

**HAVERSHAM-CUM-LITTLE LINFORD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN  
2016 - 2031**

**The Report of the Independent Examiner to Milton Keynes City Council on  
the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan**

**Andrew Matheson MSc MPA DipTP MRTPI FCIH  
Independent Examiner**

**19<sup>th</sup> April 2023**

## Summary

I was appointed by Milton Keynes City Council, in agreement with the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Parish Council, in January 2023 to undertake the Independent Examination of the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan.

The Examination has been undertaken by written representations. I visited the Neighbourhood Area on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2023 after resolving my initial enquiries of the Qualifying Body.

The Neighbourhood Plan proposes a local range of policies and seeks to bring forward positive and sustainable development in the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Area. There is an evident focus on safeguarding the very distinctive, local character of the area whilst accommodating future change and growth.

The Plan has been underpinned by extensive community support and engagement. The social, environmental and economic aspects of the issues identified have been brought together into a coherent plan which adds appropriate local detail to sit alongside Plan:MK, the Local Plan for Milton Keynes.

Subject to a series of recommended modifications set out in this Report I have concluded that the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan meets all the necessary legal requirements and should proceed to referendum.

I recommend that the referendum should be held within the Neighbourhood Area.

## Report Index

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	3
The Role of the Independent Examiner	3
Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Area	5
Consultation	5
Representations Received	7
The Neighbourhood Plan	8
Basic Conditions	9
The Plan in Detail:	10
General drafting points	10
Front Cover	10
Guide to Reading this Plan & Glossary	10
Foreword	10
Contents	11
1. Introduction & Background	11
2. The Neighbourhood Area	11
3. Planning Policy Context	12
4. Community Views on Planning Issues	13
5. Vision, Objectives & Land Use Policies	13
HLL1: Settlement Boundaries	13
HLL2: Housing Development	14
HLL3: First Homes Exception Sites	16
HLL4: Zero Carbon Buildings	17
HLL5: High Quality Design	20
HLL6: Non-Designated Heritage Assets	20
HLL7: Local Green Spaces	22
HLL8: Walking, Cycling and Equestrian Routes	22
HLL9: Green and Blue Infrastructure	23
HLL10: Important Views	25
HLL11: Local Community Uses and Public Houses	25
HLL12: Managing Road Safety	26
6. Implementation	27
Policies Maps and Insets	27
Appendices	27
EU and ECHR Obligations	27
Conclusions	29
Listing of Recommendations	30

## **Introduction**

This report sets out the findings of the Independent Examination of the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan 2016 - 2031. The Plan was submitted to Milton Keynes City Council by Haversham-cum-Little Linford Parish Council in their capacity as the 'qualifying body' responsible for preparing the Neighbourhood Plan.

Neighbourhood Plans were introduced into the planning process by the Localism Act 2011. They aim to allow local communities to take responsibility for guiding development in their area. This approach was subsequently incorporated within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2012 and this continues to be the principal element of national planning policy. A new NPPF was published in July 2021 and it is against the content of this NPPF that the Plan is examined.

This report assesses whether the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan is legally compliant and meets the 'basic conditions' that such plans are required to meet. It also considers the content of the Plan and, where necessary, recommends modifications to its policies and supporting text. This report also provides a recommendation as to whether the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to referendum. If this is the case and that referendum results in a positive outcome, the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan would then be used in the process of determining planning applications within the Plan boundary as an integral part of the wider Development Plan.

### **The Role of the Independent Examiner**

The Examiner's role is to ensure that any submitted Neighbourhood Plan meets the legislative and procedural requirements. I was appointed by Milton Keynes City Council, in agreement with Haversham-cum-Little Linford Parish Council, to conduct the Examination of the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan and to report my findings. I am independent of both Milton Keynes City Council and Haversham-cum-Little Linford Parish Council. I do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan.

I possess the appropriate qualifications and experience to undertake this role. I have over 40 years' experience in various local authorities and third sector bodies as well as with the professional body for planners in the United Kingdom. I am a Chartered Town Planner and a panel member for the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service (NPIERS). I am a Member of the Royal Town Planning Institute.

In my role as Independent Examiner I am required to recommend one of the following outcomes of the Examination:

- the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan is submitted to a referendum; or
- the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to referendum as modified (based on my recommendations); or
- the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan does not proceed to referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.

As part of this process I must consider whether the submitted Plan meets the Basic Conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. If recommending that the Neighbourhood Plan should go forward to referendum, I must then consider whether or not the referendum area should extend beyond the Neighbourhood Area to which the Plan relates.

In examining the Plan, I am also required, under paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to check whether:

- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated Neighbourhood Area in line with the requirements of Section 38A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004;
- the Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the 2004 Act (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one Neighbourhood Area);
- the Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.

These are helpfully covered in the submitted Basic Conditions Statement and, subject to the contents of this Report, I can confirm that I am satisfied that each of the above points has been properly addressed and met.

In undertaking this Examination I have considered the following documents:

- Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan 2016 - 2031 as submitted
- Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan Basic Conditions Statement (July 2022)
- Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan Consultation Statement (September 2022)
- Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Environmental Report (July 2022)
- Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Scoping Report (February 2022)
- Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Statement Appropriate Assessment Screening (January 2022)
- Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Report (February 2022)
- Content at: [www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/haversham-cum-little-linford-neighbourhood-plan](http://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/haversham-cum-little-linford-neighbourhood-plan)
- Content at: [www.havershamltlinford.org/neighbourhood-planning](http://www.havershamltlinford.org/neighbourhood-planning)
- Representations made to the Regulation 16 public consultation on the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan
- Plan:MK
- Milton Keynes Site Allocations Plan (adopted July 2018)
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2021)

- Neighbourhood Planning Regulations (2012)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) (March 2014 and subsequent updates)

I carried out an unaccompanied visit to the Neighbourhood Area on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2023. I looked at all the various sites and locations identified in the Plan document in their rural setting.

The legislation establishes that, as a general rule, Neighbourhood Plan examinations should be held without a public hearing, by written representations only. Having considered all the information before me, including the representations made to the submitted plan which I felt made their points with clarity, I was satisfied that the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan could be examined without the need for a public hearing and I advised Milton Keynes City Council accordingly. The Qualifying Body and the Local Planning Authority have helpfully responded to my enquiries so that I may have a thorough understanding of the facts and thinking behind the Plan, and the correspondence is being shown on Milton Keynes City Council's Neighbourhood Planning website for the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan.

### **Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Area**

A map showing the boundary of the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Area has been provided within the Neighbourhood Plan. Further to an application made by Haversham-cum-Little Linford Parish Council, Milton Keynes City Council approved the designation of the Neighbourhood Area on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2017. This satisfied the requirement in line with the purposes of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan under section 61G(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

### **Consultation**

In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, the Qualifying Body has prepared a Consultation Statement to accompany the Plan.

The Planning Practice Guidance says:

“A qualifying body should be inclusive and open in the preparation of its Neighbourhood Plan [or Order] and ensure that the wider community:

- is kept fully informed of what is being proposed
- is able to make their views known throughout the process
- has opportunities to be actively involved in shaping the emerging Neighbourhood Plan [or Order]
- is made aware of how their views have informed the draft Neighbourhood Plan [or Order].” (Reference ID: 41-047-20140306)

The submitted Consultation Statement notes that, following the formal designation of the Neighbourhood Area, in March 2018 a well-attended public meeting was held in the Haversham Sports and Social Centre as a first step in community awareness and

information gathering for the neighbourhood planning process. This was followed in June by a detailed paper-based survey of the residents in the Parish. 334 households received two copies of the questionnaire and all residents aged 16 and over were invited to participate. There was an impressive, estimated response rate of 77%.

In February 2019 parishioners were invited through an appeal in the Parish Magazine to join the parish councillors working on the Neighbourhood Plan. As a result four Task Groups were set up, each with responsibility for gathering information in a particular area of community interest.

In July 2019 a paper-based Housing Needs Survey was undertaken across the Parish, to collect parishioners' comments and identify potential need for future housing within the Parish. The results were recorded in the Final Housing Needs Survey Report.

In November 2019 a 'Call for Sites' letter was sent to all landowners adjoining the existing settlement areas of New Haversham and Old Haversham. 11 sites were put forward by landowners and were assessed against common criteria in the report Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan Site Assessment Report (February 2022). Due to the Covid pandemic the Parish Council was unable to hold the planned public consultation exercise on the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Instead, a Consultation document and questionnaire were issued to every household in the Parish. The questionnaire was designed to gather and evaluate residents' responses to the short list of five potential small-scale sites for housing development and views on a range of policy options which were being considered for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan. The consultation documents and the Analysis and Summary Report were published on the Parish Council website

In March 2022 the Pre-Submission Plan was published on the Parish Council website for six weeks public consultation. Every dwelling in the Parish received notice of the Regulation 14 Consultation. The parish magazine, website and social media were also used to alert as many people and organisations in the parish as possible about the consultation process. In addition, the Parish Council's Annual Parish Public Meeting in April 2022 included an update on the Neighbourhood Plan process followed by a question-and-answer session. A summary of the representations made by the statutory bodies was prepared for the Steering Group by consultants. The changes recommended as a result of the consultation responses were accepted by the Steering Group and the details of the changes made, and the comments which prompted the changes, were included in the report titled: HcLL Reg 14 summary report May 2022, available on the Parish Council website. Community comments were discussed by the Steering Group and included in the document titled Report on Community Responses to Reg 14, which was made available on the Parish Council website.

I noted to the Qualifying Body that a representation, reflecting comments in some others, commented: "[At the Regulation 14 Consultation] Over twelve pages of residents' comments are included and these resulted in two changes to the draft Neighbourhood Plan. One of the two changes was also requested by Milton Keynes City Council. No feedback has been offered on the individual points we raised and overall It seems that the consultation exercise consists of requests for comments, consideration of the

comments, with little resulting change and, importantly, no feedback.” The Qualifying Body explained that “Community comments were shared with and discussed comment by comment by the Steering Group and HcLLPC [the Parish Council] and the limited changes to the Submission Plan which the Steering Group and HcLLPC felt were necessary to clarify the process to some respondents [were] completed .... Emails were sent to all statutory and community responders to thank them for their contributions and comments following the Regulation 14 consultation and to inform them of the next steps including directing them to the HcLLPC website as follows:

‘The HcLL Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group are very grateful for your participation in the recent Regulation 14 Neighbourhood Plan Consultation. All the comments received have been read and discussed by the Steering Group. Where amendments to the plan are required as a result of consultation comments received, these will be included in the final Neighbourhood Plan Submission Document before it is submitted to Milton Keynes Council within the next two to three months. All consultation comments received and reports detailing changes to the final plan will be included among the final submission documents and made available on the Parish Council website.’ .... It may also be worth noting that the Annual Parish Public Meeting was held on 13 April 2022, a few days before the end of the consultation period. Key extracts of the plan were displayed as large posters in the meeting hall and those attending the meeting were encouraged to inspect these, which most did. Considerable time was also allowed during the meeting for an open discussion around the proposed plan, the consultation process and next steps.”

A representation further challenged the accuracy of the response to me from the Qualifying Body, on the basis that their experience was different. However, it transpired that the Qualifying Body had explained what had happened at the Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation whereas the respondents exchange of views with the Qualifying Body had pre-dated that. It is evident to me that the respondent was given the opportunity to express views and those views did impact the way that further consultation was conducted, partly during the challenging period of the pandemic. The respondent is further concerned that not all such contributions have been appropriately acknowledged, but in my view that matter of complaint does not detract from the evident interaction with the wider community from which the Plan has benefitted.

Accordingly, overall, I am satisfied that the consultation process accords with the requirements of the Regulations and the Practice Guidance and that, in having regard to national policy and guidance, the Basic Conditions have been met. In reaching my own conclusions about the specifics of the content of the Plan I will later note points of agreement or disagreement with Regulation 16 representations, just as the Qualifying Body has already done for earlier consultations. That does not imply or suggest that the consultation has been inadequate, merely that a test against the Basic Conditions is being applied.

### **Representations Received**

Consultation on the submitted Plan, in accordance with Neighbourhood Planning Regulation 16, was undertaken by Milton Keynes City Council for eight weeks from Friday



18<sup>th</sup> November 2022 to Friday 13<sup>th</sup> January 2023. I have been passed the representations – 21 in total – which were generated by the consultation and which are included alongside the submitted Plan on Milton Keynes City Council’s Neighbourhood Planning website. I have not mentioned every representation individually within this Report but this is not because they have not been thoroughly read and considered in relation to my Examiner role, rather their detail may not add to the pressing of my related recommendations which must ensure that the Basic Conditions are met.

## **The Neighbourhood Plan**

Haversham-cum-Little Linford Parish Council is to be congratulated on its extensive efforts to produce a Neighbourhood Plan for their area that will guide development activity over the period to 2031. I can see that a sustained effort has been put into developing a Plan around a vision that by 2031: “Haversham-cum-Little Linford remains a rural area distinct from the city of Milton Keynes. The parish has undergone some managed change to improve quality of life and access to local housing whilst preserving the rural village environment. These changes have not only avoided harm to biodiversity and connectivity but also helped create new ecological value and improved connectivity.”

The Plan document is well presented with a combination of text, maps and Policies that are, subject to the specific points that I make below, well laid out and helpful for the reader. Some effort is apparent to keep the Plan to a manageable length by not overextending the potential subject matter and the coverage of that.

It is an expectation of Neighbourhood Plans that they should address the issues that are identified through community consultation, set within the context of higher-level planning policies. There is no prescribed content and no requirement that the robustness of proposals should be tested to the extent prescribed for Local Plans. Where there has been a failure by the Qualifying Body to address an issue in the round, leading to an inadequate statement of policy, it is part of my role wherever possible to see that the community’s intent is sustained in an appropriately modified wording for the policy. It is evident that the community has made positive use of “direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area” (Planning Practice Guidance Reference ID: 41-001-20140306).

Individually I can see that the Policies address legitimate matters for a Neighbourhood Plan as identified with the community. The NPPF (para 16f) says that Plans should “serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant).” Representations request repetition of certain Local Plan content as affirmation that, in summary, “the Haversham Neighbourhood Plan does not prevent the ability for farmer/agricultural business to diversify their businesses outside of agriculture”. The Qualifying Body has been content to rely on existing national and local policies in regard to these matters. I can confirm that this is an appropriate approach and, as noted in the quotation above, an NPPF expectation.

I will later look at the Policies in turn so as to ensure that the Basic Conditions are met, which include an obligation to be in general conformity with Plan:MK strategic policies.

Having considered all the evidence and representations submitted as part of the Examination I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to national planning policies and guidance in general terms. It works from a positive vision for the future of the Neighbourhood Area and promotes policies that are, subject to amendment to variable degrees, proportionate and sustainable. The Plan sets out the community's priorities whilst seeking to identify and safeguard Haversham-cum-Little Linford's distinctive features and character. The plan-making had to find ways to reconcile the external challenges that are perceived as likely to affect the area with the positive vision agreed with the community. All such difficult tasks were approached with transparency, with input as required and support from the Milton Keynes City Council.

However, in the writing up of the work into the Plan document, it is sometimes the case that the phraseology is imprecise, not helpful, or it falls short in justifying aspects of the selected policy. This is not uncommon in a community-prepared planning document and something that can readily be addressed in most instances. Accordingly, I have been obliged to recommend modifications so as to ensure both clarity and meeting of the 'Basic Conditions'. In particular, Plan policies as submitted may not meet the obligation to "contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals" (NPPF para 16). I bring this particular reference to the fore because it will be evident as I examine the policies individually and consider whether they meet or can meet the 'Basic Conditions'.

### **Basic Conditions**

The Independent Examiner is required to consider whether a Neighbourhood Plan meets the "Basic Conditions", as set out in law following the Localism Act 2011; in December 2018 a fifth Basic Condition was added relating to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the Plan must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Plan for the area;
- be compatible with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations;
- not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017(d).

The submitted Basic Conditions Statement has very helpfully set out to address the issues in relation to these requirements in the same order as above and has tabulated the relationship between the policy content of the Plan and its higher tier equivalents. I note that the relevant Development Plan documents comprise Plan:MK and the Milton Keynes Site Allocations Plan 2018. From the accompanying Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment, I am satisfied that the making of the Plan will not breach the Basic Condition relating to the Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

I have examined and will below consider the Neighbourhood Plan against all of the Basic Conditions above, utilising the supporting material provided in the Basic Conditions Statement and other available evidence as appropriate.

### **The Plan in Detail**

I will address the aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan content that are relevant to the Examination in the same sequence as the Plan. Recommendations are identified with a bold heading and italics, and I have brought them together as a list at the end of the Report.

### **General drafting points**

The Council has requested that all stray references to 'Milton Keynes Council' or 'MKC' are updated and changed to 'Milton Keynes City Council' or 'MKCC'.

### **Front cover**

A Neighbourhood Plan must specify the period during which it is to have effect. I note that there is a prominent reference to the Plan period 2016 – 2031 on the front cover. I noted to the Qualifying Body that although the Plan period is shown as starting in 2016, the Plan was actually submitted in 2022. I have not identified anything that might suggest that the Plan relies on data sets or other material that predates 2022. I would therefore expect the Plan period to be 2022 – 2031. This point is different from one made in a representation which confuses the Plan validity period with the span of years addressed in the Plan. In response the Qualifying Body commented: "The HcLLNP plan period aligns itself with the plan period of the adopted plan:MK". However, there is no requirement for Neighbourhood Plans to parallel Local Plan periods and I consider that the plan period should clearly relate to the period over which it is expected to exercise influence. The references to "Submission Version" should now be removed.

### **Guide to Reading this Plan & Glossary**

This is a helpful introductory section, especially for those unfamiliar with reading Neighbourhood Plan documents. I noted that the "evidence base published alongside the plan on the Parish Council's website"; however, the Qualifying Body agreed that it is important that documents essential to the application of Policies are included with or within the Plan itself. I will be considering this issue as I progress through the Plan document.

A representation objects to some of the definitions used in the Glossary. However, the objections appear to relate to the context within which the terms are used later in the Plan. It is appropriate for planning terms to be introduced for the benefit of a wide range of readers.

### **Foreword**

I would simply note that the Plan Examination is conducted by an Examiner rather than an "inspector".

## Contents

The Contents page may need to be reviewed in the light of recommendations in the Report.

### 1. Introduction & Background

No comments.

#### **Recommendation 1:**

*1.1 Consistently ensure that references to 'Milton Keynes Council' or 'MKC' are updated and changed to 'Milton Keynes City Council' or 'MKCC'.*

*1.2 Amend the front cover to replace "2016-2031" with '2022-2031' and to remove "Submission version".*

*1.3 Within the "Foreword" replace "inspector" with 'Examiner'.*

*1.4 Review the Contents page in the light of the recommendations in this Report.*

### 2. The Neighbourhood Area

A representation has challenged the accuracy of paragraph 2.2 where it refers to Wildlife Corridors; a source reference is needed to allow anyone to check whether the text accurately reflects the MKCC position, and the Qualifying Body has now provided that. Similarly, the accuracy of paragraph 2.4 is challenged where it is stated that "much of the southern and eastern part of the parish flood" on the basis of a reference back to the Environment Agency Flood Maps; as noted below, the Qualifying Body has agreed that the supporting map should be the current Government mapping of surface water flood risk. A challenge has also been made to paragraph 2.12 where it is said "the parish remains a rural area distinct from the city" - but my visit to the area confirmed the rural nature of the Parish.

A representation suggests that the maps reproduced are not entirely accurate or could be misleading, again emphasising the value of source referencing. The Qualifying Body and the local authority jointly confirmed that Plan B is a copy of the interactive online mapping system MKCC operates (<https://mapping.milton-keynes.gov.uk>) and is considered to be accurate. They have further explained that the wildlife corridor (Plan:MK Policy L2) isn't contiguous with the linear park but does follow the River Ouse valley. Since the designations derive from the Local Plan, I conclude that the map and its referencing, including in the related supporting text, ought to be from the Local Plan.

Plan C is dated 2015 which, for the information being mapped, is not current. The representation suggests that the map should "follow the Flood Maps produced by the Environment Agency". There is evident danger that reproducing maps which need to be updated frequently is likely to mislead unless a source reference is provided for where current maps will be found. The Qualifying Body agreed that the supporting map might be changed to the current Government mapping of surface water flood risk. The Qualifying Body has agreed that it would be helpful if the boundary for the Neighbourhood Area was superimposed on Map C and other similarly scaled maps.

### **Recommendation 2:**

*Under the heading “2. The Neighbourhood Area”:*

*2.1 Amend the opening of paragraph 2.2 to read: “The Ouse Valley is designated as a Linear Park that runs along the edges of the city and separates it from the parish (see Plan B on page 7) and, although not contiguous, there is also a designated Wildlife Corridor”; also add to the end of the paragraph: ‘(paragraph 12.11 of Plan:MK)’.*

*2.2 Replace Plan B with the relevant Linear Park detail from the Plan:MK Policy Maps with the Neighbourhood Area boundary overlaid; provide a hyperlinked reference to the source maps.*

*2.3 Replace Plan C with the flood risk map publicly available on the Government website and, if possible, overlay the Neighbourhood Area boundary: <https://check-long-term-flood-risk.service.gov.uk/map?eastings=483438&northings=241704&map=SurfaceWater>; reference the source.*

### **3. Planning Policy Context**

This is a helpful context section. It could be improved with some additional source references for:

- MKC First Homes Policy Position Statement March 2022
- “In light of this MKC has issued a housing requirement figure of 1 to rural parishes”
- “the Parish Council is mindful of the provisions of §14 of the NPPF in respect of securing protection for the parish”.

A representation challenges the accuracy of paragraph 3.7 where it is stated that “The plan [ambiguous as to which plan] requires no further housing site allocations to be made in Haversham to 2031”. The same representation challenges paragraph 3.8: “Although expansion to the north into the parish is likely to be very limited given the environmental and landscape sensitivities and constraints, green infrastructure and water management function”. In both instances, source references or actual quotes would help to assure clarity. The Qualifying Body has suggested text amendments to address these issues, upon which my recommendations are based.

A challenge to the accuracy of Plan D is quickly resolved because the linked content is readily accessible.

### **Recommendation 3:**

*Under the heading “3. Planning Policy Context”:*

*3.1 Replace paragraphs 3.7 and 3.8 as follows:*

*‘3.7 Additionally, Policy DS1 of Plan:MK defines Haversham as ‘Villages and rural settlements’ where the approach to delivering new development places emphasis on neighbourhood plans. During the preparation of this Neighbourhood Plan, MKCC confirmed in a briefing note ([link](#)) that Plan:MK requires no further housing site allocations to be made in Haversham to 2031 but assumes that, across the whole Milton Keynes area, 35 dwellings per annum in the rural area will come forward as ‘windfall schemes’ (see Table 4.4 in the adopted Plan:MK Housing Supply). The briefing note also confirmed that MKCC has issued*

*an indicative housing requirement figure of 1 to rural parishes. There have been no subsequent changes to MKCC's adopted formal position on this matter.*

*3.8 However, a review of Plan:MK is currently in its early stages. A consultation on the ambition and objectives of The New City Plan concluded in March 2023 and the Parish Council will continue to engage in this process. The adopted MK Futures 2050 Strategy is a non-statutory framework for the longer-term spatial development of Milton Keynes which will inform the Plan:MK Review. The Strategy indicates that significant further growth is planned for Milton Keynes. Although expansion to the north into the Parish is likely to be very limited (given the environmental and landscape sensitivities and constraints, green infrastructure and water management function), as recognised at 'Discounted Options' on page 74 of the Milton Keynes Strategy for 2050 ([link](#)), the Parish Council is mindful of the provisions of §14 of the NPPF ([link](#)) in respect of securing some protection for the Parish.'*

*The links included above are as follows:*

<https://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/about-neighbourhood-planning>

<https://www.mkfutures2050.com>

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1005759/NPPF\\_July\\_2021.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf)

*3.2 Add the Neighbourhood Area boundary to Plan D.*

#### **4. Community Views on Planning Issues**

No comments.

#### **5. Vision, Objectives and Land Use Policies**

##### **Vision and Objectives**

No comments.

##### **Land Use Policies**

##### **POLICY HLL1: SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES**

A representation comments: "Policy HLL1 should be modified so that it allows for a degree of flexibility consistent with the requirements of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and allows for the consideration of sustainable development opportunities on sites adjoining the settlement where the benefits of the scheme significantly and demonstrably outweighed any harm, if these could assist with delivering the overall objectives of the HcLLNP." However, I can see that Plan:MK (Policy DS1) has already established the principle of defining Settlement Boundaries for villages and rural settlements. I note that the boundary for New Haversham repeats the boundary included in Plan:MK whereas the boundary for Old Haversham is new but follows the methodology adopted for Plan:MK. Accordingly Policy HLL1 shows general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan.

Policy HLL1 meets the Basic Conditions.

## **POLICY HLL2: HOUSING DEVELOPMENT**

Planning Practice Guidance says: “A neighbourhood plan can allocate sites for development, including housing. A qualifying body should carry out an appraisal of options and an assessment of individual sites against clearly identified criteria” (Paragraph: 042 Reference ID: 41-042-20170728). The context for Policy HLL2 is appropriately explained. However, a number of representations query a potential conflict of interests with the chosen consultants both evaluating the offered sites whilst representing the interest of the owners of the site ultimately chosen through their process. It is not clear that ‘representing’ is actually the case; the consultant had been requested to report authoritatively on the deliverability of the chosen site, which is one of the matters on which I would expect to see evidence. The consultant has clarified: “On occasions we are asked by Qualifying Bodies (QB) to work with a landowner that does not have an agreement with a developer to provide information for a proposed allocation. This allows the QB to put in front of the community enough information to enable them to understand and comment on a draft proposal. It also assists the SA/SEA with basic site information to provide an assessment on the reasonable alternatives and mitigation measures. Here, the QB had determined its vision for the HcLLNP and had made its decision to allocate the site before we had any involvement with the landowner. [The Qualifying Body] was concerned that the information provided to that point was insufficient to support an allocation policy. It required further site testing (including its deliverability or developability), a clearer site proposition to inform the allocation policy and the provision of necessary evidence for the Regulation 14 consultation .... As is common in these cases, the QB considered that the landowner’s and community’s interests were aligned and that there could therefore be no conflict of interest.” I am therefore satisfied that the process for arriving at the content for Policy HLL2 was appropriate.

A number of representations queried the basis for the choice of land in Old Haversham for housing development; one representation echoes others: “Given the still early stage of the New City Plan and the current uncertainty regarding the wider planning strategy and the lack of evidence of local housing need, it is queried whether a major development of 16 dwellings represents an appropriately sized housing allocation for Old Haversham consistent with its current status in the Local Plan settlement hierarchy as a ‘village and rural settlement’”. The Qualifying Body responded: “In preparing the HcLLNP the local community recognised the value of a small housing development for younger people and downsizers to breathe new life into its settlements and also in sustaining its valuable community assets. It was also recognised, as demonstrated in the Environment and Design Task Group Report published in the Evidence Base that Little Linford is a small, isolated settlement surrounded by agricultural land. Old Haversham is a traditional village settlement with access to a number of recreational uses including accessibility to the larger New Haversham, and its facilities. It was therefore considered that Old Haversham and New Haversham could potentially benefit from a small housing scheme with the provisions of paragraph 78 and 79 of the NPPF in mind. The Site Assessment Report included in the submission documents fully details the site evaluation process which included

consideration of all of the priority policy objectives with no particular objective in isolation. HcLLPC also notes that the provisions for small-scale affordable housing schemes to meet local rural needs in the parish (Rural Exception Sites) set out in national and strategic policy will continue to operate in the parish and such a scheme has already been successfully delivered in the parish elsewhere.” Accordingly, I am satisfied that a clear, criteria-based approach has been adopted; whilst it might be argued that different weightings might have produced different results, the actual outcome shows reasonable and realistic regard for the constraints identified.

A follow-up representation comments: “I would respectfully suggest that the site proposed on the plan does not appear to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan and does not meet the basic conditions. On this basis we would ask that this site is removed from the plan and does not get your approval for a referendum.” As I have argued above, my considered view is that the site assessment approach adopted for the Neighbourhood Plan was appropriate and carried out conscientiously. The Development Strategy section of Plan:MK at paragraph 4.30 notes: “the approach to delivering new development in villages and other rural settlements now places the emphasis on neighbourhood plans” and this is the basis for its Policy DS1. Doubtless this is because such plans have the opportunity to be more sensitive to local housing needs and local settlement issues. Accordingly, my conclusion remains that the basic conditions are met. The identification of sites to meet housing needs within a Neighbourhood Plan fulfils the expectation of the NPPF (paragraph 15) that, instead of speculative development, “The planning system should be genuinely plan-led. Succinct and up-to-date plans should provide a positive vision for the future of each area; a framework for addressing housing needs and other economic, social and environmental priorities; and a platform for local people to shape their surroundings.”

The Qualifying Body advised: “The Site Assessment Report, in particular Appendix C for the allocated site in Policy HLL2, included in the submission documents demonstrates how site capacities has [*sic*] been derived”. However, a number of representations queried how foul drainage would be achieved at the scale envisaged given the lack of mains drainage at the location. The Qualifying Body subsequently provided details of the drainage proposals and I suggest that these are added to the Appendix content.

I and others had a few detailed queries on the Policy wording:

- The allocated site is actually north of 27 High Street, Old Haversham, not south.
- In element Bi it is suggested that the “developable area is 1 Ha” – the document “Design Proposals Site 11” does not suggest there are undevelopable areas, so it is unclear what distinction is being made here.
- In elements Bii and iii it is unclear what is “full regard” is intended to suggest. The local authority has pointed out that “For clarity, the policy should state that it is MKCC’s First Homes Policy Position Statement”.
- The local authority has noted that Biv contains a typo – Policy HLL4 should be HLL5.
- The local authority has suggested amendment to elements Bviii and ix to add ‘significant’ to “environmental harm” and replace “approved” with ‘for approval’.



- In elements Bxi and xii it is unclear where is it expected that “current standing advice” will be accessed.
- Element Bxiv is assumed to refer to ‘vehicle’ electric charging points. And the local authority has suggested the addition of ‘relevant Supplementary Planning Documents’.

The Qualifying Body accepted the need for amendments and their responses have helped to inform the recommendations.

**Recommendation 4:**

**4.1 Within “Policy HLL2 Housing Development”:**

*4.1.1 In element A (and also in paragraph 5.7) amend “south” with ‘north’.*

*4.1.2 In element Bi delete “developable”.*

*4.1.3 In element Bii add ‘MKCC’s’ before “First Homes Policy”.*

*4.1.4 In elements Biii and Biv delete “full”; and in Biv replace “HLL4” with ‘HLL5’.*

*4.1.5 In element Bviii add ‘significant’ to “environmental harm” and in Bviii and also Bix replace “approved” with ‘for approval’.*

*4.1.6 In element Bxi and also Bxii replace “in accordance with current standing advice” with ‘to the satisfaction of the local planning authority’.*

*4.1.7 In element Bxiv add ‘vehicle’ in front of “electric charging” and at the end add ‘and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents’.*

*4.2 At paragraph 5.7 add a reference to ‘Appendix A: Site at Haversham Design Proposals’, formed from Appendix C*

*([www.havershamltlinford.org/\\_files/ugd/8c6ec7\\_0ee8dea123434a56944baa83fc357ad1.pdf](http://www.havershamltlinford.org/_files/ugd/8c6ec7_0ee8dea123434a56944baa83fc357ad1.pdf)) - retitled after the deletion, below, of the original Appendix A - to which should be added the drainage proposals provided with the Qualifying Body’s email dated 30<sup>th</sup> March 2023.*

As amended Policy HLL2 meets the Basic Conditions.

**POLICY HLL3: FIRST HOMES EXCEPTION SITES**

The context for the First Homes Policy is appropriately explained in the supporting text. I note that this Policy says “No other proposal for a First Homes Exception Site has been approved or implemented in the plan period”. The need for this constraint seems to arise because the opening sentence invites multiple schemes; making the plural singular would resolve the matter.

The local authority has commented: “It is not clear how the maximum scheme size and site area has been arrived at. The key factors to consider are that development should be proportionate to the size of the settlement and should meet a demonstrable need”. The

Qualifying Body has explained: “The approach in defining a gross site area is to respond to the provision made by Planning Practice Guidance to define the approach to proportionality in relation to First Homes Exception Sites. HcLLPC has adopted an approach which allows for a level of growth commensurate to the scale and character of the village which equates to approximately 5% increase in dwellings above the number of dwellings in New Haversham.” The Practice Guidance referenced says neighbourhood plans should: “set policies which specify their approach to determining the proportionality of First Homes exception site proposals, and the sorts of evidence that they might need in order to properly assess this” (Paragraph: 026 Reference ID: 70-026-20210524). I do not consider that a very specific site area and a requirement that the site be adjacent to a “main road” are the transparent criteria that the Practice Guidance encourages. Accordingly, I have recommended new wording for elements A(ii) – (iv).

The Policy refers to “a Critical Drainage Catchment area” but this is not further explained or referenced in the supporting text. The Qualifying Body has provided additional text which is the basis for my recommendation.

### **Recommendation 5:**

#### **5.1 Within “Policy HLL3 First Homes Exception Sites”:**

##### **5.1.1 Amend the opening sentence to read:**

*‘Proposals for a First Homes Exception Site at New Haversham will be supported if:’.*

##### **5.1.2 From element (i) delete “of New Haversham”.**

##### **5.1.3 Replace elements (ii) to (iv) as:**

*‘(ii) The proposal meets an evidenced housing need and is proportionate in scale to the existing settlement: for New Haversham this suggests a proposal of approximately 12 dwellings enlarging the settlement by around 5%.*

*(iii) Vehicle and pedestrian accesses are safe and convenient, and have regard for the amenity of neighbouring residents where applicable.’*

*Revise subsequent numbering accordingly.*

#### **5.2 To the supporting text for Policy HLL3 add a new paragraph as follows:**

*‘5.12 Parts of the Parish are within a Critical Drainage Catchment (CDC), as defined by the Milton Keynes Surface Water Management Plan 2016. As per Plan:MK Policy FR1, all sites within a CDC, will be expected to show that the development would not increase the CDC’s flood risk and, if possible, will improve the current situation.’*

*Revise subsequent paragraph numbering accordingly.*

As amended Policy HLL3 meets the Basic Conditions.

### **POLICY HLL4: ZERO CARBON BUILDINGS**

As noted earlier, the Basic Conditions require that a Neighbourhood Plan must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;

- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Plan for the area.

Whilst it is evidently the intent that Policy HLL4 should “contribute to the achievement of sustainable development”, and that is explained at some length in the related Appendix A, I found no clarity, either within the Plan or the related Basic Conditions Statement, as to what demonstrated “regard to national policies and advice” or “general conformity with the strategic policies” of the Plan:MK. In particular I was concerned that the Policy requires additions to the National and Local List of Planning Application Requirements; it is not open to Neighbourhood Plans to do that, they must address land use matters.

I noted to the Qualifying Body that the Government’s policy approach to the energy performance of buildings, ever since the 2015 Written Ministerial Statement and the Planning & Energy Act 2008, has consistently been that the required standards (and optional standards where applicable) will be set through the Building Regulations and not through the planning system. There is already a pathway for the Building Regulations to become more demanding. Whilst there is nothing to stop Neighbourhood Plans encouraging higher standards – and Qualifying Bodies engaging with land interests to encourage their delivery – requirements are presently set at a national level through the Building Regulations.

The Qualifying Body responded that “policy [HLL4] does not set an energy efficiency standard” but “simply provides an incentive at Clause C for developments to choose a higher energy efficient standard. Where it does choose that higher standard, the policy acknowledges that there may sometimes be a trade-off between its objectives and local design policy and guidance. Although meeting these standards ought not to compromise a scheme fitting in with the character of a local area, on occasions this may be the case”. This in turn raised concerns about whether the Policy has appropriate regard to NPPF expectations on housing design, the content relating to that having recently been strengthened.

Looking at the Policy in detail, paragraph A seems uncontentious as an ambition, and it accords with Plan:MK Policy SC1 and the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance on “Renewable and low carbon energy” ([www.gov.uk/guidance/renewable-and-low-carbon-energy](http://www.gov.uk/guidance/renewable-and-low-carbon-energy)). However, as the Qualifying Body has recognised, the expectation at this juncture ought to be a ‘should’ rather than a “must”.

Contrary to what the Qualifying Body argues, to my reading paragraph B seeks to set an energy performance standard, as “a space heating demand of less than 15KWh/m<sup>2</sup>/year” which, it is suggested, can be met using the Passivhaus Planning Package (PHPP) or equivalent design methodology. It is suggested that this is a legitimate approach since “Land values in the area are high relative to build costs and ought to be sufficient to ensure requirements to tackle improving energy and carbon performance are viable”, but this assertion is not supported with evidence. Despite the lack of evidence, it is further asserted that “Scheme viability will not therefore be acceptable as a reason for not using the Standard, unless the applicant can demonstrate the scheme has abnormal costs to

accommodate”. NPPF paragraph 31 requires that “The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence”. Further, paragraph B says, without establishing why design parameters might need to change, “the use of terraced and/or apartment building forms of plot size, plot coverage and layout that are different to those of the character area within which the proposal is located, this will be supported, provided it can be demonstrated that the scheme will not have a significant harmful effect on the character area.” This suggests that harm will be acceptable but “significant” harm will not. But no guidance is provided on what might distinguish “significant” harm. The NPPF paragraph 16d requires “policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals”.

Paragraphs C & D relate to the technical standards which are not appropriate. Paragraph E might be said to be in support of paragraph A, and in accord with Plan:MK Policy SC1, if appropriately expressed. My recommendations will therefore follow that approach.

**Recommendation 6:**

**6.1 Within “Policy HLL4 Zero Carbon Buildings”:**

*6.1.1 In paragraph A replace “must” with ‘should’.*

*6.1.2 Replace paragraph B with: ‘Development proposals are encouraged to use the Passivhaus Planning Package (PHPP) or equivalent design methodology for all buildings where it is feasible to do so.’*

*6.1.3 Delete paragraphs C & D and move paragraph E into the supporting text as below.*

**6.2 Within the supporting text for Policy HLL4:**

*6.2.1 Delete paragraphs 5.12 & 5.13 (including Appendix A) and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly.*

*6.2.2 In paragraph 5.14 replace “requires” with ‘expects’.*

*6.2.3 Replace paragraph 5.15 as follows:*

*‘Clause B encourages all schemes, no matter what their intended use or size (other than householder extensions), to use the Passivhaus Planning Package (PHPP)<sup>1</sup> [provide a related source reference footnote] or equivalent design methodology for all buildings. It is acknowledged that it may not be feasible to do so on some sites or schemes for practical reasons, which should be explained in the application.’*

*6.2.4 Replace paragraphs 5.16 – 5.21 (and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly) with what was Clause E of the Policy amended to delete “be submitted to”.*

*6.2.5 Delete the second and third sentences of paragraph 5.22.*

As amended Policy HLL4 meets the Basic Conditions.

### **POLICY HLL5: HIGH QUALITY DESIGN**

Whilst neighbourhood level attention to design matters is appropriate, the NPPF (para 128) says of design guidance: “Their geographic coverage, level of detail and degree of prescription should be tailored to the circumstances and scale of change in each place, and should allow a suitable degree of variety.” Expectations that buildings will always be of 1 or 2 storeys and that extensions must ‘match’ and ‘conform’ with adjacent buildings may be considered over-prescriptive. A representation comments “It may not be possible to do former farm building conversions from the materials and design matching the existing building”, and indeed it may not be appropriate. Given the Plan’s support for energy-efficient design, the NPPF (para 134) lends support for “outstanding or innovative designs which promote high levels of sustainability, or help raise the standard of design more generally in an area, so long as they fit in with the overall form and layout of their surroundings.” A representation has urged: “Make design quality guidance more Haversham specific and more robust.”

The Qualifying Body responded that “HcLLPC is satisfied that the suite of policies in the HcLLNP, alongside existing national and strategic policy provisions, considers and requires schemes to respond to important design requirements, for example Policy HLL8 and HLL9 on how ‘links to paths’ should be accommodated and Policy HLL10 on how ‘views to the countryside’ should be considered.” Whilst I agree with this approach it does perhaps further question the value of Policy HLL5 that takes a generic approach to design. The Qualifying Body has however suggested revised Policy wording which is the basis for my recommendation.

#### ***Recommendation 7:***

##### ***7.1 Within “Policy HLL5 High Quality Design”:***

###### ***7.1.1 Add an additional opening paragraph as follows:***

***‘A. Development proposals should acknowledge and respond to the Neighbourhood Character Appraisal, attached as Appendix B.’ Retitle subsequent paragraphs accordingly.***

***7.1.2 From the paragraph now retitled ‘B’, delete “as follows” and the subsequent content up to the paragraph now titled “C”.***

##### ***7.2 Create a new Appendix from the Neighbourhood Character Appraisal, titled Appendix B.***

As amended Policy HLL5 meets the Basic Conditions.

### **POLICY HLL6: NON-DESIGNATED HERITAGE ASSETS**

A representation comments at some length on the proposed identification of a Special Character Area at Old Haversham: “We consider that Policy HLL6 in its current form fails to comply with the various key paragraphs of the Framework and PPG. The basis of the policy

and the designation in Old Haversham fails to meet basic conditions as required by the Act. The evidence needed to support a neighbourhood plan is clear in the guidance and while there are prescribed documents that must be submitted with a Neighbourhood Plan or Order there is no 'tick box' list of evidence required for neighbourhood planning. Proportionate, robust evidence should support the choices made and the approach taken. The evidence should be drawn upon to explain succinctly the intention and rationale of the policies in the draft Neighbourhood Plan or the proposals in an Order. A local planning authority should share relevant evidence, including that gathered to support its own plan-making, with a qualifying body." The suggestion is that the supporting evidence doesn't justify the blanket identification of an area with, it is suggested, allegedly precise boundaries as a non-designated heritage asset. Following my visit to the Area I reminded the Qualifying Body of the need to identify "proportionate evidence" (Planning Practice Guidance Paragraph 40 (ID 41-040-20160211)) and for this to justify the proposal. I particularly noted a potential confusion between a heritage asset and its 'setting'. The Historic England publication "The Setting of Heritage Assets" includes the explanation (paragraph 9): "Setting is not itself a heritage asset, nor a heritage designation, although land comprising a setting may itself be designated [in its own right] ... Its importance lies in what it contributes to the significance of the heritage asset or to the ability to appreciate that significance". The details for the Haversham Mill Special Character Area provided by the Qualifying Body say "the site of the demolished old mill at Haversham (bottom of Mill Road). Including the mill race; wharf and mill house"; whilst it is difficult to appreciate the extent of these from the map because of the overlays, it is apparent that substantial areas of open ground are encompassed, the boundary to which is not evident or 'readable' on the ground. The heritage assets are the interrelated features listed; their setting is not. The Old Haversham Special Character Area is, at its core, a collection of already listed buildings (excluding the Manor Farm) but it had not been explained to me why the linking spaces have any particular merit, other than as setting (the northern boundary at one point appears to separate the garden from a related house). The old School is the only building of individual merit not already listed. To justify the proposed Area of Special Character a specific appraisal would have been required, otherwise the boundary must be tightly drawn around the buildings of merit; I sketched an illustrative map for this approach. The Qualifying Body acknowledged "The suggested boundary continues to capture the important value of this area identified in the evidence base. The Parish Council therefore agrees with the examiner's proposition on amending the proposed area."

Although I note the Plan is provided for information, a representation challenges the accuracy of the map on page 32 (the representation identifies this as Map F but the document shows it as Map H): "The plan showing the extent of Archaeological Notification Sites does not match those produce by English Heritage. As such we are unsure where the evidence for this plan comes from. If you look at DEFRA's Magic Maps and on English Natures Historical maps there are no known archaeological sites on the land owned by TM Paton and Sons. As such the plan should be redrawn." The local authority and the Qualifying Body have explained: "Plan H of the HcLLNP is a copy of the helpful interactive online mapping system MKCC operates <https://mapping.milton-keynes.gov.uk> and is considered to be accurate. It shows potential archaeological sites as identified by the Council, based on information from the Historic Environment Record. Identification of

these sites is used as an alert, that heritage assets of archaeological interest may be present. Plan:MK Policy HE1(I) states that “Proposals will be accompanied by an appropriate desk-based assessment and field evaluation where development is proposed affecting an unscheduled site of known archaeological interest or with the potential to include heritage assets with archaeological interest.” Accordingly, provided the map source is defined, I conclude that it is helpful content.

**Recommendation 8:**

*8.1 Within Policy HLL6 Non-designated Heritage Assets:*

*8.1.1 Amend Ai to read ‘Building group at Old Haversham’ and Aii as ‘Haversham Mill’.*

*8.1.2 Add to B, between “within” and “a”, ‘or significantly affecting’.*

*8.2 In the supporting text to Policy HLL6:*

*8.2.1 In paragraph 5.30 replace “many which are not” with ‘one which is not’.*

*8.2.2 In paragraph 5.31 replace “It covers an area” with ‘The location is’.*

*8.3 Add a full source reference for Plan H.*

*8.4 Amend the related Policies Maps to:*

*8.4.1 Add a Haversham Mill inset map showing the Area of Special Character as the site of the demolished old mill, the mill race, wharf and mill house only.*

*8.4.2 Amend the boundary of the Haversham Area of Special Character to hug the existing listed buildings and the old School in the manner illustrated with my email dated 21<sup>st</sup> March 2023.*

As amended Policy HLL6 meets the Basic Conditions.

**POLICY HLL7: LOCAL GREEN SPACES**

Following my visit to the Area I was able to confirm that the proposed green spaces meet the NPPF criteria for designation as Local Green Spaces. However, the key to the New Haversham Inset Policies Map has wrongly identified Policy numbers – eg Local Green Spaces are shown as HLL6 – and so that needs correction.

Policy HLL7 meets the Basic Conditions.

**Recommendation 9:**

*Correct Policies Inset Map 1 New Haversham to show the correct Policy numbers.*

**POLICY HLL8: WALKING, CYCLING AND EQUESTRIAN ROUTES**

Footpaths and bridleways are protected by other routes than Neighbourhood Plans and therefore, arguably, they should not be part of this Plan’s Policies Maps. However, I can see that their location is significant to the intent of elements 2 & 3 in Policy HLL8. I note that

the Policies Maps acknowledge “existing” in their keys. Element 1 of this Policy is a statement rather than a policy.

Although ‘aspirations’ outside of the Policy are essentially beyond the scope of the Examination, I note that a representation comments: “The short term aspirations put forward by the Neighbourhood Plan Steering [Group] regarding removing stiles and providing accessible gates on the Mill Road to Little Lane footpath goes through land which is grazed by our beef cattle, as such having accessible gates are not ideal as pedestrians using footpaths often leave the gates open ..... this is a footpath and not a bridlepath.” Further comments include “We have already made previous representations to state we do not support these new footpaths on our land”. The Qualifying Body has explained “Paragraph 5.39 of the HcLLNP recognises that there remain matters to resolve in realising opportunities to enhance the existing network, including working with landowners”.

**Recommendation 10:**

*Within “Policy HLL8 Walking, Cycling and Equestrian Routes”:*

*10.1 Move paragraph A to become a new paragraph 5.37 (and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly); amend the wording to replace “protecting” with ‘recognising’.*

*10.2 Redesignate paragraphs B & C as A & B and amend the new paragraph A by replacing “network” with ‘network of walking, cycling and equestrian routes’.*

As amended Policy HLL8 meets the Basic Conditions.

**POLICY HLL9: GREEN AND BLUE INFRASTRUCTURE**

It is appropriate that the Neighbourhood Plan “refines Plan:MK Policy NE4” by identifying the relevant features locally. However, the value of these spaces will be open to serious challenge without clarity as to how the spaces have been identified and evaluated. It cannot be said that the Plan “designates” a Green and Blue Infrastructure Network. As the text says more realistically, it locates “the presence of Green and Blue Infrastructure assets in the parish”. The related Policies Maps say that the network elements are “existing”.

No methodology is provided for the identification and separation of significant open space, or already recognised spaces, from open space in general. A representation consequently comments: “whilst we agree that the integrity of the Network should be maintained and improved (as Part B sets out) we do not consider that it is appropriate to resist proposals that would result in the loss of land within the Network when there is no apparent basis for the identification of land to be included in the Network and the land in question may not contribute towards the Network’s integrity.” Another representation comments: “Certain developments are allowed within Plan MK Linear Parks relating to tourism and leisure. As HLL9 policy C should be amended to allow such developments, otherwise it conflicts with Plan MK”. There is therefore a requirement for some adjustment to wording.



Within the supporting text, but not the Policy itself, there is reference to “opportunity for a new wildlife corridor as an extension to the Wildlife Corridors already designated [unreferenced] along the railway line and the River Ouse valley”. The owner of Linford Wood indicates they have never been consulted about this proposal, but I note that this is not a Neighbourhood Plan initiative but undertaken by a third party.

**Recommendation 11:**

**11.1 Within “Policy HLL9 Green and Blue Infrastructure”:**

*11.1.1 Move paragraph A to become a new paragraph 5.41 (and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly); amend the wording to replace “designates” with ‘recognises’, replace “for the purpose of providing” with ‘as’, and replace the last sentence with: ‘The Network comprises Local Green Spaces, as defined by Policy HLL7, Linear Parks and Nature Reserves as defined by Plan:MK, woodlands, rivers, streams, lakes, other water bodies and land of biodiversity value as defined by Natural England<sup>1</sup>, and the existing network of footpaths and bridleways as identified for Policy HLL8.’ Provide the relevant source reference footnote for Natural England.*

*11.1.2 Redesignate paragraphs B & C as A & B and amend the new paragraph A by replacing “Network” with ‘Green and Blue Infrastructure Network as shown on the Policies Map’ and replace “are required to have full regard to maintaining and improving” with ‘should maintain and improve’.*

*11.1.3 Amend the new paragraph B by replacing the first sentence with: ‘Proposals that would undermine the integrity of the Network will not be supported unless other material considerations outweigh the harm to the Network.’*

*11.2 Reduce the existing paragraph 5.41 to: ‘The Policy refines Plan:MK Policy NE4. Its purpose is linked with the vision and principles of Green Infrastructure in Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes (<https://bucksmknep.co.uk/projects/vision-and-principles-for-the-improvement-of-green-infrastructure/>) by defining a network of green infrastructure assets in the neighbourhood plan area. It also responds to the location of the parish in Ouse Valley Green Infrastructure Strategy Area (<https://bucksmknep.co.uk/projects/gi-opportunities-mapping/?location=zone08>), especially its promotion of habitat creation and linkage.’*

*11.3 In paragraph 5.44 provide the source reference for the “Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust Core and Recovery Zone in their Nature Recovery Network”:* [www.bbowt.org.uk/nature-recovery-map](http://www.bbowt.org.uk/nature-recovery-map)

As amended Policy HLL9 meets the Basic Conditions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Land of biodiversity value in Haversham are identified as Priority Habitats here <https://magic.defra.gov.uk/magicmap.aspx>

## **POLICY HLL10: IMPORTANT VIEWS**

I note in the supporting text it is said “The policy does not seek to prevent any development lying within a view but requires that proposals recognise and take account of these in their design” – but that does not actually accord with the wording of the Policy. Given that a significant number of factors will be taken in combination to assess any development proposal, it is not realistic to suggest that “Development proposals which would have a significant adverse impact on an Important View *will not be permitted*” [my emphasis added]. Potentially harmful impacts can often be mitigated by care with location, or design, and those are the types of factors that can make a new development acceptable, even though it is visible in the landscape.

The Qualifying Body responded: “HcLLPC recognises that harmful impacts can be mitigated by care with location, or design, as does Plan:MK Policy NE5 on Conserving and Enhancing Landscape Character..... It should be noted that the updated 2022 Milton Keynes Landscape Character Assessment was published following the submission of the HcLLNP and that significant components of the landscape which are identified as key characteristics in the 2016 Milton Keynes Landscape Character Assessment have continued to be identified in the updated 2022 Milton Keynes Landscape Character Assessment .... HcLLPC recognises that it may be considered that the evidence document needs to be included as an appendix to the HcLLNP and would therefore have no objection to a modification in this regard”. This response provides the basis of my recommendations below.

I note that the evaluation of views is one of the submitted documents, presumably because this might allow a prospective developer to identify what is valued about any individual view. However, a representation is critical of the helpfulness/wording of several of the view evaluations: “the evidence base should be revised to remove views which include detracting features identified in the published character assessment; or where reliance is placed on the degraded condition of features which actually require maintenance and restoration, as also set out in the published character assessment”. Having assessed the content of the evaluation document I feel that it is proportionate to the Policy, after amendment as above, and is appropriate as an Appendix to the Plan.

### **Recommendation 12:**

*12.1 Reword “Policy HLL10 Important Views” as follows:*

*‘Development proposals should conserve, and where possible enhance, the local character of the landscape, as identified in Appendix C and the 2022 Milton Keynes Landscape Character Assessment and, through sensitive design, landscape mitigation and enhancement measures, not cause adverse impacts on the Important Views identified on the Policies Maps.’*

*12.2 Amend both paragraph 5.45 and the title of Table A to reference the new ‘Appendix C Important Views’ formed from the document titled “Supporting evidence for Policy HLL10 Important Views”.*

As amended Policy HLL10 meets the Basic Conditions.

## **POLICY HLL11: LOCAL COMMUNITY USES AND PUBLIC HOUSES**

This Policy appropriately identifies local community buildings within the Neighbourhood Area for the application of Plan:MK policies. However, as noted in the supporting text, not all use changes will require a planning consent and therefore the Policy wording needs to acknowledge that. Since the identified Local Green Spaces will have been designated elsewhere in the Plan for a particular type of protection they should not be duplicated here – the remaining facilities are buildings. The local authority has also noted: “The policy shouldn’t rely on criteria from policies in another Plan (i.e. Plan:MK). Clause B of the policy should set out relevant exceptions for when change of use of community facilities would be acceptable.” The Qualifying Body acknowledged that these changes were needed.

### **Recommendation 13:**

*13.1 Bring the title of Policy HLL11 in line with the Policies Maps: ‘Local Community Facilities and Public Houses’*

*13.2 Reword “Policy HLL11 Local Community Uses and Public Houses” as follows: ‘Development proposals requiring a planning consent which would involve the loss of any community facility identified on the Policies Maps will be supported only if:*

- i) There is no longer a need for the facility for any type of community use, and this has been robustly evidenced by research and consultation; or*
- ii) An acceptable alternative facility can be provided elsewhere.’*

*13.3 Amend paragraph 5.47 to remove the opening sentence and amend the Policies Maps to remove the double identification of Local Green Spaces.*

As amended Policy HLL11 meets the Basic Conditions.

## **POLICY HLL12: MANAGING ROAD SAFETY**

Since traffic management measures normally don’t require a planning consent, these are difficult matters for a Neighbourhood Plan to influence. The local authority has also noted: “A development proposal cannot be required to go beyond mitigating its own harm and impacts.” The Policy will therefore be applicable in very limited circumstances. In my estimation, the two elements of this Policy say the same thing in two separate sets of words and the Qualifying Body agreed they should be combined.

### **Recommendation 14:**

*Amend “Policy HLL12 Managing Road Safety” to read as follows: ‘Save for householder applications, development proposals should address and ensure highway safety as is necessary to mitigate their traffic impacts.’*

As amended Policy HLL12 meets the Basic Conditions.

## **6. Implementation**

No comments.

### **Policies Maps and Insets**

The maps appear to have helpful keys readily relating back to the related Policy content but, as noted above, the key to the New Haversham Inset Map needs correction.

### **Appendices**

To summarise:

Appendix A has been deleted. The revised Appendix C 'Site at Haversham: Design Proposals' becomes Appendix A. A new Appendix B "Neighbourhood Character Appraisals" has been created from existing material, as has a new Appendix C "Important Views".

## **European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) Obligations**

A further Basic Condition, which the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan must meet, is compatibility with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations.

There is no legal requirement for a Neighbourhood Plan to have a sustainability appraisal. The "Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Statement [and] Appropriate Assessment Screening" (January 2022) carried out by Milton Keynes City Council considered whether or not the content of the Plan required a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) in accordance with the European Directive 2001/42/EC and associated Environmental Assessment of Plan and Programmes Regulations 2004. In accordance with Regulation 9 of the SEA Regulations 2004, the Council concluded: "Historic England have advised that SEA is merited in this case for the limited reason of the plan's potential for likely significant environmental effects for sites with potential for remains of archaeological interest which may comprise previously unidentified heritage assets. It is therefore the opinion of Milton Keynes Council that overall the Plan will have significant effects on the environment and that the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan does need to be subject to Strategic Environmental Assessment." In relation to the legal protection afforded to habitats and species of European importance through Directive 92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and Wild Flora and Fauna - known as the 'Habitats Directive' – the Screening concluded: "Given the role of Neighbourhood Plans and the scale of development likely to be proposed in the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan, it is considered that Appropriate Assessment of the plan is not required".

Because of the conclusion that a Strategic Environmental Assessment was required, Milton Keynes City Council carried out a "Haversham cum Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Scoping Report" in February 2022. This Report concluded: "The key issues arising out of the analysis of baseline data ..., and the review of relevant plans, have been used to identify objectives against which options for the Neighbourhood Plan and site allocations within it can be tested. The objective against

which options for site allocations should be tested is: To assess the potential to harm a heritage asset or its setting”. Historic England and other statutory consultees agreed that this was the appropriate approach. Therefore the “Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Draft Environmental Report (February 2022) was produced and used within the Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation. This Report concluded: “The preferred approach presented by the draft Plan does not lead to any significant negative effects. Any potential effects to the historic environment by the allocating of Land south [*sic*] of 27 High Street, Old Haversham have been mitigated in policy HLL2 by requiring a pre-application archaeological assessment. At this stage, one recommendation is made to mitigate the adverse effects of implementing the Plan. This is: Include an objective within the Plan to protect the parish’s historic assets, including sites of archaeological significance.” The recommendation was subsequently acted upon and the final SEA Assessment Report (July 2022) concluded: “The preferred approach presented by the Plan does not lead to any significant negative effects. Any potential effects to the historic environment by the allocating of Land south [*sic*] of 27 High Street, Old Haversham have been mitigated in policy HLL2 by requiring a pre-application archaeological assessment.”

Particularly in the absence of any adverse comments from the statutory bodies or the Local Planning Authority (either at the Regulation 14 or the Regulation 16 Consultations) I can confirm that the Assessments undertaken were appropriate and proportionate, and that the Plan has sustainability at its heart.

In regard to the European Convention on Human Rights, the Basic Conditions Statement that accompanies the Neighbourhood Plan states: “The Parish Council has been mindful of the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on Human Rights in [the] process of preparing the Neighbourhood Plan and considers that it complies with the Human Rights Act. The Neighbourhood Plan has been subject to extensive engagement with those people local to the area who could be affected by its policies and their views have been taken into account in finalising the Plan.” No evidence has arisen or been put forward to demonstrate that this is not the case.

Taking all of the above into account, I am satisfied that the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan is compatible with EU obligations and that it does not breach, nor is in any way incompatible with, the ECHR.

## Conclusions

This Independent Examiner's Report recommends a range of modifications to the Policies, as well as some of the supporting content, in the Plan. Modifications have been recommended to effect corrections, to ensure clarity and in order to ensure that the Basic Conditions are met. Whilst I have proposed a significant number of modifications, the Plan itself remains fundamentally unchanged in the role and direction set for it by the Qualifying Body.

I therefore conclude that, subject to the modifications recommended, the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan:

- has regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
- is in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Plan for the area;
- is compatible with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations;
- does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017(d).

**On that basis I *recommend* to Milton Keynes City Council that, subject to the incorporation of modifications set out as recommendations in this report, it is appropriate for the Haversham-cum-Little Linford Neighbourhood Plan to proceed to referendum.**

### Referendum Area

As noted earlier, part of my Examiner role is to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Plan area. I consider the Neighbourhood Area to be appropriate and no evidence has been submitted to suggest that this is not the case. I therefore ***recommend*** that the Plan should proceed to referendum based on the Neighbourhood Area as approved by Milton Keynes City Council on 8<sup>th</sup> February 2017.

**Recommendations:** (this is a listing of the recommendations exactly as they are included in the Report)

Rec	Text	Reason
1	<p>1.1 Consistently ensure that references to ‘Milton Keynes Council’ or ‘MKC’ are updated and changed to ‘Milton Keynes City Council’ or ‘MKCC’.</p> <p>1.2 Amend the front cover to replace “2016-2031” with ‘2022-2031’ and to remove “Submission version”.</p> <p>1.3 Within the “Foreword” replace “inspector” with ‘Examiner’.</p> <p>1.4 Review the Contents page in the light of the recommendations in this Report.</p>	For clarity and accuracy
2	<p>Under the heading “2. The Neighbourhood Area”:</p> <p>2.1 Amend the opening of paragraph 2.2 to read: “The Ouse Valley is designated as a Linear Park that runs along the edges of the city and separates it from the parish (see Plan B on page 7) and, although not contiguous, there is also a designated Wildlife Corridor”; also add to the end of the paragraph: ‘(paragraph 12.11 of Plan:MK)’.</p> <p>2.2 Replace Plan B with the relevant Linear Park detail from the Plan:MK Policy Maps with the Neighbourhood Area boundary overlaid; provide a hyperlinked reference to the source maps.</p> <p>2.3 Replace Plan C with the flood risk map publicly available on the Government website and, if possible, overlay the Neighbourhood Area boundary: <a href="https://check-long-term-flood-risk.service.gov.uk/map?eastings=483438&amp;northings=241704&amp;map=SurfaceWater">https://check-long-term-flood-risk.service.gov.uk/map?eastings=483438&amp;northings=241704&amp;map=SurfaceWater</a>; reference the source.</p>	For clarity and accuracy
3	<p>Under the heading “3. Planning Policy Context”:</p> <p>3.1 Replace paragraphs 3.7 and 3.8 as follows:  ‘3.7 Additionally, Policy DS1 of Plan:MK defines Haversham as ‘Villages and rural settlements’ where the approach to delivering new development places emphasis on neighbourhood plans. During the preparation of this Neighbourhood Plan, MKCC confirmed in a briefing note (link) that Plan:MK requires no further housing site allocations to be made in Haversham to 2031 but assumes that, across the whole Milton Keynes area, 35 dwellings per annum in the rural area will come forward as ‘windfall schemes’ (see Table 4.4 in the adopted Plan:MK Housing Supply). The briefing note also confirmed that MKCC has issued an indicative housing requirement</p>	For clarity and accuracy

	<p>figure of 1 to rural parishes. There have been no subsequent changes to MKCC’s adopted formal position on this matter.</p> <p>3.8 However, a review of Plan:MK is currently in its early stages. A consultation on the ambition and objectives of The New City Plan concluded in March 2023 and the Parish Council will continue to engage in this process. The adopted MK Futures 2050 Strategy is a non-statutory framework for the longer-term spatial development of Milton Keynes which will inform the Plan:MK Review. The Strategy indicates that significant further growth is planned for Milton Keynes. Although expansion to the north into the Parish is likely to be very limited (given the environmental and landscape sensitivities and constraints, green infrastructure and water management function), as recognised at ‘Discounted Options’ on page 74 of the Milton Keynes Strategy for 2050 (link), the Parish Council is mindful of the provisions of §14 of the NPPF (link) in respect of securing some protection for the Parish.’</p> <p>The links included above are as follows:</p> <p><a href="https://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/about-neighbourhood-planning">https://www.milton-keynes.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/about-neighbourhood-planning</a></p> <p><a href="https://www.mkfutures2050.com">https://www.mkfutures2050.com</a></p> <p><a href="https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf">https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf</a></p> <p>3.2 Add the Neighbourhood Area boundary to Plan D.</p>	
4	<p>4.1 Within “Policy HLL2 Housing Development”:</p> <p>4.1.1 In element A (and also in paragraph 5.7) amend “south” with ‘north’.</p> <p>4.1.2 In element Bi delete “developable”.</p> <p>4.1.3 In element Bii add ‘MKCC’s’ before “First Homes Policy”.</p> <p>4.1.4 In elements Biii and Biv delete “full”; and in Biv replace “HLL4” with ‘HLL5’.</p> <p>4.1.5 In element Bviii add ‘significant’ to “environmental harm” and in Bviii and also Bix replace “approved” with ‘for approval’.</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1



	<p>4.1.6 In element Bxi and also Bxii replace “in accordance with current standing advice” with ‘to the satisfaction of the local planning authority’.</p> <p>4.1.7 In element Bxiv add ‘vehicle’ in front of “electric charging” and at the end add ‘and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents’.</p> <p>4.2 At paragraph 5.7 add a reference to ‘Appendix A: Site at Haversham Design Proposals’, formed from Appendix C (<a href="http://www.havershamltlinford.org/_files/ugd/8c6ec7_0ee8dea123434a56944baa83fc357ad1.pdf">www.havershamltlinford.org/_files/ugd/8c6ec7_0ee8dea123434a56944baa83fc357ad1.pdf</a>) - retitled after the deletion, below, of the original Appendix A - to which should be added the drainage proposals provided with the Qualifying Body’s email dated 30th March 2023.</p>	
5	<p>5.1 Within “Policy HLL3 First Homes Exception Sites”:</p> <p>5.1.1 Amend the opening sentence to read: ‘Proposals for a First Homes Exception Site at New Haversham will be supported if:’.</p> <p>5.1.2 From element (i) delete “of New Haversham”.</p> <p>5.1.3 Replace elements (ii) to (iv) as:  ‘(ii) The proposal meets an evidenced housing need and is proportionate in scale to the existing settlement: for New Haversham this suggests a proposal of approximately 12 dwellings enlarging the settlement by around 5%.</p> <p>(iii) Vehicle and pedestrian accesses are safe and convenient, and have regard for the amenity of neighbouring residents where applicable.’</p> <p>Revise subsequent numbering accordingly.</p> <p>5.2 To the supporting text for Policy HLL3 add a new paragraph as follows:  ‘5.12 Parts of the Parish are within a Critical Drainage Catchment (CDC), as defined by the Milton Keynes Surface Water Management Plan 2016. As per Plan:MK Policy FR1, all sites within a CDC, will be expected to show that the development would not increase the CDC’s flood risk and, if possible, will improve the current situation.’</p> <p>Revise subsequent paragraph numbering accordingly.</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1

6	<p>6.1 Within “Policy HLL4 Zero Carbon Buildings”:</p> <p>6.1.1 In paragraph A replace “must” with ‘should’.</p> <p>6.1.2 Replace paragraph B with: ‘Development proposals are encouraged to use the Passivhaus Planning Package (PHPP) or equivalent design methodology for all buildings where it is feasible to do so.’</p> <p>6.1.3 Delete paragraphs C &amp; D and move paragraph E into the supporting text as below.</p> <p>6.2 Within the supporting text for Policy HLL4:</p> <p>6.2.1 Delete paragraphs 5.12 &amp; 5.13 (including Appendix A) and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly.</p> <p>6.2.2 In paragraph 5.14 replace “requires” with ‘expects’.</p> <p>6.2.3 Replace paragraph 5.15 as follows:</p> <p>‘Clause B encourages all schemes, no matter what their intended use or size (other than householder extensions), to use the Passivhaus Planning Package (PHPP) 1 [provide a related source reference footnote] or equivalent design methodology for all buildings. It is acknowledged that it may not be feasible to do so on some sites or schemes for practical reasons, which should be explained in the application.’</p> <p>6.2.4 Replace paragraphs 5.16 – 5.21 (and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly) with what was Clause E of the Policy amended to delete “be submitted to”.</p> <p>6.2.5 Delete the second and third sentences of paragraph 5.22.</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1
7	<p>7.1 Within “Policy HLL5 High Quality Design”:</p> <p>7.1.1 Add an additional opening paragraph as follows: ‘A. Development proposals should acknowledge and respond to the Neighbourhood Character Appraisal, attached as Appendix B.’ Retitle subsequent paragraphs accordingly.</p> <p>7.1.2 From the paragraph now retitled ‘B’, delete “as follows” and the subsequent content up to the paragraph now titled “C”.</p> <p>7.2 Create a new Appendix from the Neighbourhood Character Appraisal, titled Appendix B.</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1

8	<p>8.1 Within Policy HLL6 Non-designated Heritage Assets:</p> <p>8.1.1 Amend Ai to read ‘Building group at Old Haversham’ and Aii as ‘Haversham Mill’.</p> <p>8.1.2 Add to B, between “within” and “a”, ‘or significantly affecting’.</p> <p>8.2 In the supporting text to Policy HLL6:</p> <p>8.2.1 In paragraph 5.30 replace “many which are not” with ‘one which is not’.</p> <p>8.2.2 In paragraph 5.31 replace “It covers an area” with ‘The location is’.</p> <p>8.3 Add a full source reference for Plan H.</p> <p>8.4 Amend the related Policies Maps to:</p> <p>8.4.1 Add a Haversham Mill inset map showing the Area of Special Character as the site of the demolished old mill, the mill race, wharf and mill house only.</p> <p>8.4.2 Amend the boundary of the Haversham Area of Special Character to hug the existing listed buildings and the old School in the manner illustrated with my email dated 21st March 2023.</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1
9	Correct Policies Inset Map 1 New Haversham to show the correct Policy numbers.	For clarity and accuracy
10	<p>Within “Policy HLL8 Walking, Cycling and Equestrian Routes”:</p> <p>10.1 Move paragraph A to become a new paragraph 5.37 (and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly); amend the wording to replace “protecting” with ‘recognising’.</p> <p>10.2 Redesignate paragraphs B &amp; C as A &amp; B and amend the new paragraph A by replacing “network” with ‘network of walking, cycling and equestrian routes’.</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Condition 1
11	<p>11.1 Within “Policy HLL9 Green and Blue Infrastructure”:</p> <p>11.1.1 Move paragraph A to become a new paragraph 5.41 (and renumber subsequent paragraphs accordingly); amend the wording to replace “designates” with ‘recognises’, replace “for the purpose of providing” with ‘as’, and replace the last sentence with: ‘The Network comprises Local Green Spaces, as defined by Policy HLL7, Linear Parks and Nature Reserves as</p>	For clarity and accuracy and to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3

	<p>defined by Plan:MK, woodlands, rivers, streams, lakes, other water bodies and land of biodiversity value as defined by Natural England , and the existing network of footpaths and bridleways as identified for Policy HLL8.’ Provide the relevant source reference footnote for Natural England.</p> <p>11.1.2 Redesignate paragraphs B &amp; C as A &amp; B and amend the new paragraph A by replacing “Network” with ‘Green and Blue Infrastructure Network as shown on the Policies Map’ and replace “are required to have full regard to maintaining and improving” with ‘should maintain and improve’.</p> <p>11.1.3 Amend the new paragraph B by replacing the first sentence with: ‘Proposals that would undermine the integrity of the Network will not be supported unless other material considerations outweigh the harm to the Network.’</p> <p>11.2 Reduce the existing paragraph 5.41 to: ‘The Policy refines Plan:MK Policy NE4. Its purpose is linked with the vision and principles of Green Infrastructure in Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes (<a href="https://bucksmknep.co.uk/projects/vision-and-principles-for-the-improvement-of-green-infrastructure/">https://bucksmknep.co.uk/projects/vision-and-principles-for-the-improvement-of-green-infrastructure/</a>) by defining a network of green infrastructure assets in the neighbourhood plan area. It also responds to the location of the parish in Ouse Valley Green Infrastructure Strategy Area (<a href="https://bucksmknep.co.uk/projects/gi-opportunities-mapping/?location=zone08">https://bucksmknep.co.uk/projects/gi-opportunities-mapping/?location=zone08</a>), especially its promotion of habitat creation and linkage.’</p> <p>11.3 In paragraph 5.44 provide the source reference for the “Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust Core and Recovery Zone in their Nature Recovery Network”: <a href="http://www.bbwt.org.uk/nature-recovery-map">www.bbwt.org.uk/nature-recovery-map</a></p>	
12	<p>12.1 Reword “Policy HLL10 Important Views” as follows: ‘Development proposals should conserve, and where possible enhance, the local character of the landscape, as identified in Appendix C and the 2022 Milton Keynes Landscape Character Assessment and, through sensitive design, landscape mitigation and enhancement measures, not cause adverse impacts on the Important Views identified on the Policies Maps.’</p> <p>12.2 Amend both paragraph 5.45 and the title of Table A to reference the new ‘Appendix C Important Views’ formed from the document titled “Supporting evidence for Policy HLL10 Important Views”.</p>	For clarity and accuracy to meet Basic Conditions 1 & 3
13	13.1 Bring the title of Policy HLL11 in line with the Policies Maps: ‘Local Community Facilities and Public Houses’	For clarity and accuracy

	<p>13.2 Reword “Policy HLL11 Local Community Uses and Public Houses” as follows:  ‘Development proposals requiring a planning consent which would involve the loss of any community facility identified on the Policies Maps will be supported only if:</p> <p>i) There is no longer a need for the facility for any type of community use, and this has been robustly evidenced by research and consultation; or</p> <p>ii) An acceptable alternative facility can be provided elsewhere.’</p> <p>13.3 Amend paragraph 5.47 to remove the opening sentence and amend the Policies Maps to remove the double identification of Local Green Spaces.</p>	<p>and to meet Basic Conditions 1 &amp; 3</p>
14	<p>Amend “Policy HLL12 Managing Road Safety” to read as follows:  ‘Save for householder applications, development proposals should address and ensure highway safety as is necessary to mitigate their traffic impacts.’</p>	<p>For clarity and to meet Basic Conditions 1 &amp; 3</p>