

AYLESBURY VALE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Town and Country Planning Act 1990**The Town and Country Planning (General Development Orders)****13/00391/AOP**

Mr Nick Freer
David Lock Associates
50 North Thirteenth Street
CENTRAL MILTON KEYNES
MK9 3BP

Hallam Land Management
3 Apex Court
Woodlands, Bradley Stoke
BRISTOL
BS22 4JT

Subsequent to your application that was valid on the **11 February 2013** and in pursuance of their powers under the above mentioned Act and Orders, the Aylesbury Vale District Council as Local Planning Authority **HEREBY REFUSE PERMISSION FOR:**

Outline application (with access to be considered and all other matters reserved) for the demolition of Dunsham Farm and associated buildings and redevelopment of site to provide up to 1560 dwellings, a 2 form entry primary school and children's nursery, a mixed use local centre to include 8000sqm GEA floor space for small scale retail, employment, healthcare, extra care sports pavilion, community uses and some residential use (Use Classes A1 to A5, C3, D1-D2) inclusive of up to 1500 sqm GEA of retail (A1-A5) and up to 200 sqm GEA of employment (B1a & B1b), green infrastructure comprising new community parks including linear park, landscaping including new woodland planting, open space, allotments, sports pitches, play areas, sustainable urban drainage feature, new Main Link Road to connect A418 & A413 including a crossing of the River Thames and associated works of access, new walking and cycling routes, ground modelling and infrastructure provision including drainage, parking and lighting

AT:

Land East of A413 Buckingham Road and Watermead Aylesbury

The reasons for refusing your application are:

- 1 The proposal is a departure from the adopted Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan and the emerging Vale of Aylesbury Plan. Furthermore, the substantial scale and nature of the proposed development is such that were it permitted either in isolation or in conjunction with other similar substantial proposals, it will prejudice the emerging Vale of Aylesbury Plan by pre-determining a decision about the scale and location of development that should properly be addressed through the plan-making process.
- 2 The proposal would conflict with policies GP35 and RA2 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan and would not constitute sustainable development. It would fail to comply with the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, to conserve and enhance the natural environment and to reuse land that has been previously developed. The development is of a scale and nature on a greenfield site in the open countryside which would result in the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. The development would cause harm by the significant adverse visual and landscape character impact on the area of the development site and its surrounding valued landscape including through the loss of the historic parliamentary field enclosures and to the settlement identity of Berton. The extension to the built up edge of Aylesbury would lead to coalescence between settlements and which would be harmful to the character and identity of Watermead and to Berton. This is contrary to the Development Plan and to advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 3 Insufficient information has been submitted with the planning application to enable the highways, traffic and transportation implications of the proposed development to be fully assessed. From the information submitted, it is not considered that the development could take place without having a severe impact on the existing highway network and it has not been proven to promote sustainable transport and therefore, would fail to accord with advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework or the aims of Buckinghamshire's Local Transport Plan.
- 4 Insufficient information has been submitted with the planning application to enable the cumulative impact of the development on the highway network when considered in relation to other proposals for mixed use urban extensions at Aylesbury at Weedon Hill, Fleet Marston and Hampden Fields to be fully assessed. From the information submitted, the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the cumulative impact of these developments would not have a severe impact on the existing highway network and therefore, would fail to accord with advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework or the aims of Buckinghamshire's Local Transport Plan.
- 5 The proposed development does not seek to provide any dedicated employment land and as such, the proposals will not deliver any substantial growth in jobs in the District. The absence of any employment land weighs against the sustainability credentials of the scheme and undermines the Council priority for economic led growth as identified in the emerging The Vale of Aylesbury Plan and would fail to accord with advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and objectives set out in the Council's Economic Development Strategy 2011-2014.
- 6 The submitted Flood Risk Assessment fails to demonstrate that the development is 'safe' and will not increase flood risk to the surrounding area and does not consider opportunities presented by the development for reducing flood risk to the site and surrounding site and does not pass the Sequential Test or part 2 of the Exception Test and would fail to accord with one of the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework to take full account of flood risk.
- 7 Insufficient information has been submitted to adequately demonstrate that the proposed development will result in a net enhancement for biodiversity and fails to demonstrate that the risks posed by the development can be satisfactorily avoided, mitigated or compensated for. In the absence of such information and in particular the level of ecological survey information submitted with respect to existing wildlife and species, effective mitigation cannot be proposed or assessed and it is also not clear whether European Protected Species are present on site and therefore, there is insufficient information for the Local Planning Authority to assess the proposals against the '3 tests' of the Habitats Directive. As such, it is considered that the proposal would be contrary to some of the principles contained in the Aylesbury Vale Green Infrastructure Strategy 2011-2026 (2011) and with advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and to the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan policy GP66.
- 8 The submitted application fails to provide adequate archaeological information to be able to assess the likely affect of the development on any archaeological or related historic interests of which there is high potential to be found within the application site. In the absence of such information, it is considered that it is not possible to assess the archaeological significance of the site which is contrary to the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan policy GP59 and advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 9 The submitted application fails to demonstrate that the costs of providing the necessary infrastructure could be met to satisfy the requirements of the County Council and District Council in accordance with policy and which would enable the development to achieve acceptable levels of affordable housing provision, educational provision, leisure and equipped play provision, environmental standards and infrastructure either through on or off site provision or financial contribution. As a result of this the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposal will constitute a sustainable urban extension that fulfils a social economic and environmental role and is integrated with and will strengthen the traditional role of Aylesbury as a County and market town. The development therefore conflicts with policies GP2, GP45, GP86, GP87, GP88, GP89, GP90, GP91 and GP94 of the Aylesbury Vale District Local Plan and the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework to achieve sustainable development.

INFORMATIVE


In accordance with paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the Council, in dealing with this application, has worked in a positive and proactive way with the Applicant and has focused on seeking solutions to the issues arising from the development proposal.

AVDC works with applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by:

- offering a pre-application advice service,
- updating applicants/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application as appropriate and, where possible and appropriate, suggesting solutions.

In this case, no pre-application advice was sought and AVDC has therefore considered the application as submitted and consider that the harm caused by the development significantly and demonstrably outweighs any benefits when assessed against the NPPF as a whole and the other relevant considerations and as such, is not considered acceptable.

Your attention is drawn to the notes on the back of this form.



**For and on behalf of the District Council
29 May 2013**