

# **Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan**

**Main Modifications Consultation**

**5<sup>th</sup> November – 17<sup>th</sup> December**



**December 2019**



# CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Overview .....	2
1.2	Context .....	2
1.3	National Policy .....	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Proposed Main Modifications .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	MM001, MM002 and MM003 – OAN Figure and Housing Requirement.....	4
2.2	MM004, MM006 and MM008 – Overall Strategy .....	4
2.3	MM009 – Flexibility .....	4
2.4	MM010 – Distribution of Growth.....	5
2.5	MM089 – D-WIN001: Land to east of B4033, Great Horwood Road .....	5
2.6	MM115 – Policy H1: Affordable Housing .....	6
2.7	MM151 and MM152 – Policy H6a: Housing Mix.....	7
2.8	MM153 - MM167 – Policy H6b: Housing for Older People.....	7
2.9	MM168, MM169 and MM170 – Policy H6c: Accessibility .....	8
2.10	MM175 – Policy H7: Dwelling Sizes .....	8
2.11	MM234 – Policy NE5: Landscape Character and Locally Important Landscapes .....	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Overall Conclusion .....	9
	<b>Appendix 1 .....</b>	<b>10</b>
	<b>Appendix 2 .....</b>	<b>11</b>
	<b>Appendix 3 .....</b>	<b>12</b>

# **1 INTRODUCTION**

## **1.1 Overview**

1.1.1 These representations are made in response to the current consultation on the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) main modifications consultation and build on previous submissions along with written and verbal representations made during the VALP examination hearings. Gladman welcome the opportunity to comment on these main modifications to the VALP.

1.1.2 Gladman have been involved in a significant number of Local Plans across the country, both in the plan preparation stages (through written representations) and through participation at the EiP stage. Through this experience Gladman have become acutely aware of the need for Local Plans to meet the tests of soundness and be based upon robust up to date evidence.

## **1.2 Context**

1.2.1 In February 2018 Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) submitted the VALP to the Secretary of State for examination. Examination hearings were held in July 2018. Following the close of the hearing sessions the Inspector issued a note containing interim findings on 29<sup>th</sup> August 2018. This provided the Council with some broad areas of work that were necessary before they could proceed to main modifications stage.

1.2.2 Following agreement between the Council and the Inspector on a revised housing target of 28,600 homes and other points raised in the interim findings document, the Council have now published the full schedule of proposed main modifications.

1.2.3 Gladman have a number of land interests within Aylesbury Vale District and have been involved in plan preparation for a number of years. Gladman made written submissions to the various stages of consultation on the VALP and also actively participated in a number of the Examination hearing sessions in July 2018.

1.2.4 This current submission builds on representations made by Gladman at various stages through the plan preparation and through debates had at the Examination in Public (EiP).

## **1.3 National Policy**

1.3.1 As the VALP was submitted in advance of the revised Framework (NPPF 19), the national policy which it is to be tested against is the original Framework (NPPF 12).

1.3.2 The Framework (NPPF12) sets out four tests which must be met in order for a Local Plan to be found sound through the examination process. In this regard we submit that in order for the VALP to be found sound it is fundamental that it is:

- **Positively prepared** – the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- **Justified** – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
- **Effective** – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross boundary strategic priorities; and
- **Consistent with national policy** – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with policies in the Framework.

## **2 PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATIONS**

### **2.1 MM001, MM002 and MM003 – OAN Figure and Housing Requirement**

- 2.1.1 Gladman note the modifications proposed through MM001, MM002 and MM003 which amend the OAN figure, the annual housing requirement figure and the total housing requirement figure respectively.
- 2.1.2 Notwithstanding the Inspector's interim views and the proposed modifications to the VALP, Gladman's position regarding the OAN and the housing requirement remains as per our previous submissions (both written and oral) to the EiP.

### **2.2 MM004, MM006 and MM008 – Overall Strategy**

- 2.2.1 MM04, MM06 and MM08 relate to the overall strategy of the VALP and specifically removes the references to an early review of the Plan. Gladman note that the Buckinghamshire authorities will be joining to form a single unitary authority as of 1<sup>st</sup> April 2020. Once formed Gladman believe it will be necessary for the Buckinghamshire Council to undertake reviews of the various Local Plans which would result in the preparation of a plan covering the whole area. Therefore, Gladman would urge the Council to reinstate reference to undertaking an early review.
- 2.2.2 Specifically, MM008 states that the need to consider a new settlement is no longer part of this plan and that this will be reconsidered in any future Local Plan Update.
- 2.2.3 Gladman consider it important that the Local Plan Review / Update for the newly forming Buckinghamshire Council happens in a timely manner. This is of particular importance given the authority falls within the Cambridge to Oxford Growth Arc and the Government is seeking to deliver a transformational scale of growth within this corridor in the period up to 2050.

### **2.3 MM009 – Flexibility**

- 2.3.1 Gladman note that MM09 updates the housing commitments and completions total and also the buffer that this results in above the overall housing requirement. Whilst the buffer increases from 5.2% to 5.7% Gladman remain of the view that this is insufficient to ensure the effective delivery of the VALP.
- 2.3.2 As outlined in previous submissions to ensure the delivery of the necessary scale of housing across AVDC the Council should be over allocating to provide sufficient contingency for instances when sites do not come forward as planned. This flexibility within the plan is important given the heavy reliance being placed on the delivery of homes in Aylesbury. Gladman reiterate the recommendation that the flexibility factor should be increased to somewhere between 10% and 20%.

## **2.4 MM010 – Distribution of Growth**

2.4.1 Gladman note that MM010 sets out how the housing delivery will be distributed and includes updated figures. Gladman are supportive of this update as it is required to ensure that the Plan is consistent throughout and that the distribution of growth reflects the modified housing requirement figures and discussions regarding sites and locations for growth at the EiP.

## **2.5 MM089 – D-WIN001: Land to east of B4033, Great Horwood Road**

2.5.1 Gladman support the allocation of site WIN001. Gladman have promoted the site through the previous consultations and remain of the view that the site offers a suitable location to deliver housing growth in Winslow.

2.5.2 Whilst amendments have been made to the policy wording, a number of Gladman's previous concerns with the policy remain.

2.5.3 The modification proposes to reduce the allocation to "at least 315 homes" and sets out amendments to the expected time of delivery. Gladman's objections to the proposed phasing which restricts the majority of delivery on this site to 2023 and beyond remain. The Framework is clear in its intentions to boost significantly the supply of housing. The intentions of national policy are clear, therefore any phasing policy without sufficient evidence to justify its inclusion is in conflict with national policy. No evidence has been provided and therefore the proposed phasing should be removed.

2.5.4 Gladman recommend that rather than potentially restricting delivery of the site through setting phasing requirements, instead, a phasing plan could be agreed with the Council once more detail is known about the proposals. This could be required as part of any future planning application.

2.5.5 Similarly, Gladman support the removal of the wording in criterion d) which sought to restrict built form beyond the watercourse. Nevertheless, the new wording proposed is not justified.

2.5.6 It is understood that the definition of the '*Not built development*' areas are based on evidence of flood risk vulnerability covered in the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment [doc ref CD/WCF/003]. The supporting text earlier in the plan outlines that these areas should only comprise green infrastructure, landscape or biodiversity mitigation or water compatible development unless a sequential test has been passed.

2.5.7 In contrast, the evidence and assessment work prepared in support of an outline application on the northern parcel of this allocation (application reference: 18/03421/AOP) found that although the site is close to a watercourse on the northwest boundary, the site remains outside of Flood Zones and areas of fluvial risk. The work completed on the application has fully considered the potential for on-site flooding and how this can be addressed through development proposals. It illustrates that development in these parcels can be achieved without increasing flood risk.

- 2.5.8 There is consequently no evidence to justify restricting built development as shown on the proposals map within these locations. To do so could also lead to difficulties in achieving the quantum of housing proposed on the allocation or lead to an inappropriately high-density development.
- 2.5.9 This assessment has been appraised by the Environment Agency, Buckinghamshire County Council SuDS Officer and the Buckingham and River Ouzel Internal Drainage Board. As shown in Appendix 1, 2 and 3, they have not raised any objections to the proposals.
- 2.5.10 The proposed modification is therefore not justified. Gladman object to this proposed modification and recommend that this wording is removed.

## **2.6 MM115 – Policy H1: Affordable Housing**

- 2.6.1 This modification relates to policy H1 'Affordable Housing' and seeks to make a number of changes to this. One such proposed modification being the inclusion of additional text relating to neighbourhood plans. This change would allow neighbourhood plans made prior to the adoption of the VALP to maintain an alternative affordable housing requirement to that set out in the VALP. Gladman object to this proposed modification as it is not considered to be sound. The more up to date evidence which supports the 25% requirement in the VALP should be applied in all instances.
- 2.6.2 The proposed approach will have an impact on a number of strategic allocations whereby they will be required to provide a greater scale of affordable housing than has been tested through the VALP examination. Gladman use Winslow as an example, here the made neighbourhood plan sets out an affordable housing requirement of 35%. This is clearly significantly higher than the 25% requirement in Policy H1 of the VALP and there would need to be clear viability evidence to support this position. As things stand, Gladman do not consider this approach to be justified.
- 2.6.3 Gladman note that the Council's own evidence (Housing Topic Paper - CD/TP/001) does not support this proposed modification. Specifically, Gladman refer to the following quotes:

**"Pursuing a higher target than justified by the need would, it is considered, contravene the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations and paragraph 204 of the NPPF. The Council has therefore set the 25% requirement as a minimum in the proposed affordable housing policy which will allow a higher provision where justified by viability. The viability information is however clear that a requirement higher than 30% would not be justified. "(paragraph 4.9)**

**"Representations regarding affordable housing received during VALP consultations have focused on the percentage of affordable housing and have asserted that the level of affordable housing should be revised upwards. As set out above though, the assessment is based on extant Government planning policy and guidance and as the local plan has to be based on this guidance and**

**the evidence produced to support the plan, it is not possible to justify an increase in the affordable housing requirement.” (paragraph 4.10)**

2.6.4 The proposed amendment to Policy H1 is not justified and is not consistent with national policy and therefore is not sound. This proposed modification should not be taken forward within the VALP.

## **2.7 MM151 and MM152 – Policy H6a: Housing Mix**

2.7.1 Following debates at the Hearing sessions, Gladman note that Policy H6 has been re-written and is now structured around three distinct parts;

- A) housing mix;
- B) housing for older people; and
- C) accessibility.

2.7.2 Gladman are generally supportive of the rewording of this policy, as following discussions at the hearing sessions it was clear that significant modifications were required in order for this policy to be sound. Gladman do however still raise a number of points regarding this redrafted policy which are outlined in response to the proposed modifications below.

2.7.3 Gladman note and support the fact that Policy H6a does not set a rigid housing mix to which all developments must adhere. Instead MM151 refers to the fact that housing mix will be negotiated having regard to the Council’s most up to date evidence on housing need and available evidence from developers regarding local market conditions. Gladman are supportive of this flexible approach and specifically the reference to both evidence of need and also local market conditions.

2.7.4 The reference to ‘the most up to date evidence’ is important as it acknowledges that circumstances may change over the course of the plan period and what may be appropriate on a site now, may not be at a later point in time.

## **2.8 MM153 - MM167 – Policy H6b: Housing for Older People**

2.8.1 MM153 – MM167 relates to housing for older people and provides a significant amount of new wording as well as proposed site allocations for C2 older people’s housing provision and also broad locations. Gladman are supportive of the VALP providing a policy specifically dedicated to ensuring the provision of housing to meet the needs of older people. Policy H6b provides a positive policy framework to ensure that the specialist housing needs of older people within the District are met across the plan period

## **2.9 MM168, MM169 and MM170 – Policy H6c: Accessibility**

2.9.1 MM168, MM169 and MM170 relates to the new policy H6c 'accessibility'. As outlined above, Gladman are supportive of this distinction between the various elements of Policy H6 as it now provides clear policies in relation to these matters.

2.9.2 Gladman note that the proposed modification removes the requirement for a proportion of market dwellings to be built to M4(3) 'wheelchair accessible dwellings'. Gladman are in support of this proposed modification as this better aligns with the national guidance contained in the PPG which when referring to M4(3) does so in relation to those dwellings where the LPA is in control of allocating the housing (i.e. affordable housing) and not for general market housing.

## **2.10 MM175 – Policy H7: Dwelling Sizes**

2.10.1 MM175 deletes policy H7 in its entirety. Gladman are supportive of this modification.

## **2.11 MM234 – Policy NE5: Landscape Character and Locally Important Landscapes**

2.11.1 Gladman note the proposed additional wording towards the end of MM234 which states *"development will be supported where appropriate mitigation to overcome any adverse impact to the character of the receiving landscape has been agreed."* Gladman are unclear what this additional wording means, specifically the element that states, 'has been agreed'. Gladman believe further clarity is required to ensure that this policy is interpreted consistently through the decision-making process and so that the development industry is clear on what is expected from them.

## **3 CONCLUSION**

### **3.1 Overall Conclusion**

- 3.1.1 Gladman welcome the opportunity to comment on the VALP main modifications document. For the VALP to be found sound at Examination it must be able to meet the four tests of soundness set out in the Framework. This will require the plan to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.
- 3.1.2 Having reviewed the proposed modifications, Gladman believe there needs to be some further modifications to ensure that the VALP is sound. Specifically, Gladman recommend modifications to WIN001 to ensure that this policy is effective and the delivery of much needed housing on this site is not unnecessarily restricted.

## **APPENDIX 1**

Environment Agency – Consultation Response re: Land off Great Horwood Road, Winslow

Nicola Wheatcroft  
Aylesbury Vale District Council  
Development Control  
The Gateway Gatehouse Road  
Aylesbury  
Buckinghamshire  
HP19 8FF

**Our ref:** WA/2018/125810/01-L01  
**Your ref:** 18/03421/AOP  
**Date:** 24 October 2018

Dear Ms Wheatcroft

**Outline planning application for the erection of up to 235 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SUDS) and vehicular access points from Great Horwood Road. All matters reserved except for means of access**

**Land off Great Horwood Road, Winslow, Buckinghamshire**

Thank you for consulting us on the proposed development. We have reviewed the information submitted in relation to our remit on flood risk.

Part of the application site lies within Flood Zones 2 & 3 defined by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and associated Flood risk and coastal change National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) as having a medium & high probability of flooding. Paragraph 163, footnote 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires applicants for planning permission to submit a FRA when development is proposed in such locations.

We have reviewed the submitted FRA Ref: 881386-R2(03)-FRA, prepared by RSK, dated September 2018. The FRA includes an assessment of the expected flooding extent from a 1 in 100 year event (1% annual probability) and 1 in 1000 year event (0.1% annual probability). The FRA also includes an assessment of potential increases in flood levels as a result of climate change.

The FRA confirms to our satisfaction that all built development is to be located outside of the area at risk of flooding and we are therefore able to advise that the application is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and flood risk to the site and surrounding area will not increase should this application be approved.

#### **Environment Agency position**

We consider that planning permission could be granted to the proposed development as submitted if the following **planning condition** is included on any planning permission.

Cont/d..

Without this condition, the proposed development on this site poses an unacceptable risk to the environment and we would object to the application.

### **Condition**

The development permitted by this planning permission shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) Ref: 881386-R2(03)-FRA, prepared by RSK, dated September 2018 and the following mitigation measures detailed within the FRA:

1. No development or ground level raising shall take place within the areas identified as being at risk of flooding.

### **Reason**

This condition is sought in accordance with paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

1. To prevent flooding elsewhere by ensuring that storage of flood water is provided.

### **Advice to Planning Authority**

#### Sequential Test

In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 158, development should not be permitted if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower probability of flooding. It is for the local planning authority to determine if the Sequential Test has to be applied and whether or not there are other sites available at lower flood risk as required by the Sequential Test in the National Planning Policy Framework. Our flood risk standing advice reminds you of this and provides advice on how to do this

### **Final comments**

Once again, thank you for contacting us. Our comments are based on our available records and the information as submitted to us.

In accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (Reference ID: 7-043-20150415), please notify us by email within 2 weeks of a decision being made or application being withdrawn. Please provide us with a URL of the decision notice, or an electronic copy of the decision notice or outcome.

If I can be of any further assistance, please contact me directly.

Yours sincerely

**Miss Sarah Green**  
**Sustainable Places - Planning Advisor**

Direct dial 0208 474 9253

Direct e-mail [planning\\_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk](mailto:planning_THM@environment-agency.gov.uk)

## **APPENDIX 2**

Buckinghamshire County Council – Consultation Response re: Land off Great Horwood Road, Winslow

Dear Nicola,

**Subject: Land off Great Horwood Road, Winslow, Buckinghamshire**

**18/03421/AOP - Outline planning application for the erection of up to 235 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access points from Great Horwood Road. All matters reserved except for means of access.**

Buckinghamshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority has reviewed the information provided in the Flood Risk Assessment & Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy (ref. 881386-R2(03)-FRA, dated September 2018, RSK). The LLFA **has no objection** to the proposed development **subject to the following conditions listed below.**

In light of the LLFA's comments dated 25<sup>th</sup> October, RSK; the drainage consultants for the proposal, have provided further information to support the development. The format of this letter follows that of the technical note provided by RSK.

*Reference to the isolated surface water ponding that is anticipated to occur for events between the 1% and 0.1% Annual Exceedance Probability.*

The applicant has provided demonstration that the existing surface water ponding will be removed through construction of development due to the removal of topographic low spots. For any surface water flood risk associated with the onsite watercourses, a sequential approach has been clearly demonstrated ensuring that development is located out of the areas at risk.

*Overlay of the Masterplan (G/GHR/SL/01, September 2018, Baldwin Design Consultancy) onto the updated Flood Map for Surface Water.*

This has been provided and clearly demonstrates the sequential approach to locating the development out of the areas at existing risk of flooding.

*Confirmation that the attenuation basins will be lined to prevent any potential groundwater ingress*

Based on the available datasets, the LLFA are of the opinion that there is likely to be high groundwater in this area (British Geological Survey Infiltration SuDS Map). The LLFA therefore; in-line with the ground investigations report provided in support of this application, request that winter (November to March) groundwater monitoring is

completed to establish the local trends in groundwater levels. Necessary mitigation measures may then be required to ensure minimal ingress of groundwater into any sub-structure components. The proposed attenuation basins will need to be lined to protect against groundwater ingress, without the lining there is a potential for groundwater to reduce the storage capacity of the proposed basins.

*Overlay of the Masterplan (G/GHR/SL/01, September 2018, Baldwin Design Consultancy) onto the Flood Map for Planning.*

An overlay of the masterplan has been provided both for the Environment Agency fluvial flood map and for the modelled fluvial scenarios. An overlay of the masterplan and the modelled fluvial flood risk has also been provided.

*Relocation of the attenuation basin serving the 0.8ha development parcel out of the flood zone and into the open space*

Whilst relocation of the pond has been provided, it is not clear that this has been located entirely out of the flood zone. The pond must be located out of the fluvial flood zones to ensure no loss of storage linked to a fluvial flood event. We therefore request this detail is clearly provided, an overlay of the relocated ponds and the modelled fluvial flood risk (10-01 881386 RSK FZ, November 2018, RSK) must be provided.

*Clear demonstration of the 9m buffer zone between the ordinary watercourse and any development, this should be indicated on the surface water drainage layout (drawing number: 10-01, February 2018, RSK)*

The 9m buffer has been provided and clearly demonstrated. The applicant must ensure that as the application moves to the detailed design stage that the 9m buffer is preserved.

*Clarification of the land-raising proposed such as anticipated levels*

It is understood that drawing 881386:10-01(November 2018, RSK), demonstrates the proposed land-raising; however the raising is not clear. We request the original topography is provided alongside the proposed details. Consideration should also be provided for any impact the proposed land-raising will have on existing surface water regimes.

*Consideration of conveyance features such as swales, rills, the existing ditches and permeable paving.*

In accordance with paragraph 165 part d of the National Planning Policy Framework (2018) the development should incorporate SuDS that provide multifunctional benefits. Given the scale of development proposed, the LLFA would expect a series of above-ground components to be incorporated at detailed design stage. For the proposed road networks we would anticipate priority to be given to utilising swales, rills, or filter strips for the conveyance of surface water. We would also encourage small-scale SuDS such as rain gardens on a property-level. In line with the LLFA's emerging culvert policy we would also expect existing watercourses to be maintained and enhanced, and where the opportunity presents existing culverts to be de-culverted.

*An assessment of water quality in line with Chapter 26 of the CIRIA SuDS Manual*

This should be updated in line with the additional SuDS components to be incorporated at detailed design.

*An assessment of the SuDS components as listed in the CIRIA SuDS Manual providing justification for exclusion as necessary*

Whilst justification has been provided, the LLFA do not agree with all aspects of justification, in particular space has been noted as a constraint; given the scale of development the LLFA do not believe space to be a significant constraint at this site.

*Inclusion of a 10% urban creep allowance within the calculations*

This has been provided

*Provision of the full pipe and manhole schedules in support of the modelled attenuation components*

This detail is to be provided at the next stage in planning subject to a detailed surface water drainage strategy incorporating more SuDS components.

*Details of how and when the full drainage system will be maintained, this should also include details of who will be responsible for the maintenance*

Details of maintenance will be secured via condition should the LPA be minded to approve this application.

In line with the emerging Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan D-WIN001, consideration of the impact of blockage of structures on flood risk should be modelled.

We would request the following conditions be placed on the approval of the application, should this be granted by the LPA:

### **Condition 1**

Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydro-geological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall also include:

- Assessment of SuDS components as listed in the CIRIA SuDS Manual (C753) and provide justification for exclusion if necessary
- Demonstrate that water quality, ecological and amenity benefits have been considered and incorporated into the design where possible
- Ground investigations including:
  - Groundwater level monitoring over the winter period (November to March)
- If high groundwater is encountered at a depth higher than the base of any above ground and below ground SuDS components, a groundwater mitigation plan must be provided detailing measures to prevent groundwater ingress.
- Full construction details of all SuDS and drainage components
- Detailed drainage layout with pipe numbers, gradients and pipe sizes complete, together with storage volumes of all SuDS components
- Above-ground attenuation components to be located outside of the fluvial flood zones as shown on Drawing no. 10-01 881386 RSK FZ – Indicative Surface Water Drainage Strategy with RSK Flood Map (November 2018, prepared by RSK)
- Details of any proposed land-raising
- Calculations to demonstrate that the proposed drainage system can contain up to the 1 in 30 storm event without flooding. Any onsite flooding between the 1 in 30 and the 1 in 100 plus climate change storm event should be safely contained on site.
- Details of proposed overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance or failure (including blockage of structures), with demonstration of flow direction

### Reason

The reason for this pre-start condition is to ensure that a sustainable drainage strategy has been agreed prior to construction in accordance with Paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that there is a satisfactory solution to managing flood risk.

### **Condition 2**

Development shall not begin until a “whole-life” maintenance plan for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall set out how and when to maintain the full drainage system (e.g. a maintenance schedule for each drainage/SuDS component) **during and following construction**, with details of who is to be responsible for carrying out the maintenance. The plan shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

If the road is to be adopted, the developer will agree to enter into a deed of easement pursuant to Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980 to allow the Highway Authority to access the SuDS system to preserve the integrity of the highways system, for the purpose of emergency repair and maintenance.

### Reason

The reason for this being a pre-start condition is to ensure that maintenance arrangements have been arranged and agreed before any works commence on site that might otherwise be left unaccounted for.

*NB: We would recommend that the “whole-life” maintenance and management plan for the surface water drainage system is secured by a Section 106 Planning Agreement. The use of a planning obligation (as opposed to a planning condition) would help to safeguard the maintenance and management of these features over the lifetime of the development. The BCC Strategic Flood Management team are of the opinion that this is a reasonable approach due to the residual risk of fluvial, surface water and groundwater flooding to the site should the systems not be adequately maintained.*

### **Condition 3**

Prior to the first occupation of the development, a verification report carried out by a qualified drainage engineer must be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the Sustainable Drainage System has been constructed as per the agreed scheme.

### Reason

The reason for this pre-occupation condition is to ensure the Sustainable Drainage System is designed to the technical standards

### Ordinary Watercourse Informative

Under the terms of the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Floods and Water Management Act 2010, the prior consent of the Lead Local Flood Authority is required for any proposed works or structures in the watercourse. After planning permission has been granted by the LPA, the applicant must apply for Land Drainage Consent from the LLFA, information and the application form can be found on our [website](#). Please be aware that this process can take up to two months

Yours sincerely

**Alethea Walker**

SuDS Officer

Email: [suds@buckscc.gov.uk](mailto:suds@buckscc.gov.uk)



## **APPENDIX 3**

Buckingham and River Ouzel Internal Drainage Board – Consultation Response re: Land off Great Horwood Road, Winslow

# BUCKINGHAM AND RIVER OUZEL INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARD

26<sup>th</sup> October 2018

Development Control  
Aylesbury Vale District Council  
The Gateway  
Gatehouse Road  
Aylesbury  
Bucks  
HP19 8FF

Vale House  
Broadmead Road  
Stewartby  
BEDFORD  
MK43 9ND  
Tel: Bedford (01234) 767995  
Email: [contact@idbs.org.uk](mailto:contact@idbs.org.uk)  
Website: [www.idbs.org.uk](http://www.idbs.org.uk)

## BY E-MAIL ONLY

For the attention of Nicola Wheatcroft

Dear Sir/Madam

**Application No:** 18/034221AOP  
**Location:** Land Off Great Horwood Road Winslow Buckinghamshire  
**Proposal:** Outline planning application for the erection of up to 235 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access points from Great Horwood Road. All matters reserved except for means of access  
**Grid Reference:** 477148, 228683

The Board notes that the intended method of storm water discharge is via a balancing facility.

Any discharge from attenuation ponds into the watercourse will require consent from the Board.

Please also note that the watercourse on the boundary of, or passing through this site is under the statutory control of the Board. In accordance with the Board's byelaws, no development should take place within 9 metres of bank top, without the Board's prior consent, this includes any planting, fencing or other landscaping.

The 9 metre byelaw strip is required by the Board for access for maintenance plant and equipment and for the spread and levelling of arisings, from the watercourse. It is therefore inappropriate to develop within this strip such that maintenance is obstructed, and hence the proposals within the strip are unlikely to receive the consent of the Board.

As previously stated the Board recommended that where soakaways are to be used investigations are carried out and if ground conditions are found satisfactory, constructed in accordance with the latest Building Research Establishment Digest 365.

Please direct any reply to Phillip Lovesey at the Board's offices.

Yours faithfully



*PL*  
Phillip Lovesey  
Senior Engineer  
[Phillip.lovesey@idbs.org.uk](mailto:Phillip.lovesey@idbs.org.uk)

Clerk of the Board: F.C. Bowler (Mrs)  
Engineer of the Board: J. J. Oldfield