has to be achieved alongside the northern boundary of the strategic allocation.</p>	<p>Change to the Policy wording C5) to provide enhance a the strategic Green Infrastructure link along the north eastern boundary of the site, connecting the orchard adjacent the site to the north to the wider countryside to the south, as part of the provision of a sense of separation;</p> <p>Re-label C5 as C4.</p>

Page no. and policy / paragraph of submission plan	What the submission plan says	Whether or not the Examiner has modified it	Reason for change / Why we think it does not meet the basic conditions	The changes we propose to make
			<p>Extract from the Inland Homes appeal decision: “In my judgement and in the straightforward application of the meaning of part 1 a) of Policy HW8, there is a clear requirement for separation on the northern boundary, this is the only part of the appeal site where the two parish boundaries are contiguous”.</p> <p>In planning terms, a sense of separation is taken to mean separation between built-up areas.</p> <p>The northern section of C5 is not ensuring the separation of Hazlemere and Holmer Green (because it is not on the parish boundary). The southern section of C5 is located adjacent to undeveloped land within Holmer Green which already provides the sense of separation.</p> <p>Clause C5 fails to be in general conformity with strategic policy HW8 on that ground.</p> <p>The result is also, in combination with delivering HW8 part 3, a much-reduced land parcel for development, which in turn impacts on the overall quantum of development that the strategic site would be able to deliver. Although</p>	<p>Change to the supporting text Re-label C5 as C4</p> <p>Delete final sentence of para 5.63.</p> <p>Changes to Plan E: A narrower line needs to be shown between the orchard and Amersham Road running along the boundary. Deletion of the small triangle south-west of the orchard. Re-label C5 as C4</p>

Page no. and policy / paragraph of submission plan	What the submission plan says	Whether or not the Examiner has modified it	Reason for change / Why we think it does not meet the basic conditions	The changes we propose to make
			<p>the policy itself does not allocate a specific number, the supporting text in the WDLP indicates that the site is allocated for 350 homes. This figure forms part of the strategic housing figure for the Wycombe District Local Plan as set out in CP4.</p> <p>C5 does not meet the basic conditions as it is not in general conformity with HW8 and with CP4 Delivering Homes. Paragraph 29 of the NPPF states that neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies for the area, or undermine those strategic policies. Therefore, Plan E is in conflict with paragraph 29 of the NPPF as it would not be possible to deliver 350 units within HW8.</p> <p>C5 is not consistent with HAZNP2 (which does not identify this area as part of the Green Infrastructure Network) and HW8 and therefore cannot be shown as a “strategic” green infrastructure link.</p>	

Page no. and policy / paragraph of submission plan	What the submission plan says	Whether or not the Examiner has modified it	Reason for change / Why we think it does not meet the basic conditions	The changes we propose to make
			The plan should enhance the green infrastructure that is already there.	
Page 41 Supporting text Para 5.64	Clause C6 addresses the frontage to the A404 which presents a Green Infrastructure opportunity, as well as providing a suitable setting for the development for the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty opposite. New development would be set back from the road frontage behind a landscaped area including a generous number of large trees once mature. This will also help reduce the isolation of the small area of woodland adjacent to the A404 near Badger Way.	Yes - The Examiner deleted this clause (PM18) C6 to provide a landscape setting to the site on its southern boundary, along the A404 which is the boundary to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Plan E still shows C6 and should be modified as a consequential change of the Examiner's deletion of the clause	Change to Plan E: Delete C6 Re-label C7 as C5
Page 34 Para 5.37	5.37 Second, at the time HW8 was adopted, it was envisaged that connection with the adjacent urban areas would be to the north. The policy did not, therefore, include any connections into the existing urban area to the south.	Yes - PM18 Relating to the changes to the site boundary to reflect the development	HW8 is not out of date. The fact that the Chiltern and South Bucks allocation has fallen away has no bearing on the policy nor on illustrative figure 14 in the Wycombe Local Plan.	Change to supporting text: 5.37 Second, at the time HW8 was adopted, it was envisaged that connection with the adjacent urban areas would be to the north.

Page no. and policy / paragraph of submission plan	What the submission plan says	Whether or not the Examiner has modified it	Reason for change / Why we think it does not meet the basic conditions	The changes we propose to make
	<p>Since then, the prospect of the land to the north being allocated for development has fallen away, and it remains in the Green Belt. Therefore, connecting the new development into the existing urban area to the south becomes imperative. HAZNP5 therefore includes in its allocation the turning head and parking area between 44 and 45 Badger Way, to facilitate a future active travel connection in this location, which would allow residents of the new development to access the existing play area, among other things.</p>	<p>brief additional land parcels</p>	<p>Changing the site boundary of a strategic site allocation is not in general conformity with strategic policy HW8. There is no obvious route into the HW8 area at the current time from the existing residential area in the vicinity of Badger Way.</p>	<p>The policy did not, therefore, include any connections into the existing urban area to the south. Since then, the prospect of the land to the north being allocated for development has fallen away, and it remains in the Green Belt. Therefore, connecting the new development into the existing urban area to the south becomes imperative. Therefore the housing development within HAZNP5 needs to be planned with the opportunity to join into a footpath and cycleway within the adjoining existing residential area, should an opportunity arise in the future. HAZNP5 therefore includes in its allocation the turning head and parking area between 44 and 45 Badger Way, to This would facilitate a</p>

Page no. and policy / paragraph of submission plan	What the submission plan says	Whether or not the Examiner has modified it	Reason for change / Why we think it does not meet the basic conditions	The changes we propose to make
				<p>future active travel connection in this location, which would allow residents of the new development to access the existing play area, among other things.</p> <p>Change to Plan E: The site allocation boundary to follow that of the WDLP in that area.</p>
Page 41 Paragraph 5.66	<p>5.66 The exception to this is the sense of separation along the north-eastern boundary. Policy HW8 requires the provision of a sense of separation between Hazlemere and Holmer Green. Since the adoption of HW8, and the falling away of the allocation of adjacent land for housing, separation between Hazlemere and Holmer Green is achieved though the adjacent land remaining in the Green Belt. It is therefore not necessary for HAZNP5 to provide for the whole</p>	No Examiner modification	<p>HW8 is not out of date. The fact that the Chiltern and South Bucks allocation has fallen away has no bearing on the policy nor on illustrative figure 14 in the plan.</p> <p>A sense of separation is not required between a built- up area and the countryside, because the countryside provides that sense of separation between built up areas.</p> <p>The proposed change provides clarity for the decision maker.</p>	<p>Re-label C5 as C4</p> <p>Amend paragraph 5.66 to say:</p> <p>5.66 The exception to this is the sense of separation along the north eastern boundary. Policy HW8 requires the provision of a sense of separation between Hazlemere and Holmer Green. Since the adoption of HW8, and the falling away of the allocation of adjacent</p>

Page no. and policy / paragraph of submission plan	What the submission plan says	Whether or not the Examiner has modified it	Reason for change / Why we think it does not meet the basic conditions	The changes we propose to make
	<p>of a sense of separation because, should the adjacent land come forward for development through a future local plan, the space required to achieve a sense of separation can be 'completed' as part of that development, and in the meantime, it is achieved through the adjacent land remaining in the Green Belt. However, it is essential that the Green Infrastructure that will be provided along this boundary is characterised by the aim of a sense of separation. Open space, and strategic open space, may or may not be located along this boundary (see above). At present there is no need for pedestrian and cycle connections across this boundary to the adjacent land.</p>			<p>land for housing, separation between Hazlemere and Holmer Green is achieved through the adjacent land remaining in the Green Belt. In respect of C4 It is therefore not necessary for HAZNP5 to provide for the whole of a sense of separation, because, the boundary is located adjacent to open land and should the adjacent land come forward for development through a future local plan, the space required to achieve a sense of separation can be 'completed' provided as part of that development. and in the mean time it is achieved through the adjacent land remaining in the Green Belt. However, it is essential that the Green Infrastructure that will be provided along this boundary is characterised by the aim of a sense of</p>

Page no. and policy / paragraph of submission plan	What the submission plan says	Whether or not the Examiner has modified it	Reason for change / Why we think it does not meet the basic conditions	The changes we propose to make
				separation. Open space, and strategic open space, may or may not be located along this boundary (see above). At present there is no need for pedestrian and cycle connections across this boundary to the adjacent land.
Plan E	The current plan E has no explanation as to its status.	No Examiner modification	It is important for plans to be clear for the decision maker – this helps meet the basic conditions relating to clarity as set out in the NPPF.	Change title of Plan E to say “Plan E – indicative plan for sustainable development at HAZNP5” Insert note under Plan E to say “Please note this plan is indicative”

Consequential Amendments

Please note that in his report, the Examiner stated that “Amendments to the text can be made consequential to the recommended modifications, alongside any other minor non-material changes, updates or corrections in agreement between the Parish Council and Buckinghamshire Council (PPG Reference ID: 41-106-20190509).” It is recognised that the proposed further changes may also lead to consequential and non-material changes, necessary to help the plan’s coherence.