



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 5 - 8 March, 12 - 15 March, 26 - 28 March, 16 April - 19 April and 20 May - 21 May 2024

Site visits made on 25th March, 10th April and 17th July 2024

by M Woodward BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11/09/2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K0425/W/23/3332257

Land at Gomm Valley, Gomm Road, High Wycombe, Buckinghamshire
HP10 8HB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for full and outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Taylor Wimpey UK Limited against Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application reference 22/06485/OUTEA, is dated 25 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is: -hybrid application consisting of a phased delivery of: full planning application for construction of 79 dwellings (Class C3) including associated vehicular access, areas of open space, ecological enhancements, hard and soft landscaping, and associated infrastructure. Outline application for 4 custom-build units within Parcel 1 and up to 461 dwellings (Class C3), a 1FE primary school and early years provision, up to 1.4 hectares of employment land to provide flexible floorspace of Class E(g), B2 and B8 uses and up to 201m² of community floorspace (Class F2) within Parcels 2-8 together with ecological enhancements, green open spaces, hard and soft landscaping and associated highways and drainage infrastructure (with matters reserved as shown in the Application Boundary Plan 21020 S202).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Procedural and Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal results from the **Council's failure to determine the planning application** within the prescribed time period. **The Council's Statement of Case** includes the putative reasons as to why planning permission would have been refused had the Council been empowered to do so. These putative reasons for refusal (RfR) have been taken into account, along with the other evidence before me, in forming the main issues in this appeal.
3. The appellant sought an amended description of development which, in summary, sought to reserve some of the detail in relation to the proposed employment and school sites. Specifically, the amended description refers to '*Application Boundary Plan 20120 S202*'. This plan was submitted with the planning application and therefore, was subject to publicity and consultation. However, this plan is inconsistent with the '*Scale and Layout Plan 20120 C612*', also submitted with the planning application, which shows layout and other details of the proposed employment and school sites. Consequently, the original description of development does not correspond with the complete suite of plans which have been subject to consultation.

4. The amended description would not introduce any additional built form, nor alter the maximum extent or nature of development applied for. In essence, it **would reserve a relatively small part of the scheme's detail for future** consideration. To that extent, the changes sought in relation to **the proposal's** overall scale and complexity would not be significant.
5. During the Inquiry I issued a Ruling accepting the amended description on the basis that further consultation was carried out during the course of the Inquiry¹. Following the completion of this exercise, I am satisfied that the amended description of development is minor in nature and not prejudicial to the interests of parties². For these reasons the description of development contained in the banner heading above is different to that originally applied for.
6. A draft Section 106 Agreement under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 was submitted by the appellant during the Inquiry and subsequently signed by the main parties³. Where relevant to my decision, I deal with this in my reasoning.
7. A number of documents were submitted during the course of the Inquiry, as detailed in Annex B. Each document was accepted on the basis of their relevance to the appeal and exceptional circumstances for their late submission and where necessary, parties were given an opportunity to comment on them. I am satisfied that no procedural unfairness results.
8. The proposal is EIA development⁴ (EIA) and the planning application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement (ES) summarising the findings of **the EIA process. Despite the Council's objections** to the scheme and disagreement over some of the conclusions drawn in the ES, they are satisfied that it meets the requirements of Regulation 18 of the EIA Regs, as am I.
9. Matters concerning the provision of cycle infrastructure (RfR2), safe and suitable access and parking in relation to the proposed employment site (RfR4), and the adequacy of the proposed surface water drainage strategy (RfR16) were resolved between the main parties during the Inquiry. I am satisfied that these matters warrant no further detailed analysis.
10. After the Inquiry closed, the Government published a consultation on '*proposed reforms to the NPPF and other changes to the planning system*' including the '*National Planning Policy Framework: draft text*'. The Secretary of State also issued a Written Ministerial Statement '*Building the homes we need*'. The main parties were given the opportunity to comment on these publications and I have considered their subsequent responses accordingly (ID64 and ID65).

Main Issues

11. The main issues in this case are:

- The effects of the proposal on highway safety and capacity.
- The effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to landscape and visual effects.

¹ ID12

² Satisfying the principles set out in *Holborn Studios Ltd v The Council of the London Borough of Hackney* [2017] EWHC 2823 (Admin)

³ ID63

⁴ The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Regs)

- Whether the scheme would achieve a well-designed place, having regard to its design attributes, and the living conditions of potential future occupiers of the proposed development.
- The suitability of the proposal having regard to accessibility, specifically the provision of wheelchair user dwellings.
- Biodiversity effects of the proposal, including on ancient woodland, having regard to mitigation and enhancement.

Reasons

Policy, guidance and background

12. The development plan includes the Wycombe District Local Plan (2019) (Local Plan), within which the appeal site occupies a *Residential-Led Mixed Use* allocation. Policy HW6 of the Local Plan deals specifically with the '**Gomm Valley and Ashwells**' allocated site (allocation) and this is the most important policy for determining the appeal. Insofar as is relevant to this appeal, the development plan also includes the Adopted Delivery and Site Allocations Plan for Town Centres and Managing Development (2013) (ADSAP).
13. The northern part of the allocation benefits from an extant, separate outline planning permission for up to 109 dwellings (Ashwells)⁵, which has not yet been built out. The appeal site is larger, occupying approximately 65 hectares (ha) of the total 74 ha allocation. Whilst the acceptability of specific elements of the proposal are disagreed, there is no dispute between the main parties that the principle of the type of development proposed in this appeal is acceptable.
14. Along with the Local Plan, the Gomm Valley and Ashwells Development Brief 2017 (DB) provides a planning framework for the allocation. The DB was formulated with input from various technical, independent experts and was subject to extensive consultation with a range of stakeholders.
15. Whilst it is a non-statutory guidance document⁶ which does not form part of the development plan, the DB is explicitly referred to in the supporting text of Local Plan Policy HW6 and the criterion of the Policy also closely resembles the **DB's Development Framework Objectives** (the Objectives). The '**illustrative layout**', contained within Policy HW6, is taken directly from the DB, and provides an overview as to how a policy compliant scheme might look.
16. Therefore, whilst the DB was produced before the Local Plan, the weight attributed to this document should not hinge on its age; rather, it forms a robust evidence base which subsequently influenced the content of the more recent Policy HW6 contained within the Local Plan. As such, the DB is a material consideration of significant weight, comprising a steppingstone between the Local Plan and the requirements of any proposal.
17. Nevertheless, it is a high level, strategic guide to site development. Where detailed technical work is undertaken as part of a development proposal, it may transpire that there are alternative, more suitable ways of achieving the Objectives.

⁵ ID19

⁶ CD6.1 - para 2.6

Highways

Background

18. The vehicular accesses to connect the surrounding roads with the proposed residential parcels would be provided in general accordance with the DB⁷. This would include an access from Hammersley Lane into Parcel 1, an access from Gomm Road to link with the southern end of the proposed spine road, and an **access from Cock Lane to the spine road's northern end**. The site is in a sustainable location, evidenced by its allocation, and the scheme includes a range of sustainable travel measures.

Highway Capacity

Traffic Generation and Traffic Model

19. The A40 (also known as London Road) is a strategic route which links High Wycombe with urban areas to the east, including Beaconsfield and the M40. For the purposes of this appeal, the main affected corridor of the A40 comprises a series of six linked, signal controlled junctions (the corridor).
20. Whilst traffic modelling was undertaken as part of the allocation, and traffic impacts are an inevitable consequence developing the site, Local Plan Policy HW6 sets out a range of necessary transport related works, including a requirement for a contribution towards a wider A40 package and capacity improvements at the Gomm Road junction. Policy CP7, relating to the delivery of infrastructure, also highlights the road as a local priority, requiring development to provide or contribute to measures to improve the conditions on London Road, where justified⁸.
21. The Transport Assessment (TA) considers the A40 corridor based on a 2028 design year. This includes modelled traffic flows in 2028 comprising the baseline, along with other committed developments, but excluding the proposal (*do minimum*). Traffic flows through these junctions and subsequent analysis is based on the AM peak and PM peak, representing the times of the day when traffic flows would be generally at their highest.
22. In relation to the baseline *do minimum*, the distribution and assignment of traffic flows on the highway network **were based on the Council's Visum traffic model**, with trip rates for each respective element agreed with the Council and applied in relation to the proposal (*do something*). In effect, *do something* modelled anticipated traffic generation, trip distribution and assignment associated with the proposal in combination with the baseline 2028 *do minimum* scenario.
23. The modelled forecast traffic flows for *do something* includes traffic management measures necessary to alleviate potential traffic increases and 'rat running' along Orchard Road (Orchard Road measures). The traffic flowing through each of the affected junctions along the corridor included in the *do something* incorporates two different scenarios, based on the different Orchard Road options. These are:
- a) the closure of Orchard Road to general traffic and the implementation of a bus gate; or,*

⁷ CD6.1 – figure 5.3

⁸ Policy CP7 2)(a) of the Local Plan

b) partial closure of Orchard Road so as to allow only east-bound only traffic along it.

Network performance as modelled – existing/forecast baseline

24. For the purposes of forecasting future performance of the A40 corridor in association with the proposal, the appellant utilised a linked LinSig traffic model. LinSig modelling outputs include queue lengths and Degree of Saturation (DoS). The latter can be used to determine traffic flows in relation to the physical capacity of lanes to accommodate traffic⁹.
25. Given the importance of this transport corridor and the potential capacity issues set out in the Local Plan, a comprehensive understanding of the A40 corridor, including the capacity of its junctions, is fundamental to inform the type of modelling necessary to accurately forecast traffic impacts associated with the development. Consequently, I sought additional clarity on junction performance during the Inquiry and the relevant DoS was subsequently extracted from the appendices within the TA and presented to the Inquiry as ID37a-c and ID38. Relevant extracts from these tables are set out below.

Table 1 - showing Degree of Saturation (%)		Observed Flows (2021)		Do Minimum (2028 Baseline)		Do Something (2028 baseline + development + Orchard Rd Bus Gate)		Do Something (2028 baseline + development + Orchard Rd one way eastbound Only)	
		AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
1	A40 /Micklefield Road/Ryemead Way	85.1	82.5	116.9	91.1	125.2	90.9	131.6	91.3
2	A40/Cock Lane	75.4	80	87.5	82.4	89.5	79	89.7	80.6
3	A40/Abbey Barn Road	59.5	78.7	99.2	166.9	99.2	116.5	99.1	116.5
4	A40/Gomm Road	72.3	62.4	63.5	68.5	84.3	85.6	76.2	81.5
5	A40/Hammersley Lane	76.6	76.4	82.9	91.5	83.4	83.5	85.2	83.5
6	A40/Rayners Avenue	79.7	79.7	98	85.5	106.2	82.4	103.2	85

26. The junction performance outputs tabulated above assist in this case as they help determine whether any junction along the corridor has the capacity to operate efficiently before any additional traffic impacts associated with the scheme are considered. In this regard, LinSig guidance considers any lane

⁹ ID40

over 90% DoS to be over saturated indicating that it has no Practical Reserve Capacity¹⁰ (PRC).

27. In the context of this appeal, forecast background traffic growth is important. This is because traffic flowing through the junctions is anticipated to increase by 2028 *do minimum*, in some cases markedly so, during both the AM and PM peak, in comparison with the recorded situation in 2021¹¹, irrespective of this scheme coming forwards.
28. This is indicative of a corridor which is forecast to be highly congested, where queues are more likely to form and the network more likely to experience poor performance due to limited reserve capacity. As such, realistic and detailed analysis of development traffic impacts is necessary.
29. However, the forecast network capacity does not appear to have had a **significant bearing on the appellant's decision to utilise LinSig to determine** future traffic impacts, as opposed to a microsimulation model, which the Council states would provide better representation of network performance and driver behaviour in this case.
30. This is surprising because the appellant considered the use of an alternative, microsimulation modelling package and pro-actively engaged with the Council at pre-application stage with a view to utilising it to assess the implications of the scheme¹².

Network performance as modelled – proposal

31. Focussing now on the modelling of the scheme itself, which is forecast to generate around 500 two-way vehicular movements during the AM peak and over 400 during the PM peak¹³. In terms of traffic reassignment, and having regard to the Orchard Road measures, there would be some differences between traffic flows at individual junctions depending on whether the Orchard Road '**bus gate**' or '**eastbound-one way**' scheme was adopted.
32. In either case the increase in traffic at the Gomm Road junction would be greatest, forecast between 12% and 17% over and above the *do minimum* during the AM and PM peak, although still exhibiting positive PRC. In relation to other affected junctions, when comparing either of the Orchard Road measures and the proposed scheme with the *do minimum*, traffic flows would likely decrease at some junctions (in comparison with *do minimum*) due to traffic re-assignment and increase at others during the AM and PM peak¹⁴.
33. Nevertheless, when considering *do something*, the corridor would be overloaded, with several junctions anticipated to experience a negative PRC and others with limited PRC during the AM or PM peak¹⁵, with some of the individual lanes within each junction also being over-saturated¹⁶. This is indicative of an unstable network, which has potential negative implications in respect of efficient operation, driver delay and traffic congestion.

¹⁰ ID40

¹¹ CD2.10 – Figures 3.1,3.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.7, 6.8

¹² Para 2.2.6 of Mr Marshall Highways rebuttal proof (Appellant)

¹³ CD2.10 – Appendix F

¹⁴ CD2.10 – Figures 3.1,3.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.7, 6.8

¹⁵ ID38 – table 1

¹⁶ As set out in ID37b and ID37c

34. To provide some context to the anticipated DoS, the modelled length of a queue relative to lane length helps in understanding the implications of junction saturation on the ground. Of the outputs modelled, the Mean Maximum Queue length (MMQ) is a more robust measure in this case, as this shows the length of queues based on the sum of the maximum back of uniform queue and random and oversaturated queues.
35. As the Council explained during the Inquiry and as part of the evidence, when vehicle numbers in a modelled queue stretch beyond the available space in any lane, this can lead to blocking back past other junctions. The evidence indicates that this is more likely when any lane is highly saturated, because queues forming during a red-light sequence may not fully clear during the green light, and random and potential residual queues could build over subsequent cycles. In other words, the queue formed may not clear every cycle and queues have the potential to be carried over to the next cycle.
36. The alternative Maximum Back of Uniform Queue (plotted 'red' in **Appendix J of appellant's** proof) does not include random and oversaturation queues forming whilst the queue is clearing during a cycle, which are more likely in this case. **It is for these reasons that the MMQ (plotted green in Appendix J of appellant's** proof) is preferable.
37. Looking in more detail at the modelled outputs, **Appendix I of the appellant's** proof highlights the individual lanes of junctions where traffic could potentially exceed lane length¹⁷, with Appendix J containing a graphical representation of the potential queues, including the MMQ at each of the junctions.
38. However, whilst I have concluded that MMQ is more suitable, it cannot be relied upon as a precise measure of junction performance in this case. This is because the MMQ represents the average over the modelled period which, statistically, will be regularly exceeded. Exceedance is more likely in situations where the MMQ for any particular lane is close to its capacity, and where oversaturation conditions are likely to prevail. Therefore, the final queue at the end of the modelled period in those circumstances could theoretically double the modelled MMQ according to the LinSig user manual¹⁸.
39. This is best illustrated by focusing on the A40/Abbey Barn Road junction. The junction is forecast to experience an MMQ during the PM peak of up to approximately 730m in a westbound direction (Orchard Road full closure) or approximately 658m (Orchard Road eastbound - one way). The lane in question here is red flagged in **Appendix I of the appellant's** proof, as it is 312m in length, significantly short of the anticipated MMQ, indicating that the lane would not be able to contain the *average* maximum queue.
40. In relation to this lane, a geometric correction was applied by the appellant to the graphical outputs in Appendix J, which I was told more accurately reflects the layout of lanes on the ground. However, whichever version of the plotted MMQ is analysed in Appendix J¹⁹, it exhibits an hourly average queue extending past the Gomm Road junction during the PM peak.
41. **The appellant's response to this point**, and indeed all other examples of potential traffic blocking past upstream junctions along the corridor as depicted

¹⁷ Para 7.4.14 of Mr Marshall Highways Proof (Appellant)

¹⁸ **Para 2.36 and 'mean maximum queue' definition of Mrs Radley Highways** rebuttal Proof (Council)

¹⁹ And ID39

- by Appendix J, relies partly on their assertion that any queue reaching an upstream junction would do so at the very end of the cycle, which would subsequently clear as traffic flows through the network, ensuring network performance is maintained²⁰.
42. However, this is not a satisfactory response in light of the evidence before me. Indeed, **the appellant's reference to the 'LinSig Queue Graph'**²¹ underlines what I consider to be a misguided approach, as it exhibits a uniform queuing scenario, which assumes that the queues forming at each junction would be uniform and would clear every cycle. This is not reflective of the overloaded situation as forecast on the A40 corridor, where random queuing would be more likely.
43. As such, I have significant concerns that Appendix J generally underplays the severity of queues that could occur along the corridor. And so, where any junction has limited or negative PRC, because the modelling assumes a regular flow of traffic and the peak hour variability of queues is not properly represented by MMQ (which accounts only for the average over the period modelled) the queue forming may exceed the lane length even where it is not **'flagged' by LinSig**, given that the LinSig output is based solely on MMQ relative to lane length.
44. In addition to which, the modelling undertaken fails to account for unpredictable traffic and driver behaviour at times when junction loading is high. Therefore, and in the absence of detailed qualitative analysis, I am concerned that other lanes may have insufficient storage capacity to accommodate extreme queues that may develop and may not perform in a uniform and predictable manner. This further validates the **Council's case that** the modelling undertaken, based on average and consistent values²², is insufficiently robust.
45. Notwithstanding the foregoing, which relates to situations where LinSig does not record the MMQ as exceeding the lane length, I return now to focus on the Abbey Barn Road/A40 junction (PM peak) where I have stated that the MMQ *would* exceed the lane length [39], at a junction which is forecast to exhibit negative PRC²³. As per the LinSig guidance, the queue could be up to double the MMQ as modelled and in any event significantly longer, blocking past the Gomm Road junction and beyond²⁴.
46. As such, there would be consequences for south bound traffic travelling along Gomm Road during the PM peak, including that generated by the appeal scheme. The LinSig modelling is predicated on vehicles being able to join the A40 without being impeded but right turners may not be able to join due to traffic queuing along the corridor. This would likely impede those wishing to turn left out of Gomm Road as they may be stuck behind those wishing to turn right, effectively causing queues and delays at the Gomm Road exit, this being the main access from residential parcels, employment and the school²⁵.

²⁰ Para 7.4.19 of Mr Marshall Highways Proof (Appellant)

²¹ Image 7.1 of Mr Marshall Highways Proof (Appellant)

²² Paragraph 2.53 of Mrs Radley Highways Rebuttal Proof (Council)

²³ The two lanes heading west are anticipated to have a 111.2% or 95% DoS according to pages 667 and 777 of TA respectively during AM peak

²⁴ CD2.10 – figures 3.1,3.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.7, 6.8 and Council Closing para 2.28

²⁵ Para 2.32 of Council closing

47. There is the reasonable prospect of driver frustration leading to attempts to jump the red-light or join the congested A40, resulting in blocking of the A40 and the risk of collision with other vehicles. No capacity improvements are proposed at this junction even though required as part of the site allocation policy. Therefore, due to the lack of capacity improvements, the modelled likelihood that the exit of Gomm Road will be blocked during the afternoon peak and given the lack of qualitative analysis of traffic behaviours in such circumstances, this would represent an unacceptable highway safety risk.

Other modelling considerations

48. Whilst the appellant has refined the LinSig model to reflect the prevailing characteristics of the network layout, as set out in appendix I of the TA, this is not been sufficient to address the concerns I have set out. I also appreciate that whilst LinSig has been utilised by the Council in relation to the A40, this was for a different purpose and not for a major mixed-use development in this location.

49. Moreover, I have no reason to dispute the **appellant's** assertions that recent alterations to signal timings have improved the efficiency of the network, that active travel measures proposed would reduce car reliance, that trip generation figures are based on a worst-case scenario²⁶ and that the model assumes every light at every junction would be on red at the same time. However, as those particulars have not been modelled in detail or properly analysed, I cannot attribute them any meaningful weight.

50. The Council present written evidence in relation to signal timings and other technical highway capacity information, contained in Appendix B of their highway rebuttal proof. However, the Council did not call the author of the document as a witness so their evidence could not be properly tested. Therefore, this evidence has had no bearing on my decision.

51. There are few parallels to be drawn between this appeal and the *Satnam Millenium* appeal decision on the basis that the data used to inform the **appellant's findings in this case is up to date and comprises a thorough analysis** (albeit flawed), whereas the data that was used in that case was considered to be outdated²⁷. In addition, the characteristics of the highway network in question was markedly different. As such, that case has not affected my determination of this appeal.

52. The appellant states that microsimulation modelling would add an extra layer of complexity²⁸, but that would seem proportionate in this case and necessary to assess the implications of the scheme, which fails to properly consider the unpredictable and real-life randomness of building queues when junctions are highly saturated, the impacts of stacking back, and driver behaviour and actions when such conditions prevail. In any event, I see no reason why multiple model types or inputs could not be utilised to create a bespoke modelling solution appropriate to the context, to achieve a sufficiently robust appraisal of the future traffic impacts.

53. The situation is exacerbated here due to the interdependency of the signals at each of the six junctions to facilitate the free flow of traffic along this important

²⁶ 650 residential units as opposed to 544

²⁷ *Satnam Millenium v SSHCLG* [2019] EWHC 2631 (Admin)

²⁸ See para 55 of appellant closing in reference to Mr Marshall evidence

transport corridor. Given the limited or exceeded capacity forecast at several junctions, and my other observations concerning the lack of detailed assessment in relation to individual lane capacity, and the relatively close distance between each junction, excessive congestion at one could have significant effects for upstream junction performance and network stability.

54. **Finally, for the reasons set out, I am unable to rely on the TA's findings which** indicate relatively minor average driver delays of up to around 16 seconds across the entire network, as the extent to which time delays can be relied upon to understand network performance depends on the nature and robustness of the modelling undertaken in the first place.

Mitigation requirements relating to A40 and Gomm Road

55. Policy HW6(4)(a) of the Local Plan requires that appropriate works or a contribution towards various schemes are provided, including capacity improvements at the Gomm Road junction and a contribution towards a wider A40 package.
56. The main mitigation proposed would involve traffic restrictions along Orchard Road, which would have a limited effect on reducing traffic impacts at some junctions along the A40. A series of highway improvement works along the A40 corridor have already been implemented, but the modelling does not indicate to me that these measures would significantly improve the future baseline conditions of the network compared with the existing.
57. Irrespective of whether or not the developer of Ashwells made proportionate contributions to highway works, as I have already set out, junctions along the A40 corridor would exceed their PRC when the scheme is added according to the modelling.
58. Even though the Council were unable to point to any schemes the appellant may be able to make a contribution towards, the appellant did not undertake a robust analysis of potential ways to mitigate cumulative traffic effects, despite clear capacity issues forecast. In any event, Policy HW6(4)(a) makes it clear **that any improvements are 'not limited to' the 'wider package' contribution as detailed in the policy.**
59. In relation to the Gomm Road junction, the Wycombe Reserve Sites Infrastructure Delivery Plan (2016) (WRSIDP) sets out an indicative scheme of junction improvements²⁹. However, there is no evidence to indicate that the appellant has attempted to engage third party landowner(s) or design possible capacity improvement schemes at this junction. As that has not been done, it cannot be said that it would lead to an unviable ransom situation for the appellant, when no meaningful engagement on a scheme has been carried out. Therefore, I am not satisfied that a similar or alternative scheme to that depicted by the WRSIDP could not be delivered, or that cycle and pedestrian improvements as currently set out could not be incorporated into a scheme of capacity mitigation.
60. Overall, no mitigation is proposed to address the identified highway capacity and safety issues and policy requirements.

²⁹ CD6.6 photo 4.2

Other Highway Matters

School Safety

61. In relation to the proposed school, all matters are reserved except for access, which are included on the submitted plans and are fixed. The parcel proposed would be broadly the same shape and size as the parcel set out in the DB and it would occupy an area of 1.23ha, which exceeds the minimum 1ha requirement set out in the DB.
62. Even if I was to accept **the Council's position that the drop-off area** as proposed would be too small to cater for the number of vehicles likely to occupy it at peak school pick up and drop off times, I see no reason why an alternative drop-off layout and/or an alternative external school layout, which could facilitate drop-off or similar parking areas within the wider school site, could not come forwards at reserved matters stage. Moreover, this could be provided whilst retaining the fixed points of access.
63. Schedule 15 of the S106 requires the appellant to submit a detailed plan of the drop-off area, in accordance with the proposed plan, but alternatives appear feasible within the written terms of the S106³⁰.
64. There is a degree of overlap between layout and access, insofar as it would be contradictory to expect full details of all internal access routes to be provided when layout is a reserved matter, as providing this level of detail would effectively fix the layout for this part of the site³¹. Therefore, it would be feasible to provide segregated links for cyclists and pedestrians within the school site to link the school with the highway as part of subsequent reserved matters layout details.
65. All of the above indicate to me that safe and suitable access could be achieved for all users in relation to the proposed school, as required by Policy DM33 of the Local Plan and paragraph 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). I am satisfied that sufficient capacity for parking and drop-offs could be realised at reserved matters stage, aligning with the fixed access points proposed as part of this appeal, without resulting in unacceptable highways impacts.

Site layout – spine road

66. **The issue here concerns the switchback described by the Council as a 'U-shaped bend', and the undisputed position that a typical 7.5 tonne vehicle and greater (HGV) would not be able to pass an estate car (or larger vehicle) on this section of the spine road.**
67. **However, I cannot attribute any weight to the Council's evidence which purports to show that there would be 492 two-way movements of 7.5 tonne vans³². In fact, the table appears to show the anticipated movement of smaller LGVs, which are vehicles ranging between 3.5 tonnes and 7.5 tonnes, more typical of standard 'transit' type vans one might typically associate with parcel and home delivery service couriers. Therefore, the Council's evidence**

³⁰ S106 – Schedule 15 paragraph 1

³¹ See appeal ref - APP/Q4245/W/19/3243720

³² Table above para 6.7 of Mrs Radley Highways Rebuttal Proof (Council)

represents a considerable overestimate of the number of 7.5 tonne and above vehicles likely to use the spine road.

68. Because of this, it is reasonable to conclude that the chances of larger sized vehicles meeting at the same time on the bend would be markedly lower than suggested by the Council. In addition, the DB sets out that the role of the spine road, in part, is to deliver traffic slowly, but steadily, through the site³³. The scheme has been designed in this manner, with a focus on ensuring it is not suitable for use as a rapid bypass to cut through Gomm Valley³⁴. As such, the proposed road layout would encourage lower vehicle speeds.
69. If larger vehicles were approaching the bend such that a risk of meeting was possible, there would be sufficient visibility for either driver to take evasive action by reducing speed or giving way on the carriageway, thus reducing the chances of collision or obstruction.
70. Moreover, despite the submission lacking precise tracking details covering all possible vehicle meeting permutations, in addition to the above, other mitigation including road signage could be implemented to further mitigate against the risk. Overall, there is no basis for concluding that this constrained part of the spine road would represent an inherently unsafe situation for drivers.

Site layout – cul-de-sacs

71. I deal with the design aspects of cul-de-sacs later in my decision. However, as proposed, they are relatively narrow and so would include turning heads to reduce the likelihood of drivers reversing along the length of the cul-de-sac to rejoin the main carriageway. Signage or parking restrictions could be implemented to discourage inappropriate parking of vehicles in the turning heads, secured by Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) as necessary.
72. **Figure 18 of the Council's highways proof shows a long stretch of cul-de-sac** where there are no visitor parking bays provided. However, even if vehicles were to park on one side of the cul-de-sac, there would appear to be sufficient space for a larger vehicle, such as a refuse vehicle, to safely pass³⁵.

Site layout – bus routing

73. Turning now to the proposed route of a public transport bus service, which would travel through the site and effectively turn round by travelling the loop associated with proposed Parcel 7. The concern relates to the suitability of the layout to accommodate a larger bus vehicle.
74. The starting point here is that there is a current Demand Responsive Transit (DRT) service which comprises smaller buses able to safely navigate the site, including the Parcel 7 loop. However, long-term future funding of a DRT service is not guaranteed. **The Council's request for a monetary contribution to support the bus service provision is based on the annual cost of running DRT³⁶.** Should DRT not continue, the contribution would cover the provision of an existing and alternative bus service to the site.

³³ CD6.1 page 43

³⁴ CD2.10 para 8.2.3

³⁵ See 'drawings' appended to Mr Marshall Highways Proof (Appellant)

³⁶ ID51

75. In terms of alternative provision, the Council state that Carousel (the operator of DRT) is one of 12 bus operators in Buckinghamshire. However, their objection in part relies **on written evidence from the Council's public transport lead**. Amongst other things, this evidence sets out that smaller bus vehicles associated with other operators cannot be guaranteed in future. However, as they were not at the Inquiry to support their written evidence, it could not be properly scrutinised or questioned, and carries limited weight.
76. The evidence before me is not conclusive, so I cannot conclude with a high degree of certainty whether or not another bus operator would be able to serve the site with a suitable vehicle if DRT was to cease. However, as there are approximately 12 bus operators in the area, it indicates to me there would be a realistic prospect of securing an alternative service to the site utilising an appropriately sized vehicle.
77. Even if it was to transpire that no suitable alternative vehicle and provider was available, the monetary contribution proposed would allow a potential solution to be found, including measures such as parking restrictions or a one-way system within Parcel 7 so that a larger vehicle could navigate the route successfully. This is sufficient to convince me that a suitable bus access could be provided through the site, in accordance with Policy HW6(4)(c) of the Local Plan.

Cock Lane

78. The DB identifies a need to widen Cock Lane from the point where the spine road would join it, northwards to the Ashwells site entrance. This is in the interests of highway safety. The Ashwells scheme proposed improvements to this stretch of Cock Lane, which the Council finds acceptable, secured by condition under the Ashwells planning permission. The approved Cock Lane scheme cannot be implemented by the appellant as the Council own the land.
79. **The Council accepts that this allocated site 'clearly can and should be developed' and state that they have been 'extremely pro-active in bringing about good quality development of this site'³⁷.** Whilst the Council have been **critical of the appellant's lack of meaningful engagement on this matter, such criticism works both ways**. As landowner and local planning authority it is rather unfortunate that this situation has not been resolved, despite an acceptable scheme having previously been approved, and the Council having control over the land in question.
80. That has led to the substitute arrangement proposed as part of this appeal, which is not as comprehensive as that previously approved, in that it does not include highway widening to facilitate two-way passing vehicular movements. Instead, working within the confines of the highway, it is proposed to provide give-way markings in the southern lane. As there would be sufficient visibility for vehicles travelling in this direction, they would be able to wait at the markings to avoid meeting a vehicle at the narrowest part of the carriageways to the south.
81. The above would only be implemented if Ashwells was not to come forwards, in which case, there would be no traffic exiting and entering Ashwells, thus

³⁷ Council closing submission paras 1.1 and 1.2

overall traffic flows would be reduced in comparison with the modelled future baseline.

82. In any case, the scheme proposed could be delivered in isolation as the Council have not demonstrated **that the appellant's proposal** would be unsafe, and ensuring safety is the stated intention of the Cock Lane widening as set out in the DB. As such, there would be no unacceptable highway safety impacts in this respect.

Highways Conclusion

83. Paragraph 115 of the Framework states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. **There is no definition of 'severe' in the Framework** and whilst the severe test is a high bar, it is one which requires case specific consideration of the impacts and local highway context. Therefore, whilst I have considered the various appeal decisions referred to which relate to this issue³⁸, none of them are directly comparable with the scheme before me, which relates to the particular circumstances of this transport corridor and scheme.
84. Overall, in combination with the proposal, the corridor is forecast to be overloaded and the modelling undertaken is insufficiently robust to convince me that the network **won't be severely congested during** peak times. In addition to this, if the modelling is relied upon, this shows that traffic impacts associated with the proposal, in combination with other committed developments, would result in a severe residual cumulative impact on the corridor during the PM peak. This does not justify the lack of proposed capacity improvement measures, which are a requirement of the allocation policy. There would be a consequential and unacceptable impact on highway safety at the Gomm Road/A40 junction.
85. Therefore, due to the adverse impact of the scheme on highway capacity and safety, the proposal would be in conflict with Policies HW6(4)(a)(i)(ii), DM33 and CP7 of the Local Plan and DM2 and DM19 of the ADSAP which requires, amongst other matters, that an appropriate contribution is made towards schemes including, but not limited to, capacity improvements at the Gomm Road junction and wider contributions towards the A40 corridor and that safe access to the highway network is made for all users. The scheme would also be contrary to paragraph 115 of the Framework.
86. I recognise that the proposal would comply with Policies HW6, CP7 and DM33 of the Local Plan, DM2 and DM6 of the ADSAP, and the Framework and various DFOs within the DB and other planning guidance documents insofar as they relate to the other highway safety matters for the reasons set out, but this does not override my findings in relation to the A40 corridor.
87. In relation to the ES, chapter 6A (Transport) states that it should be read in conjunction with the TA. In terms of EIA significance, whilst traffic flow **impacts are considered 'negligible', this is unsurprising given that the ES is** underpinned by the TA and traffic modelling, which I consider to be flawed for the reasons given.

³⁸ Refs - APP/U1105/A/13/2208393, APP/D3315/W/16/3157862, APP/M2325/A/14/2217060 and APP/N4720/W/15/3004034

Character and appearance

Landscape and Visual

Existing

88. The land runs generally downwards in a north-east to south-west direction, meeting the extended urban area of High Wycombe which occupies the Wye Valley floor. Generally, the east and west sides of the site are partly made up of steep valley slopes or 'shoulders', which fall towards a dry valley which runs generally through the centre of the site.
89. Much of the site is occupied by agricultural land and it is free from significant built form. Other notable features include woodland blocks, inclusive of the Little Gomm's Wood and Pimms Grove ancient woodlands, along with tree lines and scattered hedgerows. The site also contains areas of chalk grassland, vegetation and scrub, which occupy parts of the west-facing valley side, forming the Gomm Valley Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and the Gomm Valley Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The appeal site also includes several Public Rights of Way (PRoW)³⁹.
90. The immediate setting of the site influences its character to varying degrees depending on precise location. Generally, views of the settlement edge, including Peregrine Business Park, and housing off Hammersley Lane and Pimms Grove, are readily visible from the southern portion of the appeal site. From the upper, northern section, the presence of built form tends to be less evident partly due to the less undulating landform.
91. The pronounced changes in levels across the site, coupled with the significant screening effect of trees and vegetation in places, in contrast with the relatively open and more gently undulating landform in other areas, means that any notable visual effects due to built form can quickly diminish. By the same token, areas of the site set further away from buildings may have elevated views of extensive built form, significantly altering the perceptible character of the site. Therefore, at one end of the spectrum the site evokes a rural and tranquil feel; at the other, it is indicative of semi-urban, edge of settlement typology.
92. Given the above, and having regard to my own observations following site visits, along with the evidence before me, it is apparent that the appeal site broadly reflects independent national and local landscape studies, which in turn have informed the DB. This includes National Character Area (NCA) 110: *The Chilterns*⁴⁰ and on a more local level, Landscape Character Area (LCA)⁴¹ 19.1: *High Wycombe Settled River Valleys*.
93. These characteristics manifest themselves in the Objectives of the DB which in turn complement Policy HW6 of the Local Plan which requires schemes to adopt a landscape-led approach, recognising the hillside landform, and paying regard to obtainable views.
94. Finally, any potential changes to the boundary of the Chilterns National Landscape (referred to as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) have not been

³⁹ References – CWY/61/1, HWU50/1, CWY/15/1 AND HWU/50/1

⁴⁰ Natural England (2013)

⁴¹ Wycombe District Landscape Character Assessment 2011

progressed to adoption. The appeal site does not fall within the current Chilterns National Landscape and the appeal has been assessed on the basis of its current boundary. I concur with the main parties that the scheme would not have a discernible impact on the Chilterns National Landscape, and the findings of the ES, that there would not be a significant impact on its setting.

Context

95. Whilst the scheme would involve the development of a greenfield site, it is an allocated site which benefits from a detailed DB which recognises that large-scale development can be successfully accommodated. It provides a two-dimension layout plan as to how a successful scheme may be realised.
96. The **Council's case**, insofar as it concerns alleged landscape and visual impacts, focuses on the proposed development of Parcels 1, 7, 8 and the employment area. They take no issue with other impacts of the scheme which, according to **the appellant's own** evidence, would result in various levels of adverse landscape and visual effect⁴². As such, by any reasonable measure, negative landscape and visual impacts are inherent in the development parameters set by the Local Plan and the DB, and an inevitable consequence of developing the site in accordance with the allocation.
97. **The Council's RfR 7** alleges that the scheme is not sufficiently landscape led and to the extent there is crossover between landscape/visual impacts and design issues in relation to this RfR, as well as RfRs 8 and 9, I focus here on the specific landscape and visual effects.

Parcel 1 – Visual Impacts

98. Starting with Parcel 1 (**referred to in the submission as 'phase 1'**), the extent of built form proposed would expand beyond the northern and western boundaries of the corresponding illustrative Parcel associated with Policy HW6⁴³.
99. From outside of the site boundary, obtainable short distance views of the development would be mainly confined to a short stretch of Hammersley Lane to the northeast, which is articulated by a series of Visually Verified Montages (VVM)⁴⁴.
100. The landform associated with the appeal site generally slopes away from Hammersley Lane leaving open views of countryside in the foreground with the existing settlement being largely contained in the valley bottom and visible at mid to long distance. Whilst proposed housing associated with Parcel 1 would occupy part of the **site's valley shoulder, it would be a restrained form of encroachment**.
101. Indeed, even from VVM9e, which represents a relatively close view from an open corner of Hammersley Lane, the housing proposed would not be a prominent skyline feature and would be set against the backdrop of the conglomeration of built form in the Wye Valley. Over time landscaping proposed on the northern edge of the housing parcel would filter obtainable

⁴² Table 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 of Mr Andrew Smith landscape proof (appellant)

⁴³ As depicted in figure A2 of Mr Kennett landscape and design proof (Council)

⁴⁴ VVM 9a – 9j – see appendix 3 of Mr Andrew Smith landscape proof, with VVM9b superseded and replaced by appendix 3.4 of his rebuttal proof (appellant)

views of buildings. With or without landscaping, open space would be readily appreciable in the foreground.

102. Nevertheless, given the further creep of development both across and up the valley slope, and the reduction in the openness of the shoulder which would result, when compared to that depicted by the DB, visual impacts for residential and transient receptors from VVM9e would be significantly greater. Obtainable views for the closest residents to VVM9g would also be major adverse, compared with negligible impacts associated with the DB.
103. In relation to VVMs 9a-d, the viewpoint distances are progressively greater as one ascends Hammersley Lane in comparison with VVMs 9e-j, with a greater proportion of the valley shoulders being appreciable, and the visual impacts of the housing proposed being generally less. In comparison with the DB, the associated visual impacts would not be significantly greater. The same applies to VVMs 9h-j, and any impacts from here could be mitigated by a planning condition requiring a landscaping scheme for this phase.
104. The proposed apartment block would be a large and prominent building in the street. However, the DB acknowledges that this is a gateway to the site. The access would be in the broad location anticipated by the DB and this would inevitably open up the site such that it would be reasonable and acceptable to expect significant urban form in this location given a) its location on the lower slopes of Gomm Valley; b) it is within the indicative layout Parcel set out in the DB; and, c) relatively speaking, a dense arrangement of existing housing faces the site on the opposing side of Hammersley Lane⁴⁵.
105. Overall, the additional impacts of an expanded parcel would, in some instances, lead to additional significant visual harm in comparison with the DB, particularly in respect of those viewpoints closest to the proposed housing which would lie adjacent to, extending north of, the Parcel in the DB. Insofar as the scheme would involve further urban encroachment into an area which is earmarked in the DB as open space, this element would not represent a landscape led approach.

Parcels 7 and 8 – Visual Impacts and Coalescence

106. Parcel 7 would extend **downslope towards the site's central valley more so** than envisaged by the DB. In plan form, it would represent nothing more than a minor additional incursion into **the site's open space** and the perceptible impacts would be negligible. The sloping valley form of this part of Gomm Valley is less pronounced in this location **and there are no 'key views' which** would be meaningfully affected, with limited internal site views and impacts over and above those envisaged by the DB.
107. Turning to Parcel 8, the main concern in this respect relates to the potential for physical or perceptual coalescence to occur between the scheme, Ashwells and Tylers Green. Policy HW6(1)(b) of the Local Plan sets out that coalescence should be avoided by *'...leaving an undeveloped gap of approximately 200m or more at their closest point, informed by landscape impact, ecological requirements and character issues'*. This is broadly reflective of DFO16 of the DB, albeit that **the supporting text calls for a gap of 'at least' 200m.**

⁴⁵ CD2.3 page 82

108. The concern principally arises here because Parcel 8 would extend further to the north and east than illustrated in the DB, thereby reducing the distance between the scheme and Ashwells. Whilst the building-to-building distance would be at least 200m, the gap between various elements of built form would be less.
109. Irrespective of this, the crude distance between two points does not take into account the three dimensional and multifaceted, qualitative aspects which contribute to an appreciation of separation between settlements. Whilst it is the case that the DB considered these aspects when formulating the suggested 200m distance, it did so in the absence of a detailed landscape and visual assessment of a comprehensive scheme of development, which includes extensive landscaping. Again, the DB is a strategic *guidance* document.
110. When the details of the proposed scheme are considered, what is clear to me is that a sizeable gap would be retained, free from buildings and significant built infrastructure. The proposed housing in association with Parcel 8 would be set downslope and partially behind an extensive landscaping belt. This, in addition to existing field boundaries, which have the potential to be reinforced with planting⁴⁶.
111. As landscaping is a reserved matter, and given the opportunities afforded due to the extended area of green space that would be retained, I am satisfied that a large gap would be retained of suitable character to prevent coalescence. In this respect, I find no conflict with Policy HW6(1)(b) of the Local Plan.
112. **I cover the scheme's 'interzones' in more detail in the design section. However, they would be an important part of the scheme's response to** accommodating changes in the land levels. Comprising landscaped strips running in between the different levels of housing, when viewed from the opposing valley side, they would exhibit a layering effect, contributing to the incorporation of housing into Gomm Valley in a manner commensurate with its verdant character. This would be particularly the case when viewing Parcels 7 and 8 from Hammersley Lane and internally within the site, thereby reducing visual impacts associated with these areas of housing.

Employment Land

113. The DB does not depict land ownership⁴⁷. Therefore, the guidance contained within the DB, that development of the area earmarked for employment is dependent on securing access from either the adjacent Peregrine Business Park (Peregrine) or Network Rail land to the south, should be considered in that context.
114. I am unconvinced that either of the approximate access points depicted by the DB would be feasible in the circumstances of this case⁴⁸. Firstly, it is common ground that Network Rail would not be willing to allow an access via their land. In relation to Peregrine, despite a lack of submitted detailed technical analysis, **I agree with the appellant's civil engineering witness, that** access from Peregrine would likely be disruptive to the business park as well as likely requiring the demolition of existing buildings within the complex.

⁴⁶ CD2.3 – section 7.2

⁴⁷ 3.1.2 of DB

⁴⁸ Figure 5.32 of DB

115. In any event, the question turns to whether the proposed employment area and access would result in harm in landscape and visual terms.
116. Dealing with the proposed employment building(s) first. Details relating to finished floor levels and maximum building heights could be secured by planning condition. Whilst the employment area as proposed would be slightly larger than that outlined in the DB, and it would rise further up the slope, the appellant would be content for this larger area than depicted by the DB to be free from any buildings, which could be controlled by a planning condition.
117. For these reasons, the proposed employment building(s) would be well contained on the lower slopes of Gomm Valley, assimilating with existing built form in the valley bottom as well as the adjacent business park. This would be apparent, for example, from the more open areas of Hammersley Lane as well as from various points within the site.
118. In relation to the proposed access, which would climb the slope from the proposed employment site towards the spine road, this would be partly screened by existing hedgerows. Reserved matters submissions present opportunity to provide appropriate landscaping treatment to further mitigate impacts. Therefore, I find no harm in landscape and visual terms.

Wider Views and 'Parcel 9'

119. The scheme as a whole would be less visible from close distance from the south, but longer distance views would be obtainable, particularly from various points on the north facing valley slopes. VVMs 14 and 15 demonstrate that the proposed employment area, whilst sitting higher than much of the existing linear development located in between the A40 and the railway line adjacent, would appear below Pimms Grove woodland, with an area of undeveloped open space surrounding it.
120. In relation to distant north facing views of Parcel 1, whilst the scheme would **sit higher on Gomm Valley's sloping shoulder than** anticipated by the DB, it would be contained so that a considerable area of open land would be visible beyond, which at this point would appear at a higher level. Both the employment area and Parcel 1 would appear as a logical and contained extension of the built-up valley floor.
121. This brings me onto 'Parcel 9', which according to the DB should comprise a parcel of housing in the north-eastern corner of the site. There was much debate during the Inquiry as to the materiality of **the scheme's non-inclusion** of housing in this area. Whilst I agree with the Council in broad terms that the **'landscape effects of the parcels simply cannot be traded off each other'⁴⁹**, it is worth at this point considering the policy context.
122. Policy HW6(2)(a) of the Local Plan requires that regard is paid to views from the south. Accepting the illustrative nature of the DB, and irrespective of how the final design of housing within Parcel 9 could appear, in limited views from the south (namely VVMs 14 and 15) it is likely that any housing here would appear as a somewhat isolated and anomalous area of urban form at the northern **'top'** end of the Gomm Valley, diminishing the extent to which it would **contribute to the 'green finger' of the valley** and its open rural character.

⁴⁹ Council Closing – para 3.27

123. Conversely, the proposal would comprise orchard planting and landscaping in the general area of Parcel 9, with full planting details to be realised at a later stage. This would ensure an attractive, landscaped area which would be more in keeping with the rural surroundings than housing.
124. The benefits of this element of the scheme would not be significant given that the omission of housing in Parcel 9 would not change the overall visual effect on those views in comparison with the DB⁵⁰. However, at the very least this element of the proposal would represent a better way of delivering the Objectives of the DB, as it would retain a verdant area of land in comparison **with the DB's alternative** housing iteration.

Landscape character

125. In relation to landscape character effects, the mid to upper eastern shoulders of Gomm Valley would be retained or altered so that, overall, they would appear as large areas of green infrastructure running generally north to south, terminating at Parcel 1 towards the base of the valley slope. The western parcels of housing would be contained by woodland and landscaping in between, as well as softened through the incorporation of landscaping within each of the parcels. The effect of the proposal on the wider NCA and LCA would be minor⁵¹.
126. At site level, whilst key landscape features would be retained and enhanced in places, there would also be an increase in activity in the areas of retained green space. Consequently, there would be a moderate adverse effect.

Spine Road/Primary Avenue and Engineering

127. No part of the scheme demonstrates more starkly the difficulties in reconciling the challenging topography and the multiple objectives of the DB than consideration of the spine road/primary avenue, which is earmarked in the DB as the main route through the site, linking Gomm Road with Cock Lane. Here I cover the entire spine road issue, concluding on landscape and visual implications, revisiting my other observations throughout this decision as necessary.
128. The DB emphasises that the two spine road options illustrated are indicative only⁵². In assessing these routes further as part of the Spine Road Study (SRS)⁵³, the appellant concluded that these routes would lead to, amongst other things, a requirement for extensive retaining elements in some areas and conflict with a known badger sett. It is telling that the Council did not question this, nor did they suggest that the DB's spine road routings would represent an acceptable way of developing the site.
129. The SRS assessed a range of other routing options, demonstrating that a route which follows the natural contours of the land would not be compatible with other constraints and objectives, including ensuring suitable access can be achieved for all users, landscape impact and ecology. As the appellant put it, 'there is no silver bullet'⁵⁴.

⁵⁰ That is set out in table 5.3 of Mr Andrew Smith landscape proof where he identifies the same overall visual effects between the proposal and DB

⁵¹ This is also confirmed by the ES – chapter 7

⁵² CD6.1 para 5.1.2

⁵³ CD 2.32

⁵⁴ As was stated by the appellant in the Round Table Session - engineering

130. The **appellant's approach** to spine road gradients would be appropriate for several reasons. Firstly, whilst the Council refer to Manual for Streets 2, this document states that a gradient of 8% should be a practical maximum⁵⁵. Conversely, Local Transport Note 1/20 advises on a steepest gradient of 1:20 for cyclists⁵⁶. Whilst neither document comprises statutory guidance, it is logical to conclude that a lesser gradient would be more attractive for the wide range of ages and walking/cycling abilities which would be introduced by the scheme, encouraging all users to adopt non-motorised means of travel where possible.
131. Lesser gradients would be more likely to encourage those residing in the housing proposed in the Gomm Valley to adopt non-car modes of travel to and from school. Indeed, making places accessible and easy to move around is one of the pillars of making well-designed places⁵⁷. Therefore, a gradient of 1 in 20 is a good principle to adopt, as opposed to the steeper gradients suggested by the Council.
132. Furthermore, I do not accept that the spine road as proposed would be intrusive in the landscape. Whilst it would be routed in an elongated manner along a stretch to the north of the proposed school, its switchback design would assist in reconciling levels, reducing the need for an excessive number of prominent retaining elements.
133. Nevertheless, I recognise in particular that the interface between the spine road along the edge of Parcel 4 would be steep and abrupt in places. The same goes for various stretches of the spine road as well as the streets within the parcels, resulting in marked deviation from existing contours in places.
134. However, to view these elements in isolation would be to lose sight of the scheme in its entirety. In this regard, the DB was devised on the basis that there would be large changes to a green valley landscape, introducing a townscape character through the provision of housing, roads and other structures.
135. **Whilst the SRS considered other options, including the Council's preferred** options E and F, they do not appear to represent a more suitable way of providing the spine road. Both options, whilst reducing the amount of necessary cut and fill, would encroach further up Gomm Valley. In short, I do not see how they would represent a better option in landscape and visual terms, particularly given that most of the views of the spine road would be from within the appeal site, and the appeal proposal offers to reduce the extent of encroachment up the Gomm Valley in comparison with these preferred options. Therefore, the proposed routing would be no more harmful than the routes envisaged in the DB but it would be better in accessibility terms.
136. Finally, the Council also suggested splitting the pedestrian and spine road routes, allowing a steeper incline for the spine road which would work more closely with the contours. However, this is nothing more than a hypothetical scenario, and no robust analysis of any implications of such a design has been carried out. Ultimately, I find the routing as proposed would be acceptable anyway.

⁵⁵ CD 7.5 para 8.4.2 – note, that is a gradient of 1:12

⁵⁶ CD 7.3

⁵⁷ CD 7.2 para 75

Other Landscape and Visual matters

137. The proposed Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP) would be located generally to the north of the proposed school and spine road. Despite its location set away from that indicated by the DB, it could be landscaped and treated appropriately to ensure it would not be visually intrusive.
138. The DB envisaged swales running along the dry valley. However, the proposal would include a much larger water attenuation basin. The drainage **basin's proposed location, towards the bottom of the valley, would not** significantly encroach up into the linear dry valley landscape. It would comprise an attractive aquatic feature, forming part of an integrated landscape approach, which would provide opportunities for a wetland habitat to support a range of biodiversity. It would be a better way of achieving the DB.
139. The engineering works, including cut and fill, required to accommodate the Parcels would not result in notable landscape and visual effects. To mitigate visual impacts to an acceptable level, the proposal would include extensive landscaping to accommodate level changes, including interzones within the parcels.

Landscape and Visual Conclusion

140. The ES was accompanied by a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). This sets out the impact and significance of the overall effect of the development. This formed the basis of a comparison between the appeal scheme and notional **DB, included in the appellant's witness evidence**⁵⁸. The Council accepted that this **appraisal was 'broadly accurate'**⁵⁹.
141. The main additional impacts would be due to the expanded Parcel 1 and resultant effects on short distance obtainable views. The LVIA records these impacts as being greater adverse effects in comparison with the notional DB scheme. However, this harm should be considered in context.
142. The enlarged Parcel 1 would not undermine the key characteristics of Gomm Valley, such as the green shoulders and sinuous valley form, which would be retained. Encroachment by Parcels 1, 7 and 8 into undeveloped areas would not significantly detract from the scheme when considered as a whole, which would promote substantial areas of open space, parkland and landscaping, extensive areas of woodland and hedgerows. This includes the proposed landscaping of Parcel 9, as opposed to housing as envisaged by the DB.
143. Viewing the scheme as a whole, it would comprise a landscape-led approach which recognises the character and beauty of the site, and comparison between the proposal and the DB indicates broadly similar impacts in LVIA terms.
144. For these reasons, there would be no unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area having regard to landscape and visual impacts. The proposal would accord with Policy HW6 of the Local Plan which requires, amongst other matters, that development recognises the intrinsic character and beauty of the hillside landform, establishes an appropriate urban edge to existing settlements and avoiding coalescence, pays particular regard to the

⁵⁸ Table 5.1 and 5.3 of Mr Andrew Smith landscape proof (appellant)

⁵⁹ During Cross Examination

landscape character and views from the south and mitigates unavoidable impacts in a way that respects landscape character.

145. The proposal would also comply with Policies CP9, DM32 and DM35 of the Local Plan which includes a requirement to protect key characteristics of the receiving landscaping having regard to views and vistas both from and towards the site.
146. The proposal would address DB DFO5(a)-(d), DFO6 and DFO16 which requires, amongst other matters and in addition criterion relating to Policy HW6 of the Local Plan, that the key features including the sinuous valley form and green shoulders are respected, and that extensive manipulation of topography is avoided.

Design

Design Approach

The Scheme

147. The design ethos synergises with the LVIA insofar as the existing levels of the land, and the potential landscape and visual impacts of the scheme, have informed a clearly defined strategy which has in turn informed the proposed building heights. Residential parcels would generally be laid out in perimeter blocks, thus increasing the prevalence of streets with active frontages. The streets would take on a hierarchical function and appearance.
148. The primary avenue would form the spine, with secondary, community, and green streets; each corresponding with different roles they would play in terms of movement through the site. More than that, they would set the framework for the street scene and the buildings which would occupy them. So, at one end of the spectrum, the primary avenue would adopt a strong movement function where some parking would take place on-street, and dwellings would often be close to the footway edge. At the other end, green lanes and private drives would be designed to be lightly trafficked, shared traffic and pedestrian routes, often hosting more spacious plots with a stronger emphasis on views of existing and proposed landscaping and the wider Gomm Valley setting.

Character areas

149. In response to local context and to engender a strong sense of place, the scheme would exhibit three distinct character areas, the attributes of each corresponding to their position within the appeal site. The most visible parcels, including 4, 5 and 6 located on the steeper western valley slopes, would have a contemporary urban style, consisting mainly of semi-detached and detached dwellings with some small apartments, set within tree planted streets, interzones and boundary planting corresponding with the wider valley character.
150. Parcels 7 and 8, higher up the valley and partly screened from wider views by existing woodland, would adopt a more varied, rustic mix of materials. Where areas, such as Penn and Tylers Green, exhibit traditional and positive design features, these have been incorporated.
151. The lower slopes of the wider site would incorporate the school and larger apartment buildings, with the building styles in these areas being more varied.

This includes Parcel 1, which would exhibit traditional architectural forms with a contemporary twist, including an apartment block which would appear prominent when travelling along Hammersley Lane. Evidence of an architectural style which has been influenced by Hammersley Lane is limited but the housing facing Hammersley Lane close to Parcel 1 is varied in its overall style and composition, whereas the proposal would successfully create its own distinctive identity.

152. Overall, the identification of specific character areas sets the parameters for the scheme to tailor the design of individual buildings so that they would contribute positively to the street and the wider surroundings. The illustrative street scenes clearly **exhibit the scheme's identity relative to its context, and** the potential for buildings to create attractive streets through good architectural design⁶⁰.

Interzones

153. In relation to the interzones, they would represent an imaginative, landscape led way of addressing level changes within the development parcels, fundamentally at odds with the **Council's assertion that** innovative and distinctive design solutions have been ignored. Access would be restricted to the landscape management company, and each interzone could be landscaped with appropriate species⁶¹, with a management framework in place to deal with specific long-term maintenance requirements of each interzone⁶².
154. Whilst some sections would be narrow, most would not be, and substantial areas of varied planting would be achievable in all of the interzone blocks. By and large they would be located in between the rear gardens of houses and would be overlooked to an extent, as well as being secure, these factors reducing potential for anti-social behaviour within the interzones.
155. They would absorb level changes through landscaping and would not be designated areas of open space accessible to the public. Instead, the wider scheme would provide 28ha of parkland open space, along with numerous and varied areas of formal play, exceeding the quantitative open space requirement set out in policy DM16 of the ADSAP. There would be no conflict with GI1 of the Residential Design Guide 2017 (RDG).

Addressing levels

156. The DB states that split-level dwellings should be utilised⁶³. However, that is in the context of DFO17 and DFO17(b) of the DB, which emphasises a need for development to work with, and sit within, existing topography. Moreover, there is no Local Plan policy requirement for split level dwellings specifically.
157. The proposal would adapt **to the site's topography in a variety of ways**. Interzones would be located within Parcels 4 and 5, creating a soft terracing effect. In addition, the lower two rows, corresponding with the steeper slopes of these parcels, would mainly comprise split level housing. Split level units would be utilised more sparingly in Parcels 7 and 1. However, in total 71 units (13%) of the housing proposed across the site would be split level. This may

⁶⁰ CD2.3 – Illustrative Street scenes on pages 100, 101, 106, 107

⁶¹ **Detailed as part of 'landscaping' reserved matters**

⁶² Secured in the S106 Agreement – Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP)

⁶³ Shown in figure 8 of DB

be less than the Council would wish to see, but it is by no means representative of a scheme which would fail to utilise split level dwellings.

158. Consequently, the approach across the scheme would be to address levels within individual parcels in different ways, comprising interzones and in some cases split-level dwellings, along with landscaping where level changes would otherwise be particularly apparent.
159. Examples of existing unsuitable retaining structures at another site in High Wycombe⁶⁴ have been highlighted. However, those examples are precisely the type of retaining feature which this scheme seeks to avoid. Where necessary, public facing areas and back-to-back plots would be faced with retaining elements including reinforced planted banks, green screens, crib walls, gabion walls incorporating planting, and many other options, which could be secured by condition.

Bespoke

160. House types and the outward appearance of development is part of a design-led process, which includes consideration of context. In this case, the visual impression of buildings, including their external built form, architecture and materials, are reserved for subsequent approval.
161. **Details of 'scale' form part of this proposal, but this sets the height, width and length of each building.** Appearance, on the other hand, concerns the appearance within the limits set by other matters included within this **application, including 'scale'**⁶⁵. Therefore, set-backs could be provided at upper floors of individual dwellings to improve visual amenity in key locations, and they would fall within the parameters of appearance.
162. In relation to Parcel 1, for the reasons set out, this element of the proposal would be distinctive in its own right⁶⁶.
163. Overall, the three-dimensional quality of the built form would work with landscaping and topography to create a hillside townscape, exhibiting its own distinctive identity whilst respecting the factors which contribute to the character of the existing surroundings. Each parcel would respond in an individual way to its surroundings. In the context of this proposal, that is the definition of bespoke.

Perimeter blocks

164. Whilst some of the perimeter blocks would be broken, resulting in long cul-de-sacs, they have been incorporated as the most appropriate design response in the circumstances of each, based on the topographically challenging nature of the site. Several of them would be on the lower section of parcels and would form green lanes, being more suburban and rural in character, reinforced in many cases by existing and proposed planting within the vicinity of the streets. On the whole, they would not be overly prominent features.
165. In addition, whilst the use of cul-de-sacs would terminate the movement of vehicles through areas of the site, in most instances pedestrians and cyclists would be able to continue along the cul-de-sac routes; thus, for those users,

⁶⁴ Mr Kennett proof (Council) – Appendix A7

⁶⁵ Having regard to ID26 – *MMF(UK) v SSCLG [2010] EWHC 3686 (Admin)*

⁶⁶ As illustrated by CD8.24 and 8.25

many of these routes would not be dead ends. As a result, and taking into account the layout in its entirety, which would consist of many fully linked perimeter blocks, the street network proposed would be well-connected.

Parcel 2

166. The street facing building facades would be largely inactive at ground floor level. However, visual interest could be added as part of appearance at reserved matters and the indicative elevations show that attractive, contemporary buildings could be designed with thoughtful detailing to screen and mitigate the effects of the proposed undercroft parking area. Balconies would provide passive surveillance to the street.
167. The proposed integral parking would have the benefit of reducing the prevalence of **on-street parking or parking areas within the buildings' curtilage**. Appropriate security measures could be incorporated to prevent unauthorised access into the parking areas.
168. Therefore, the benefits of undercroft parking would outweigh other design deficiencies, which could be addressed through appropriate detailing at reserved matters. Overall, the buildings could make a positive contribution to creating a high-quality sense of place.

Other design matters

169. In relation to the NEAP, landscaping would offer opportunities to soften visual impacts. There would be footpaths running close to the NEAP which would likely be well used, reducing the likelihood of anti-social behaviour issues. The link to the NEAP would involve crossing a cul-de-sac road within Parcels 4/5 but as this would be lightly trafficked by generally slow moving vehicles, and in the absence of robust evidence to the contrary, I conclude it would present no inherent road safety risk.
170. There would be several instances of large parking courts, and many parking courts proposed across the development would not comply with the RDG⁶⁷ and some would not represent particularly attractive areas due to excessive hardstanding.
171. However, the parking courts would benefit from a degree of surveillance, obtainable from the upper storey windows of many nearby dwellings, and there would be varying degrees of landscaping within each. Most would provide access from the rear gardens of corresponding plots. It is important to recognise that they would be part of a wider parking strategy and mix of solutions, and would supplement other provision, including on-street and on plot parking.
172. Moreover, most proposed parking solutions would be visually attractive, safe, accessible and would contribute to street activity, as supported by the RDG⁶⁸. Therefore, the use of parking courts would not undermine the overall parking arrangement.
173. Based on the proposed layout, the link from Parcel 6 to Pimms Grove would be steep, limiting access via this route for pedestrians and cyclists. However, a

⁶⁷ Mr Taylor Urban Design Proof (Appellant) – table on page 32

⁶⁸ According to the RDG pages 37-39

connection to Pimms Grove would be achievable further to the south⁶⁹. I acknowledge that all Proposed pedestrian and cycling links to Pimms Grove would be steeper than the spine road in places, but I do not accept that they would present a considerable barrier for residents of Pimms Grove and beyond to access the proposed school by foot, or for future residents of the appeal scheme to access the bus stops located on Cock Lane, via Pimms Grove.

174. Moreover, the proposal would provide an accessible spine road, thus allowing movement through the site. In addition, bus links would be provided. The steepness of the pedestrian links proposed would not markedly diminish from a scheme which, overall, would be permeable and well-connected.

Living conditions

175. A number of the proposed dwellings would fail to retain a 25m distance between rear facing elevations, as advocated by Policy B5 of the RDG. As **clarified by this section of the RDG, the 25m distance relates to 'achieving privacy', so the principal concern here is the potential for overlooking**, so the '25 degree rule'⁷⁰ advocated by the appellant, which relates to daylight and sunlight levels, is of little assistance.

176. The appellant's **evidence** includes a list of affected properties. This also includes a calculation of the required distances, based on the RDG's approach, which also advocates an increase in separation due to level differences, or a decrease where offset angles between facing windows are apparent.

177. It is evident from the submitted plans that in many instances where the 25m distance would be breached, interzones would provide landscaping as an innovative design solution which help ensure privacy, as supported by the DB⁷¹.

178. However, there would be some relationships between properties which would not benefit from these interzones, where the intervening distances would fall below the RDG guidance. In that respect, the relationship between approximately 40 dwellings would be sub-standard. This figure is calculated on the basis of **those highlighted in red in the appellant's proof**, where no interzones would be present. It assumes a reciprocally substandard relationship between facing properties, even though it is the occupiers of the downslope dwellings more likely to be potentially overlooked by occupiers of dwellings facing them on a higher level, but it also includes the substandard relationship between several plots in Parcels 4/5, not referred to by the appellant⁷².

179. It is also worth noting that, even ignoring the interzones, and aside from one exception⁷³, facing distances between dwellings would be in excess of 20m⁷⁴. In my view, this would generally, and at worst, allow a minimal standard of privacy, if not the higher-level and standard of privacy sought by the RDG.

180. Moreover, the rear gardens of proposed dwellings would generally be at least 10m deep. As such, there would be a reasonable distance between the rear windows of properties and any retaining features located towards the back of

⁶⁹ Marked '6' on CD2.43

⁷⁰ ID48

⁷¹ CD 6.1 – page 54

⁷² Mr Smith Planning proof (Council)

⁷³ Plots 379 to 375 distance is 19.23m

⁷⁴ Figures 44 – 49 of Mr Taylor Urban Design proof (appellant)

gardens. Therefore, there would be sufficient space so that future residents could enjoy their property without feeling oppressed by any retaining elements utilised to address land levels.

181. In relation to Parcel 2, concerns relating to the use of nearby raised land as public open space, leading to privacy loss, could be addressed and managed through appropriate landscaping to dissuade public use of this space and additional measures such as signage.
182. Finally, in relation to the apartment building proposed along Hammersley Lane (Parcel 1), the position and height of the proposed retaining wall relative to the street facing windows at plot no's **34 and 35** would ensure no unacceptable levels of overbearing or overshadowing, with the latter benefitting from light entering through other windows on a separate elevation.
183. As such, whilst there would be some sub-standard relationships in relation to privacy, the scheme would achieve acceptable levels of privacy overall and all other matters relating to living conditions in relation to outlook, sunlight and daylight would be acceptable.

Building for Healthy Life

184. The proposal has also been appraised against a well-respected design toolkit, Building for Healthy Life⁷⁵ (BHL). **Despite the appellant's urban design witness having not been involved in the scheme at the early stages, I have no reason to question his professional integrity, nor his expertise and extensive experience in this field. Furthermore, I do not accept that this review was not 'independent'**⁷⁶.
185. The Council have not provided their own BHL assessment and the only BHL **assessment before me is that conducted by the appellant's witness, which I** find to be generally robust. Nevertheless, as is the case here, different urban designers, in applying their professional judgment, may reach different conclusions on the same issue.
186. This also extends to disagreement over the BHL. However, it has been assessed according to BHL guidance, where 12 different design related issues **have been considered, where each is rated 'red'** (*poor practice, stop and rethink*), **'amber'** (*not fully resolved, try and turn to green*) or **'green'** (*good practice, go ahead*).
187. In relation to those that are graded as *amber*, as previously set out, the provision of cul-de-sacs in places would **reduce the scheme's overall legibility**. Whilst improvements through reserved matters landscaping and appearance could strengthen perimeter blocks, the lack of linked up streets in places means that an amber score is justified.
188. The *amber* grade for **'healthy streets'** and **'back of pavement, front of home'** could be elevated to *green* through appropriate design responses at reserved matters stage, principally concerning the proposed landscaping and appearance.
189. **In relation to my foregoing observations on the scheme's design, some of the proposed parking courts would fall short of the attractive and well-**

⁷⁵ Appendix 2 of Mr Taylor proof (appellant). This document is explicitly referred to in para 138 of the Framework

⁷⁶ Mr Kennett proof (Council) – para 4.69

integrated parking solutions provided across most of the remaining scheme. I have also highlighted that a number of proposed dwellings would not meet the back-to-back distances advocated by the RDG, although proposed interzones would mitigate potential privacy impacts and, overall, most dwellings would meet the RDG guidance in relation to overall living conditions.

190. In relation to the identified deficiencies above, which the submitted BHL assessment grades *green*, **they relate to 'cycle and parking' and 'making the most of what is there'** criteria of BHL respectively and each of those criteria includes a range of other considerations. However, even if I was to place significant weight on the individual issues identified above such that the BHL grading for each was to be downgraded to *amber*, I am satisfied that the scheme could achieve at least nine *green* at reserved matters stage, indicative of one worthy of BHL commendation⁷⁷.

Design (including Living Conditions) Conclusion

191. **The National Design Guide states that 'place is more complex and multi-faceted than a building'**⁷⁸. This is endorsement of a holistic approach to assessing whether a place is well-designed. Policy CP9 of the Local Plan reflects this in pursuit of a high-quality sense of place⁷⁹. Adopting this approach, there may be aspects of a scheme which are sub-standard individually, but when considered in light of the positive elements, do not detract from an overall good standard of design.

192. Taking a rounded view in determining the overall design quality of a scheme is crucial and in this case the scheme would constitute a well-designed place. It would comply with Policies HW6, CP9, DM32 and DM35 of the Local Plan which requires, amongst other things, that development adopts a sensitive design response to establish a strong sense of place with a distinctive, attractive and functional living environment with a landscape-led design. The Policies also require measures to conserve the key characteristics of the natural and built environment, demonstrating attractive and high-quality design which is appropriate in scale, character form and layout. For the same reasons, it would also comply with DFO5, 6 and 17 of the DB, the RDG, the National Design Guide and paragraphs 135 and 139 of the Framework.

193. Overall, a reasonable degree of privacy would be achieved, and a high standard of amenity overall. When viewed in its entirety, the proposal would be in compliance with Policies HW6 and DM35 of the Local Plan, the National Design Guide, DFO17 of the DB and paragraph 135(f) of the Framework which require, amongst other things, that development provides privacy and a high standard of amenity for future occupants appropriate to the proposed use, adopting a sensitive design response.

Accessibility

194. Policy DM41 of the Local Plan requires that 30% of affordable homes and 20% of market homes are provided in accordance with Building Regulation Approved Document M4(3). This approved document provides guidance for meeting the legal requirement, which is set out in the Building Regulations.

⁷⁷ Page 11 of appendix 2 of Mr Taylor proof (appellant)

⁷⁸ CD 7.2 para 5

⁷⁹ Paragraph 4.103 subtext to Policy CP9 clarifies that 'senses of place is about ensuring that development responds in a holistic way...'

195. The disagreement relates to the accessibility of parking bays associated with the proposed apartments/flats only. One aspect of providing wheelchair user dwellings is to ensure suitable car parking and drop-off. In this respect, the Approved Document M4(3) distinguishes between parking spaces within the private curtilage of a dwelling and communal parking areas, whereby different standards apply.
196. Even though I appreciate that the parking spaces would be allocated and conveyed to respective occupants of the apartments, they would not be within the private curtilage of dwellings. Therefore, even if not precisely reflective of, the nature of the scheme would most closely resemble, the communal parking requirements set out in Approved Document M4(3).
197. In order to address this requirement, there would need to be clear access zones of 1200mm to both sides of the relevant parking spaces. In this regard, the proposed parking spaces to serve wheelchair accessible dwellings/apartments be non-compliant.
198. However, that is not to say that the parking layout proposed would have no regard to wheelchair accessibility. Instead, the proposal would provide space to the rear of relevant parking spaces with either individual or shared space to one side, but it would not be in accordance with Approved Document M4(3). As a result, there would be conflict with Policy DM41 of the Local Plan.
199. This relates to one criterion of Policy DM41, and there is no suggestion that any of the other criteria would not be met. Moreover, practical accessibility considerations are relevant, as set out above, in that the parking provided would comprise enhanced accessibility for wheelchair users over and above **'standard' parking bays**.
200. In addition, the conflict arises in relation to wheelchair accessible parking provision within flats/apartments only, and not standard house types. Approved Document M4(3) includes various other requirements, and I have no reason to think that there would be any other breaches of this document. For these reasons, conflict with Policy DM41 is attributed limited weight in this case.

Biodiversity

Ecological connectivity

201. The contested feature relates to a meandering hedgerow located generally in **between Little Gomm's Wood and Pimms Grove woodland**. **This would be** severed in two places to make way for the proposed spine road and access to the employment land.
202. Local Plan Policy HW6 requires that effects of severance and disturbance on existing and proposed habitats are minimised. This is generally reflective of paragraph 186(a) of the Framework which requires that significant biodiversity impacts should be addressed in a sequential manner, with avoidance being the first consideration, followed by mitigation then, as a last resort, compensation.
203. **The word 'significant' is important** here⁸⁰, as it indicates that application of the mitigation hierarchy is intended to address significant potential biodiversity

⁸⁰ See also Planning Practice Guidance paragraph: 019 Reference ID: 8-019-20240214

- impacts and should be informed by the nature of the feature(s) affected as well as the extent of harm or effects that may arise. Relevant guidance supports a proportionate approach to ecological impact assessments, which focus on significant effects as opposed to all ecological effects⁸¹.
204. In this regard, the significance of the hedgerow in connectivity terms is diminished by an expanse of arable land which lies beyond the northern extent of the hedgerow, which leaves a gap of approximately 85m between it and Little Gomm's Wood. **By the Council's own admission, arable land does not** provide good connectivity, and this is recognised by the ES⁸². Therefore, the arable land breaks the link between the two areas of woodland, so it is not a feature of significance in connectivity terms warranting detailed analysis in this regard.
205. Nevertheless, the hedgerow includes ecological features and species of significance, including trees, bat habitats and badger setts. These were assessed individually in the ES, addressing any inference that the ES completely ignored the hedgerow in question. Therefore, rather than an important feature of connectivity between the two woodland areas, its value can mainly be attributed to the extent to which it supports protected species and habitat.
206. Severance of the hedgerow would be an inevitable effect of delivering a policy compliant scheme, as illustrated by the anticipated route of the spine road as set out in the DB, which cuts through the same hedgerow. Therefore, whilst the proposed spine road would create a gap in the existing hedgerow, this would be justified and unavoidable.
207. The proposed employment access deviates from the location envisaged by the DB. However, the indicative access points are not suitable, for the reasons previously set out. Therefore, further severance of the hedgerow is justifiable in the circumstances, necessary to provide a suitable access to the proposed employment land.
208. The scheme exhibits an iterative design approach whereby the most important ecological features of the hedgerow have been recognised⁸³. Consequently, the mitigation adopted is mainly embedded into the scheme. The severance of hedgerow, as a result of the two accesses, would be in locations which would avoid its significant ecological features. Moreover, in light of the need to provide a road of sufficient width to accommodate all vehicle types, pedestrians, and to address land level changes; the Council provided no substantive evidence to support any suggestions that the width of the proposed accesses should be narrower.
209. In relation to the foraging potential of the hedgerow and the impacts on badgers both generally and in relation to roads proposed, severance effects could be dealt with by planning conditions relating to the provision of sensitive lighting along the accesses. Badger tunnels could also be incorporated. Further mitigation would include appropriate planting close to badger setts to reduce badger mortality. The overall effects of the scheme on badgers would be negligible.

⁸¹ CD8.16 – para 1.11

⁸² CD2.23 - para 8.374

⁸³ CD2.3 – Design and Access Statement pages 48-51

210. In addition to minimising the effects of severance, Policy HW6 of the Local Plan requires opportunities for habitat creation and connectivity to be maximised. By any measure, the enhancement proposed in this respect would be significant. At least an additional 1.8km of native hedgerow would be planted and the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the woodland bands between Little Gomm's Wood and Pimms Grove woodland would be significantly increased. This would result in a largely connected ecological corridor, running generally north to south through the site. The existing gap between Little Gomm's Wood and the hedgerow would be substantially reduced.
211. These enhancements⁸⁴ would not be dependent on the proposed planting to the rear of Pimms Grove, which would offer only limited habitat enhancement in the form of a narrow hedgerow running between the rear of existing and proposed housing.
212. Policy HW6, paragraph 5.1.51 of the Local Plan sets out several tests used to determine whether severance effects would be minimised. For the reasons set out, the proposal would address all these criteria.

Ancient Woodland

213. The evidence of the Council and Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) states that a 50m buffer, as advocated by the Woodland Trust in 2019, should be provided between ancient woodland and the development. However, Planning Practice Guidance indicates that Forestry Commission and Natural England standing advice can be a material consideration in determining proposals which could affect ancient woodland⁸⁵ and this recommends a buffer zone of at least 15m between ancient woodland and development. I have adopted this as a starting point for determining the suitability of the buffer in this case.
214. This is not a speculative development. Rather, it would be on an allocated site, informed by a DB which also recommends a minimum buffer of 15m. Nevertheless, the ES acknowledges that distance in itself would not be sufficient to mitigate impacts due to an increase in informal recreation due to future residents potentially accessing unsuitable ecological areas within Gomm Valley.
215. The concerns relate to the Pimms Grove ancient woodland which is also a priority habitat. During the Inquiry the appellant explained that heights of the proposed retaining walls **had not been included in the Council's evidence**, which alleged that buffer zones would not be 15m from built form in some places. Based on the submitted plans and this evidence, I am satisfied that the proposal would provide buffers of at least 15m. In places it would be greater and would also provide a root protection area to the important trees which lie within the buffer but outside the ancient woodland itself.
216. The DB does not elaborate on the nature of the buffers, other than to say **they should be 'appropriate'**. However, the scheme has been designed to incorporate buffer zones which would serve to address the adjacent ancient woodlands. They would be populated by trees, scrub and areas of grassland and herbaceous planting, forming an ecological transition between the ancient woodland and development and open space beyond.

⁸⁴ Plan ECO2b of Mr Goodwin ecology proof (appellant)

⁸⁵ PPG - Paragraph: 035 Reference ID: 8-035-20190721 which is provided in CD8.1

217. Consequently, the ancient woodland buffers would be appropriate. In addition, the proposal would include active management of the ancient woodland, where currently no formal management exists, including public access management.
218. In addition to the type of planting proposed in the buffers, additional measures would include a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CECoMP) and a condition specifically relating to minimisation of impacts on the ancient woodland, both of which would be secured by planning condition in order to mitigate construction effects. This is also confirmed by the ES.
219. Overall, the mitigation measures proposed would adequately respond to the nature of the potential effect and significance⁸⁶, including the adoption of a 15m buffer.

Other ecological matters

220. Impacts on the SSSI would be mitigated by the provision of a 50m buffer from the proposed built form, along with construction mitigation measures in the form of a CECoMP, which would require prior agreement with the Council.
221. There would be direct loss of approximately 0.3ha of LWS due to the creation of a pedestrian link from Parcel 1 to the western part of the site, although the vast majority of the LWS would be retained. The DB acknowledges the likely requirement for links through the LWS, as illustrated in the accompanying text and illustrative drawings. In this case, the calcareous grassland habitat (which is the LWS' important attribute) is declining and suffering from scrub encroachment, confirmed by detailed analysis carried out as part of the EIA process. Adverse effects would be mitigated and enhanced by the establishment of new calcareous grassland and management of the LWS, resulting in beneficial effects overall in this respect⁸⁷.
222. In relation to the biodiversity net gain, it is clear that significant linear and area habitats would be created over and above the baseline⁸⁸. In addition, the Council does not contest the details associated with the submitted biodiversity metric. Therefore, it would be in a measurably better state in comparison with the baseline.

Biodiversity Conclusion

223. The proposal would address ecological connectivity, including adequate mitigation for the resultant severance of the hedgerow. In this regard the proposal would satisfy the requirements of Policies CP9, CP10, DM34 and HW6 of the Local Plan, and Policies DM11, DM13 and DM14 of the ADSAP and DFO9 of the DB which requires the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment and green infrastructure, giving the highest level of protection to habitats and species of national importance, the maximisation of biodiversity by creating new areas or features and minimising severance of existing and proposed habitats caused by access and development.

⁸⁶ CD2.23 – ES Chapter 8 - Table 8.16

⁸⁷ The S106 agreement would require the submission of a Habitat Management Monitoring Plan, including details of habitat creation and management (including calcareous grassland) to be provided following agreement with the Council.

⁸⁸ CD2.6

224. The proposal would ensure the retention of appropriate and adequate buffers to the ancient woodlands in accordance with Policies HW6, CP9, CP10 and DM34 of the Local Plan, DM11, DM13 and DM14 of the ADSAP and DFO7 of the DB. The proposal would ensure that ancient woodlands, being irreplaceable habitats, would not be deteriorated or lost, in compliance with paragraph 186(c) of the Framework. Adequate buffers and mitigation would also be provided in relation to the LWS and SSSI, subject to conditions and a S106, in compliance with Policies including HW6 of the Local Plan.

Planning Obligations

225. The obligations are secured in the form of a bilateral Section 106 Agreement which are binding on the appellant and the Council.

SSSI - Legal Principles

226. BBOWT are not party to the S106 Agreement despite having a lease on the SSSI land, which forms part of the appeal site. Nevertheless, there is no requirement in law that all interests in the land must be party to a S106 Agreement.

227. In order to ensure delivery of the mitigation set out in the ES in relation to a management strategy, the appellant proposes a long-term annual monetary contribution (SSSI Management Contribution) which would be paid to the Council. The Council would be required to administer to BBOWT (or other lease holder), to be spent on the SSSI in accordance with a management scheme for the SSSI which would be agreed between the appellant and the Council.

228. Given BBOWT's focused remit on nature conservation, I have no reason to think that as leaseholder, with many remaining years on their lease, they would not do everything possible to support the appropriate management and conservation of the SSSI.

229. In any event, any owner or occupier of the land has a number of roles and responsibilities in relation to the SSSI, as set out in the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). This includes BBOWT as a leaseholder, and these legislative requirements would not be altered by the proposal. Furthermore, they appear to have been consummate custodians since acquiring an interest in the land over 20 years ago, as evidenced by the SSSI's current 'favourable' status.

230. I am satisfied that the bilateral agreement as drafted provides suitable mitigation and a mechanism, implementation of which would be under the **Council's** direct control, with subsequent management of the SSSI to be carried out by a competent body, their responsibilities in relation to the SSSI also being governed by other legislation. This would mitigate indirect impacts on the SSSI, along with the other mitigation measures previously set out.

SSSI - Funding Arrangements

231. The S106 also includes a requirement for full funding details of the Habitat Monitoring and Management Plan (HMMP) and the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) to be provided. The appellant (owner) would be required to perform all management and maintenance obligations should the management company be responsible for a fundamental breach of the Sustainable Management Framework.

232. The monetary contribution in relation to the SSSI whilst long-term, would be limited to 29 years. The justification for the annual contribution includes, amongst other things, an appointed member of staff to deal with mitigation and management of the SSSI through an increase in visitors throughout this period. By that time the wider Gomm Valley site would likely be markedly different due to significant habitat creation, in comparison with the site as it stands today. Specifically, SSSI buffer zones would have established, which would serve to restrict public access. Moreover, the S106 includes a one-off initial Capital Costs Contribution to erect stock proof fencing, and this would assist with retaining grazing animals within the SSSI in the interests of beneficial habitat management.
233. The long-term duration of the annual payments means that there would be ample opportunity to implement the SSSI management strategy and continually improve necessary access restrictions, conservation and enhancement for the important features for which the site is a SSSI. Moreover, at the end of the annual payment period, statutory responsibilities as set out in current legislation are likely to still apply. I have no reason to conclude that the SSSI would be harmed in the long-term.
234. The range of measures (including the annual contribution) for the completed development would, according to the ES, result in beneficial effects of minor significance⁸⁹. The cessation of payments after 29 years, for the reasons set out, would not markedly diminish the positive aspects delivered by the SSSI management strategy overall.
235. In this regard, the S106 is sufficiently robust to ensure the creation, retention and enhancement of habitats in the Gomm Valley in accordance with the DB.

Custom Build

236. Policy DM22 of the Local Plan requires that schemes involving 100 houses or more include 5% of the dwellings proposed as self-build plots. Numerically the proposal would address the 5% requirement, but the extent to which the 28 serviced plots proposed would meet the definition is disputed.
237. The proposal purports to include custom-build only, with some fixed parameters, as opposed to self-build. The Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended) (SBCHA Act) provides a definition of self-build and custom housebuilding, although it does not distinguish between each of the types of housing, and there is no definition contained in the Local Plan. It seems that broadly speaking, self-build denotes a higher level of customisation and construction by the initial homeowner, whereas custom-build can include an element of fixed plans and specifications where the homeowner works with a third-party enabler.
238. The key point is that the initial homeowner must have primary input into the final design and layout⁹⁰. Therefore, it is not necessary for the initial homeowner to influence and design every aspect of their home.
239. In this case, whilst **the initial homeowner's input into the final design and layout** would be constrained by parameters, including the fixed location and

⁸⁹ CD2.23 – para 8.413

⁹⁰ PPG – para 038 Reference ID: 57-038-20210508

external layout and scale of each dwelling, they would be able to influence matters including, but not limited to, the external materials, external features such as porch design, internal home configuration and placement of non-structural walls. As the appellant confirmed during the Inquiry, there would not be a fixed number of plans or specifications to choose from and a prospective homeowner would be able to present their own options.

240. Whilst the S106 omits **part of the definition of 'self-build and custom housebuilding' contained in the SBCHA, the alternative provided** in the S106, relating specifically to the custom housebuilding proposed, is sufficiently detailed and precise so that primary input into the final design and layout would be retained by initial homeowners.
241. In relation to local demand, over 500 individuals are seeking serviced self-build or custom build plots in the Wycombe area of Buckinghamshire, and there has been persistent failure to meet the demand.
242. I recognise that the semi-detached nature and size of the plots proposed in this case would not precisely align with the indicated current demand, which suggests an overwhelming preference for larger, detached self-build plots. This is a **'preference'** and secondary source data suggests that the number of persons interested in self-build/custom build plots may be considerably higher than the numbers registered⁹¹, although that is an estimate based on ONS data and not a result of specific primary research into local demand in the High Wycombe area.
243. Therefore, the scheme would promote a limited range of custom build plots in terms of the degree of customisation and the type of plots available. The evidence indicates that a range of custom and self-build types and plots are required.
244. Nevertheless, the custom build plots proposed would ensure that initial homeowners would have primary input into its final design and layout. As such, it would meet the SBCHA definition. The proposal would comply with Policy DM22 which requires that 5% of dwellings in large schemes should be self-build plots.

Employment

245. Policy HW6(1)(d) of the Local Plan requires the provision of 1.2ha of land for employment uses. I concur with the appellant that the unpredictable nature of market conditions means that there are risks associated with tying the delivery of the employment parcel with the delivery of prescriptive elements of the wider scheme. Such an approach could prevent the delivery of the wider scheme and the benefits associated with delivering housing and the like.
246. Furthermore, the scheme before me is comprehensive in that it includes details of access and the land would be fully integrated into the wider scheme, likely being a very attractive prospect for those with an interest in developing the site for employment purposes.
247. There is no requirement for a mechanism to secure the delivery of employment land contained within Policy HW6, which is the most important policy in determining this appeal. Moreover, securing outline consent with

⁹¹ Mr Shepherd Planning Proof (Appellant) – appendix F para 4.16

future reserved matters to provide specific site layout and detail would represent a suitable mechanism in this case, in compliance with Policy DM6 of the ADSAP.

248. As I am dismissing the appeal, I have not sought to address all the planning obligations included in the S106, only those mainly in dispute.

Other Matters

Material considerations in favour - Benefits

249. The benefits of the scheme should not be ascribed lower weight on the basis of a fall-back. There is no planning permission or current planning application for any alternative scheme on the appeal site. Therefore, there is no more than a theoretical prospect of an alternative scheme coming forwards on this site any time soon that accords with the DB, thus no credible alternative with a real prospect of being delivered.

250. In terms of benefits, the proposal would deliver up to 544 high quality homes including 261 affordable homes. I recognise that the scheme would provide much needed market and affordable housing, where nationally the need is acute⁹² and where locally there is a pressing need for affordable housing given worsening affordability and persistent failure to deliver the affordable units needed annually.

251. Moreover, the Local plan is now older than five years, and there is evidence to indicate that the Council may not be able to demonstrate a five-year supply once the current transitional protection arrangement ceases. These considerations do not displace the current, agreed position, which is that the Council are able to demonstrate a five-year supply⁹³. Nevertheless, the scheme would make a significant contribution towards **the Council's five-year** housing land supply and affordable housing requirement.

252. **The scheme's layout, including plots and the design of road and footways** across the scheme, would negotiate the considerable topographical challenges of the site, incorporating suitable levels and promoting accessibility for all users, providing many adaptable and accessible dwellings.

253. The community facility and orchards/growing areas proposed would provide benefits for new and existing residents of the locality. Sustainable modes of transport would be provided directly or contributed towards, including PRoW, cycleway and bus service improvements.

254. Employment benefits would arise due to the provision of employment land and the potential for future job creation forming part of the scheme⁹⁴. **Furthermore, there would be temporary jobs associated with the scheme's** construction⁹⁵ and indirect benefits to the local economy through an increase in spending by future occupiers of the development, as well as community infrastructure contributions and New Homes Bonus.

⁹² Secretary of State's written ministerial statement entitled '*Building the homes we need*'

⁹³ I also recognise the 'standard method' used to assess housing need, as advocated by the draft Framework, would likely further increase the annual requirement for new homes in Buckinghamshire, although this is a draft consultation document which carries limited weight and does not alter the weight attributed to housing proposed in this case

⁹⁴ Anticipated 52 FTE jobs

⁹⁵ 138 FTE direct and 134 indirect jobs along with construction training

255. The biodiversity benefits would include, but not be limited to, restoration of the Gomm Valley LWS along with new calcareous grassland, new species-rich habitats across the site, extensive new canopy cover, and improved connectivity in terms of hedgerow and tree belts, along with management and stewardship of the site, including Gomm Valley LWS and Ancient Woodlands for an extensive period of time. There would be improvements to the SSSI. Biodiversity net gain would exceed statutory requirements.
256. The benefits above each carry significant weight in favour of the scheme.
257. The proposal would include a single form entry school which would also serve the existing area and contribute towards the needs of the community. In accordance with the Framework, this attracts great weight in favour.
258. The proposal would provide a large number of custom build plots (5%) in the **context of the Council's** persistent failure to meet their statutory duty. However, the local demand indicates a preference for a wider range of plot types than the semi-detached custom build plots as proposed. Therefore, moderate weight is attributed to the custom build homes as proposed.

Overall Balance and Conclusion

259. The identified highways objections are matters that attract very substantial weight because, having regard to the deficient analysis of the transport network and future traffic impacts associated with the proposal, the residual cumulative impact on the network would be severe, resulting in unacceptable highway safety impacts.
260. The scheme would address the allocation in respect of character and appearance, design, biodiversity and ancient woodland, living conditions, accessibility and other infrastructure, in compliance with elements of Policy HW6 and related Local Plan and ADSAP Policies as set out. However, due to highways impacts, I find conflict with Local Plan Policy HW6 overall and several other policies in relation to transportation and highways. Therefore, I find overall conflict with the development plan when read as a whole.
261. The proposal would fail to meet one aspect of Approved Document M4(3) in relation to wheelchair users, in conflict with Policy DM41 of the Local Plan. This carries limited weight, but I find conflict with the development plan irrespective of this.
262. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the appeal must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
263. The material considerations in this case which weigh in favour of the scheme do not indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan when taken as a whole. Consequently, the appeal is dismissed, and planning permission is refused.

M Woodward

INSPECTOR

ANNEX A: APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

James Maurici KC Landmark Chambers

Alex Shattock Landmark Chambers

Called:

Robin Shepherd BSc(Hons), DipTP, MRTPI - *Planning* Director - Stantec

Stephen Taylor BA(Hons), Recognised Practitioner of Urban Design - *Design* Head of Design - Turley

Neil Marshall BSc(Hons), CMILT, MIHT - *Transport* Partner - i-Transport

Andrew Smith BSc(Hons), MSc, CMLI - *Landscape* Director and Trustee Board Director - Fabrik

Owen Hallett MSc, qualifying member of CIEEM - *Ecology/Biodiversity* Assoc- Ecology Solutions

Witnesses giving evidence only at Round Table Sessions:

Emma Philpott CEng, C.WEM MCIWEM - *Drainage* AD - Abley Letchford Partnership Ltd.

Sarah Cross BSc(Hons), MA, MSc, MRTPI Assoc - Stantec

Robin Pearmain BA(Hons), MATCP MRTPI - Head of Planning - Taylor Wimpey West London

Vicky Fowler Solicitor Partner - Gowling WLG LLP

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Richard Ground KC

John Fitzsimons

Called:

Chris Kennett Pg Dip, MSc, CMLI Urban Designer and Landscape Architect - Council

Melanie Radley BSc, MSc Highways Development Management Team Leader - Council

Philip Simpkin
BSc, MSc, MA, PD Arb (RFS), MArborA, MICF

Interim Ecology Team Leader

Adam Smith BSc, MSc, MRTPI

Principal Planning Officer -
Council

Witnesses giving evidence only at Round Table Sessions:

Del Tester FIHE, MCIHT

MD – Origin Transport
Consultants

Katherine Stubbs

Senior Solicitor - Council

Chris Steuart BA, MSc, MRTPI

TL, Majors (West) - Council

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Councillor David Johncock - Buckinghamshire Council

Councillor Katrina Wood - Buckinghamshire Council

Councillor Steven Barrett - Buckinghamshire Council

Councillor Nathan Thomas - Buckinghamshire Council

Councillor Andrea Baughan - Buckinghamshire Council

Sarah Hearn - Buckinghamshire, Berkshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust

Matthew Stanton - Buckinghamshire, Berkshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust

Martin Reed

John O'Brien (Pimms Action Group)

Miles Green

Ken Cooke

Mr Barrett

Miss Overton

Dr Chris Woodman

Mr Collison

Mrs Roker

ANNEX B: INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

- ID1 – Statement of Common Ground – Flood Risk and Drainage
- ID2 – Statement of Common Ground – Highways
- ID3 – Statement of Common Ground – Landscape and Visual
- ID4 – Draft list of Planning Conditions (01-03-24)
- ID5 – Draft Round Table Session Agenda
- ID6 – E-mail from appellant to Council concerning height of employment buildings
- ID7 – *Bramley Solar Farm Residents Group v Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities & Ors [2023] EWHC 2842 (Admin)*
- ID8 – Appellant Opening Statement to Inquiry
- ID9 – Council Opening Statement to Inquiry
- ID10 – **'Ashwells'** decision notice – ref - 18/05002/R9OUTE
- ID11 – Mr Ken Cooke Opening Statement
- ID12 – Inspector Ruling on amended Description of Development
- ID13 – Agricultural Land Classification Report – May 2022
- ID14 – Site visit itinerary agreed by main parties part 1
- ID15 – Site visit itinerary agreed by main parties part 2
- ID16 – Representations from Mr Cooke
- ID17 – Representations from Julie Overton
- ID18 – **Representation from Mr Cooke on 'coalescence'**
- ID19 – Summary of information/plans **relating to 'Ashwells' development**
- ID20 – GLVIA⁹⁶ – box 5.1
- ID21 – Fabrik recommendation report extracts
- ID22 – Inquiry Note – appellant - school and employment land
- ID23 – Appellant e-mail attempting to clarify/address several reasons for refusal
- ID24 – Design Evidence in Chief presentation – Stephen Taylor
- ID25 – Addendum to Flood Risk Statement of Common Ground
- ID26 – *MMF (UK) Ltd v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Another [2010] EWHC 3686 (Admin)*
- ID27 – Addendum to Ecology Evidence
- ID28 – Ecology and Nature Conservation Statement of Common Ground
- ID29 – Inquiry Note - appellant – BMV Land
- ID30 – **Appellant's additional response to consultations received**
- ID31 – Inquiry Note – appellant – Environmental Statement
- ID32a) – Previous correspondence Mr Cooke and Taylor Wimpey b) further correspondence
- ID33 – Council note to Inspector in response to ID22
- ID34 – Inquiry Note – Council – Highways/TRICS
- ID35 – Inquiry Note – Appellant – Highways/TRICS
- ID37a) – LinSig Summary Tables (existing) b) Option 1 c) Option 2
- ID38 – LinSig Summary Results V2
- ID39 – Appendix I Table 4 of appellant Highways Proof – visual interpretation
- ID40 – LinSig User Guide definitions
- ID41 – **Transport Assessment addendum 'Ashwells'**
- ID42 – Working draft list of planning conditions
- ID43 – Drainage technical note (02.04.24)
- ID44 – Second Addendum Flood Risk and Drainage Statement of Common Ground
- ID45a) – Gomm Valley draft S106 Agreement 05.04.24 b) S106 issue note
- ID46 – Round Table Sessions agenda
- ID47 – Gomm Valley Statement by BBOWT

⁹⁶ Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment - third edition

ID48 – BRE Guidance
ID49 – Technical annexe – condition assessment for Grasslands
ID50 – Wycombe Local Plan Extract page 89
ID51 – Council CIL Compliance Statement
ID52a) – Draft S106 Agreement b)Appended plans
ID53 – Appellant S106 Note – SSSI
ID54a) Gomm Valley SSSI Citation **b) Natural England 'Views about Management'**
ID55 – NHS BOB ICB – healthcare contribution request
ID56 – S106 and Conditions Round Table Session Agenda
ID57 – Draft list of Conditions 13.05.24
ID58 – List of plans to be conditioned
ID59 – Ken Cooke – supplementary comments on re-consultation
ID60 – Optimism Bias
ID61 – Council Inquiry Closing Submission
ID62a) Appellant Inquiry Closing Submission b)Annex

Received after the Inquiry closed:

ID63 – S106 Agreement
ID64 – **Appellant's note in response to** SoS WMS and proposed changes to NPPF and planning system.
ID65 – **Council's note in response to** SoS WMS and proposed changes to NPPF and planning system.

ANNEX C: CORE DOCUMENTS

Core Doc Number	Title	Drawing/Document Ref.	Date
<i>CD1 – Application Documents and Plans as originally submitted and which remain relevant to the appeal</i>			
1.1	Ecology and Trees Checklist	F-105 Rev 2.0	No date
1.2	Statement of Community Involvement		May 2022
1.3	Site Existing Survey	21020 S101	May 2021
1.4	Site Survey	Rev B	January 2022
1.5	Site Survey Sheet 1 of 7	Rev B	January 2022
1.6	Site Survey Sheet 2 of 7	Rev B	January 2022
1.7	Site Survey Sheet 3 of 7	Rev B	January 2022
1.8	Site Survey Sheet 4 of 7	Rev B	January 2022
1.9	Site Survey Sheet 5 of 7	Rev B	January 2022
1.10	Site Survey Sheet 6 of 7	Rev B	January 2022
1.11	Site Survey Sheet 7 of 7	Rev B	January 2022
<i>CD2 – Additional/Amended Documents and Drawings</i>			
2.1	Application Form		25 August 2023
2.2	Planning Statement	32646/A5/LD	14 July 2023
2.3	Design and Access Statement		July 2023
2.4	Energy and Sustainability Statement	Ta.GV.HP13 R04	21 July 2023
2.5	Arboricultural Development Report	TF1193-FAB-00-XX-RP-G-8301 Rev P03	July 2023
2.6	Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment and Calculator		July 2023
2.7	Canopy Calculator (Outline)		03 July 2023
2.8	Canopy Calculator (Phase 1)		09 June 2023
2.9	Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy	A372-R001B	14 July 2023
2.10	Transport Assessment	NM/MD/HC/ITL16767-014A	13 July 2023
2.11	Travel Plan	NM/MD/ITL16767-015A	13 July 2023
2.12	Utilities Statement	Rev 2	July 2023
2.13	Site Waste Management Plan		July 2023
2.14	Waste and Recycling Strategy		July 2023
2.15	Gomm Valley ES Vol 1 Main Text Contents		August 2023
2.16	Gomm Valley ES Vol 2 Appendices Contents		August 2023
2.17	Gomm Valley ES Chapter 1 Intro, figures and appendices		August 2023
2.18	Gomm Valley ES Chapter 2 EIA Method, figures and appendices		August 2023
2.19	Gomm Valley ES Chapter 3 Site, figures and appendices		August 2023
2.20	Gomm Valley ES Chapter 4 Alternatives figures and appendices		August 2023
2.21	Gomm Valley ES Chapter 5 Construction, figures and appendices		August 2023

2.22	Gomm Valley ES Chapter 7 Landscape, figures and appendices		August 2023
2.23	Gomm Valley ES Chapter 8 Ecology, figures and appendices		August 2023
2.24	Gomm Valley ES Chapter 9 Historic Environment, figures and appendices		August 2023
2.25	Gomm Valley ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health, figures and appendices		August 2023
2.26	ES Appendix 8.2 Confidential Badger Appendix		August 2023
2.27	ES Addendum Letter and Non-Technical Summary – Part 1 and 2		October 2023
2.28	ES Addendum - Gomm Valley ES Chapter 6A Transport		October 2023
2.29	ES Addendum - Gomm Valley ES Chapter 10A Air Quality		October 2023
2.30	ES Addendum - Gomm Valley ES Chapter 11A Noise and Vibration		October 2023
2.31	ES Addendum - Gomm Valley ES Chapter 13A Summary and Residual Effects		October 2023
2.32	Spine Road Study		19 July 2023
2.33	Landscape and Ecological Management and Maintenance Framework	D3086_FAB_00_XX_SP_L_001 Rev 002	August 2023
2.34	Building for a Healthy Life Assessment		July 2023
2.35	Preliminary Utilities Appraisal Report	Rev 2	July 2023
2.36	Site Location Plan	21020 S201	April 2022
2.37	Application Boundary Plan	21020 S202	April 2022
2.38	Phasing Plan	21020 / C655	May 2023
2.39	Coloured Site Layout Masterplan	21020 / C601	July 2023
2.40	Site Layout Masterplan	21020 / P601	April 2023
2.41	Land Use Parameter Plan	21020 / C606	May 2023
2.42	Building Heights Parameter Plan	21020 / C607	May 2023
2.43	Access and Movement Parameter Plan	21020 / C608	May 2023
2.44	Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan	21020 / C609	May 2023

2.25	Gomm Valley ES Chapter 12 Population and Human Health, figures and appendices		August 2023
2.26	ES Appendix 8.2 Confidential Badger Appendix		August 2023
2.27	ES Addendum Letter and Non- Technical Summary – Part 1 and 2		October 2023
2.28	ES Addendum - Gomm Valley ES Chapter 6A Transport		October 2023
2.29	ES Addendum - Gomm Valley ES Chapter 10A Air Quality		October 2023
2.30	ES Addendum - Gomm Valley ES Chapter 11A Noise and Vibration		October 2023
2.31	ES Addendum - Gomm Valley ES Chapter 13A Summary and Residual Effects		October 2023
2.32	Spine Road Study		19 July 2023
2.33	Landscape and Ecological Management and Maintenance Framework	D3086_FAB_00_XX_SP_L_001 Rev 002	August 2023
2.34	Building for a Healthy Life Assessment		July 2023
2.35	Preliminary Utilities Appraisal Report	Rev 2	July 2023
2.36	Site Location Plan	21020 S201	April 2022
2.37	Application Boundary Plan	21020 S202	April 2022
2.38	Phasing Plan	21020 / C655	May 2023
2.39	Coloured Site Layout Masterplan	21020 / C601	July 2023
2.40	Site Layout Masterplan	21020 / P601	April 2023
2.41	Land Use Parameter Plan	21020 / C606	May 2023
2.42	Building Heights Parameter Plan	21020 / C607	May 2023
2.43	Access and Movement Parameter Plan	21020 / C608	May 2023
2.44	Green Infrastructure Parameter Plan	21020 / C609	May 2023

2.65	Tree Removal and Arboricultural Impact Assessment Plan (Phase 1) - Sheet 1 of 1	TF1193-FAB-P1-XX-DR-G-8301 P03	July 2023
2.66	Indicative Levels Strategy Sheet 1	A372-002 Rev P4	July 2023
2.67	Indicative Levels Strategy Sheet 2	A372-003 Rev P4	July 2023
2.68	Indicative Levels Strategy Sheet 3	A372-004 Rev P4	July 2023
2.69	Indicative Levels Strategy Sheet 4	A372-005 Rev P4	July 2023
2.70	General Arrangement	A372-RM1-101 Rev P2	June 2023
2.71	Longitudinal Sections Sheet 1	A372-RM1-151 Rev P2	June 2023
2.72	Longitudinal Sections Sheet 2	A372-RM1-152 Rev P2	June 2023
2.73	Surface Water Main Rising Longitudinal Section	A372-RM1-153 Rev P2	June 2023
2.74	Basin Sections	A372-RM1-161 Rev P2	June 2022
2.75	Engineering Layout	A372-RM1-401 Rev P5	June 2023
2.76	Drainage Layout Sheet 1	A372-RM1-501 Rev P2	June 2023
2.77	Drainage Layout Sheet 2	A372-RM1-502 Rev P2	June 2023
2.78	Drainage Details Sheet 1	A372-RM1-551 Rev P2	June 2023
2.79	Drainage Details Sheet 2	A372-RM1-552 Rev P2	June 2023
2.80	Materials Plan	A372-RM1-701 Rev P2	May 2023
2.81	Highway Construction Details	A372-RM1-710 Rev P2	June 2023
2.82	Coloured Street Scenes A & B	21020 / C210	July 2023
2.83	Coloured Street Scenes C, D & E	21020 / C211	July 2023
2.84	Phase 1 Site Layout – Roof Plan	21020 / P201	April 2023
2.85	Phase 1 Site Layout – Parking Plan	21020 / P203	April 2023
2.86	Site Sections 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D Parcel 1	21020 / P212	May 2023
2.87	Site Sections 1E, 1F, 1G, 1H Parcel 1	21020 / P213	May 2023
2.88	Site Sections 2A, 2B, 2C, 2D Parcel 1	21020 / P214	May 2023
2.89	Street Scenes A & B (Sheet 1 of 2)	21020 / P210	April 2023
2.90	Street Scenes C, D & E (Sheet 2 of 2)	21020 / P211	April 2023
2.91	Parcels 2 & 3 Coloured Site Layout	21020 / C602	July 2023
2.92	Parcels 2 & 3 Site Layout	21020 / P602	April 2023
2.93	Parcels 4 & 5 Coloured Site Layout	21020 / C603	July 2023

2.94	Parcels 4 & 5 Site Layout	21020 / P603	April 2023
2.95	Parcel 6 Coloured Site Layout	21020 / C604	July 2023
2.96	Parcel 6 Site Layout	21020 / P604	April 2023
2.97	Parcels 7 & 8 Coloured Site Layout	21020 / C605	July 2023
2.98	Parcel 7 & 8 Site Layout	21020 / P605	April 2023
2.99	Scale and Layout	21020 / C612	June 2023
2.100	Housing Tenure Plan Phase 1	21020 / P202	April 2023
2.101	Building Materials Layout Phase 1	21020 / P204A	April 2023
2.102	Boundary Materials Layout Phase 1	21020 / P205	April 2023
2.103	Building Heights Plan Phase 1	21020 / P206	April 2023
2.104	Accommodation Plan Phase 1	21020 / P207	April 2023
2.105	Custom Build Plan Phase 1	21020 / P208	April 2023
2.106	M4(3) Distribution Plan Phase 1	21020 / P209	April 2023
2.107	Indicative Surface Water Drainage Strategy Sheet 1	A372-007 Rev P4	July 2023
2.108	Indicative Surface Water Drainage Strategy Sheet 2	A372-008 Rev P4	July 2023
2.109	Indicative Foul Water Drainage Strategy Sheet 1	A372-009 Rev P4	July 2023
2.110	Indicative Foul Water Drainage Strategy Sheet 2	A372-010 Rev P4	July 2023
2.111	Exceedance Plan	A372-RM1-505 Rev P1	June 2023
2.112	Surface Water Catchment Plan	A372-RM1-503 Rev P1	June 2023
2.113	Foul Water Catchment Plan	A372-RM1-504 Rev P1	June 2023
2.114	Plots 1-2 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P220	April 2022
2.115	Plot 3 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P221	April 2022
2.116	Plots 4-5 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P222	April 2022
2.117	Plots 6-7 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P223	April 2022
2.118	Plots 8-9 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P224	April 2022
2.119	Plots 10-11 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P225	April 2022

2.94	Parcels 4 & 5 Site Layout	21020 / P603	April 2023
2.95	Parcel 6 Coloured Site Layout	21020 / C604	July 2023
2.96	Parcel 6 Site Layout	21020 / P604	April 2023
2.97	Parcels 7 & 8 Coloured Site Layout	21020 / C605	July 2023
2.98	Parcel 7 & 8 Site Layout	21020 / P605	April 2023
2.99	Scale and Layout	21020 / C612	June 2023
2.100	Housing Tenure Plan Phase 1	21020 / P202	April 2023
2.101	Building Materials Layout Phase 1	21020 / P204A	April 2023
2.102	Boundary Materials Layout Phase 1	21020 / P205	April 2023
2.103	Building Heights Plan Phase 1	21020 / P206	April 2023
2.104	Accommodation Plan Phase 1	21020 / P207	April 2023
2.105	Custom Build Plan Phase 1	21020 / P208	April 2023
2.106	M4(3) Distribution Plan Phase 1	21020 / P209	April 2023
2.107	Indicative Surface Water Drainage Strategy Sheet 1	A372-007 Rev P4	July 2023
2.108	Indicative Surface Water Drainage Strategy Sheet 2	A372-008 Rev P4	July 2023
2.109	Indicative Foul Water Drainage Strategy Sheet 1	A372-009 Rev P4	July 2023
2.110	Indicative Foul Water Drainage Strategy Sheet 2	A372-010 Rev P4	July 2023
2.111	Exceedance Plan	A372-RM1-505 Rev P1	June 2023
2.112	Surface Water Catchment Plan	A372-RM1-503 Rev P1	June 2023
2.113	Foul Water Catchment Plan	A372-RM1-504 Rev P1	June 2023
2.114	Plots 1-2 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P220	April 2022
2.115	Plot 3 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P221	April 2022
2.116	Plots 4-5 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P222	April 2022
2.117	Plots 6-7 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P223	April 2022
2.118	Plots 8-9 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P224	April 2022
2.119	Plots 10-11 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P225	April 2022

2.140	Plots 60-61 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P248	April 2022
2.141	Plots 62-63 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P249	April 2022
2.142	Plots 64-65 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P250	April 2022
2.143	Plots 66-67 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P251	April 2022
2.144	Plots 68-69 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P252	April 2022
2.145	Plots 70-71 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P253	April 2022
2.146	Plots 72-73 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P254	April 2022
2.147	Plots 78-79 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P255	April 2022
2.148	Plots 80-81 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P256	April 2022
2.149	Plots 82-83 Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations	21020 / P257	April 2022
2.150	Apartment Building 1 - Plots 30 to 39 Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans	21020 / P235-1	February 2023
2.151	Apartment Building 1 - Plots 30 to 39 Proposed Second Floor and Roof Plan	21020 / P235-2	February 2023
2.152	Apartment Building 1 – Plots 30 to 39 Proposed Elevations	21020 / P236	February 2023
2.153	Amended Lighting Assessment (detailed application)	Tetra Tech	14 July 2023
2.154	Amended Lighting Assessment (outline application)	Tetra Tech	14 July 2023
2.155	Energy and Sustainability Statement	R04	21 July 2023
2.156	Minerals Safeguarding Assessment	IC Planning	July 2023
CD3 – Key Consultation Responses			
3.1	Natural England		21 December 2023
3.2	National Highways		02 October 2023
3.3	Chepping Wycombe Parish Council		20 July 2022
3.4	Chepping Wycombe Parish Council		13 October 2023
3.5	Chepping Wycombe Parish Council		22 December 2023
3.6	Buckinghamshire Council Affordable Housing		18 September 2023
3.7	Buckinghamshire Council Local Lead Flood Authority		11 July 2022 &

3.8	Buckinghamshire Council Local Lead Flood Authority		4 October 2023
3.9	Buckinghamshire Council Highways		22 September 2022
3.10	Buckinghamshire Council Landscape and Design Officer		14 September 2022
3.11	Buckinghamshire Council Landscape and Design Officer		12 October 2022
3.12	Buckinghamshire Council Ecology		26 August 2022
3.13	Buckinghamshire Council Education		07 December 2022
3.14	Buckinghamshire Council Archaeology Officer		29 Sept 2022
3.15	Buckinghamshire Council Strategic Access Officer		19 October 2022
3.16	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust		19 December 2023
3.17	Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board (ICB)	Response & Calculations	22 September 2023
3.18	Chiltern Society		10 July 2022
3.19	Chiltern Society		16 October 2023
3.20	Woodland Trust		4 August 2022
3.21	Woodland Trust		9 November 2023
3.22	Chilterns Conservation Board		03 August 2022
3.23	Penn and Tylers Green Residents Society		21 July 2022
3.24	Penn and Tylers Green Residents Society		13 October 2023
3.25	Mr Ken Cooke		23 July 2022
3.26	Mr Ken Cooke		15 October 2023
3.27	Tylers Green Middle School		15 October 2023
3.28	Cadent Gas		7 July 2022
3.29	Environment Agency		19 December 2022
3.30	Environment Agency		11 January 2024
3.31	Thames Valley Police		21 July 2022
3.32	Network Rail		17 September 2023
3.33	Thames Water		06 October 2023
CD4 – Appeal Documents			
4.1	Appellant's Statement of Case		October 2023
4.2	Council's Statement of Case		December 2023
4.3	Statement of Common Ground		31 January 2024
4.4	Inspector's CMC Agenda and Note		23 January 2024
4.5	Inspector's Post CMC 2 Note		<i>no date</i>
4.6	Draft s106 Obligation		<i>tbc</i>
4.7	Appellant's CMC Position Statement		03 January 2024
4.8	Council's CMC Position Statement		05 January 2024
4.9	Council's CMC2 Position Statement		22 January 2024
4.10	Appellant's CMC2 Position Statement		23 January 2024
4.11	Building Heights Schedule (Attachment to Appellant's CMC2 Position Statement)		23 January 2024

<i>CD5 – Development Plan Policies</i>			
5.1	CP1 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Sustainable Development	2019
5.2	CP2 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Overall Spatial Strategy	2019
5.3	CP3 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Settlement Strategy	2019
5.4	CP4 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Delivering Homes	2019
5.5	CP5 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Delivering Land for Business	2019
5.6	CP7 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Delivering the Infrastructure to Support Growth	2019
5.7	CP9 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Sense of Place	2019
5.8	CP10 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment	2019
5.9	CP12 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Climate Change	2019
5.10	HW6 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Gomm Valley and Ashwells	2019
5.11	HW7 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Terriers Farm and Terriers House	2019
5.12	DM20 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Matters To Be Determined In Accordance With The NPPF	
5.13	DM21 of the Wycombe Local Plan	The Location of New Housing	
5.14	DM22 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Housing Mix	2019
5.15	DM23 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Other Residential Uses	2019
5.16	DM24 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Affordable Housing	2019
5.17	DM28 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Employment Areas	2019
5.18	DM29 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Community Facilities	2019
5.19	DM30 of the Wycombe Local Plan	The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	
5.20	DM32 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Landscape Character and Settlement Patterns	2019
5.21	Policy DM33 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Managing Carbon Emissions: Transport and Energy Generation	2019
5.22	DM34 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Delivering Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity in Developments	2019
5.23	DM35 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Placemaking and Design Quality	2019
5.24	DM38 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Water Quality and Supply	
5.25	DM39 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Managing Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems	2019
5.26	DM40 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Internal Space Standards	2019
5.27	DM41 of the Wycombe Local Plan	Optional Technical Standards for Building Regulation Approval	2019
5.28	DM1 Delivery and Site Allocations Plan for Town Centres and Managing Development	Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development	
5.29	DM2 Delivery and Site Allocations Plan for Town Centres and Managing Development	Transport Requirements of Development Sites	2015
5.30	DM3 Delivery and Site Allocations Plan for Town Centres and Managing Development	Transport Improvement Lines	2015
5.31	DM4 Delivery and Site Allocations Plan	Former Bourne End to High Wycombe Railway Line	2015

	for Town Centres and Managing Development		
5.32	DM6 Delivery and Site Allocations Plan for Town Centres and Managing Development	Mixed Use Development	2015
5.33	DM11 Delivery and Site Allocations Plan for Town Centres and Managing Development	Green Networks and Infrastructure	2015
5.34	DM13 Delivery and Site Allocations Plan for Town Centres and Managing Development	Conservation and Enhancement of Sites, Habitats and Species of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Importance	2015
5.35	DM14 Delivery and Site Allocations Plan for Town Centres and Managing Development	Biodiversity in Development	2015
5.36	DM16 Delivery and Site Allocations Plan for Town Centres and Managing Development	Open Space in New Development	2015
5.37	DM19 Delivery and Site Allocations Plan for Town Centres and Managing Development	Infrastructure and Delivery	2015
5.38	Policy 1 of the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2016-2036	Safeguarding Mineral Resources	2019
5.39	Policy 10 of the Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2016-2036	Waste Prevention and Minimisation in New Development	2019
CD6 – Other Local Planning Guidance			
6.1	Gomm Valley and Ashwells Development Brief		2017
6.2	Wycombe Residential Design Guide SPD		2017
6.3	Wycombe Planning Obligations SPD		2020
6.4	Wycombe Canopy Cover SPD		2020
6.5	Buckinghamshire Council Biodiversity Net Gain SPD		2022
6.6	Wycombe Reserve Sites Infrastructure Delivery Plan		2016
6.7	High Wycombe Reserve Sites Transport Framework		2016
6.8	Buckinghamshire Parking Guidance for New Development		2022
6.9	Buckinghamshire Local Transport Plan 4		2016
6.10	High Wycombe Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan		2024
6.11	Buckinghamshire Highways Development Management Guidance		2018
6.12	Buckinghamshire School Site Specification Document		2019
6.13	Buckinghamshire Council High Wycombe 2050 Transport Strategy		2024

6.14	Wycombe District Landscape Character Assessment		2011
6.15	Wycombe District Council Air Quality SPD		2020
6.17	Wycombe Development Framework Community Facilities SPD		2011
6.18	Wycombe District Council Housing Intensification SPD		2011
6.19	Wycombe District Infrastructure Delivery Plan		2017
6.20	Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance		2015
6.21	First Homes – Position Statement		2022
6.22	Buckinghamshire Council's Travel Plans: Guidelines for Developers		2022
6.23	Buckinghamshire Council's West planning area five-year housing land supply position statement		2024
6.24	Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment Update		2016
6.25	Draft Buckinghamshire Housing Strategy 2024-2029		2023
6.26	Buckinghamshire Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2022-2025		2022
6.27	High Wycombe: Wycombe District Council. Green Networks and Infrastructure Background Paper.		2011
CD7 – National Policy and Guidance			
7.1	National Planning Policy Framework and relevant planning practice guidance		December 2023
7.2	National Design Guide		2021
7.3	Cycle Infrastructure Design – Local Transport Note 1/20 (Department for Transport)		July 2020
7.4	Manual for Streets 1 (Department for Transport)		2007
7.5	Manual for Streets 2 (Department for Transport)		2010
7.6	Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure (Department for Transport)		2021
7.7	Building Regulations: Access to and use of buildings: Approved Document M		2021
CD8 – Other Documents			
8.1	Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions (Natural England and Forestry Commission Standing Advice)		2022
8.2	Report on the Examination of the Wycombe District Local Plan		10 July 2019
8.3	Planning for Ancient Woodland - Planner's Manual for Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees		July 2019

	(Woodland Trust, July 2019)		
8.4	Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Biodiversity Action Plan		2021
8.5	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire & Oxfordshire Gomm Valley SSSI Management Plan		2016
8.6	OPDM Circular 06/05: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation - Statutory Obligations and Their Impact Within The Planning System		August 2005
8.7	Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB)		
8.8	Notice	From Buckinghamshire Council	22 June 2022
8.9	Amendments cover letter	From Stantec	25 August 2023
8.10	Cover Letter	From Stantec	14 July 2023
8.11	Transport Analysis Guidance (TAG)	Department of Transport	November 2023
8.12	Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements		6 March 2014
8.13	Guidance Note 08/18 Bats and artificial lighting in the UK	Bat Conservation Trust and Institute of Lighting Professionals	2018
8.14	Forward to 2030: Biodiversity Action Plan for Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes	BMKNEP	2021
8.15	BS 8683:2021 Process for designing and implementing Biodiversity Net Gain		August 2021
8.16	Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment - Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine.		April 2022
8.17	Information you need for biodiversity net gain (BNG).	DEFRA	November 2023
8.18	Transport Assessment Scoping Note	ITL16767-002 B - 12	October 2021
8.19	VISSUM Modelling Briefing Note	ITL16767-003 C - 16	December 2021
8.20	Transport Assessment	ITL16767-004 B	25 May 2022
8.21	CGI – Image 00001	Image 00001	No date
8.22	CGI – Image 00002	Image 00002	No date
8.23	CGI – Image 00003	Image 00003	No date
8.24	CGI – Image 00004	Image 00004	No date
8.25	CGI – Image 00005	Image 00005	No date
8.26	Gomm Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area	Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Natural Environment Partnership (BMKNEP)	No date
8.27	Badger Protection: Best Practice Guidance for Developers, Ecologists and Planners (England)	Badger-Trust	August 2023
8.28	A Green Future: Our 25 Year Plan to Improve the Environment	HM-Government	2018
8.29	Making Space for Nature: A review of England's Wildlife Sites and Ecological Network	Report to Defra	2010
8.30	Badgers: advice for making planning decisions	Natural-England	January 2022
8.31	UK Bat Mitigation Guidelines: a guide to impact assessment, mitigation and compensation for developments affecting bats	CIEEM	2023

8.32	The State of Britain's Hedgehogs	British Hedgehog Preservation Society and People's Trust for Endangered Species	2018
8.33	Badger Tunnels	BadgerLand	January 2024
8.34	Assessing habitat connectivity in environmental impact assessment	Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal 40(6)	September 2022