



## **Clerk's Planning Report**

**13<sup>th</sup> April 2026**

### **Planning History**

[25/02417/AOP](#) Land at Haddenham Airfield – see original HPC response to this application appended.

5 Hedgehog Way – no prior history

### **Tree work responses to note**

[PL/26/01909/KA](#) Apple Tree - Reduce to previous pruning points by removing up to 2.5 meters reactive growth

21 The Croft Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8AS

### **Decisions**

[PL/26/00325/FA](#) Flat roof dormer to front roof slope and associated works for loft conversion to habitable space.

1 Coxon Close, Haddenham, Buckinghamshire, HP17 8DE

**Buckinghamshire Council, PERMITS subject to conditions.**

### **Tree work Decisions**

[PL/26/01523/KA](#) T1 Poplar reduce by 3m in height and width. (Haddenham Conservation Area)

9A Churchway, Haddenham, Buckinghamshire, HP17 8AB

**Buckinghamshire Council - no tree preservation order to be made, work may be carried out.**

[PL/26/01611/KA](#) Tree work as shown on specification/plan. (Haddenham Conservation Area)

11 Churchway, Haddenham, Buckinghamshire, HP17 8AB.

**Buckinghamshire Council - no tree preservation order to be made, work may be carried out.**

### **Enforcement**

The following have been reported to Bucks Council with no updates to report:

1. 13/11/25 - Post Office 165-167 Churchway: New illuminated signs installed without planning permission
2. 13/11/25 – 7 Woodways: unauthorised change of use for car sales business
3. 12/01/26 - House of Spice: rooflights installed on front elevation of the roof. Planning permission was for rooflights on the rear elevation. An earlier application was refused with rooflights on the front elevation.

This has been added to enforcement ref: 25/00977/NAPP

4. [EN/26/00061/OPHH](#) 9 Church End: Alleged construction of an outbuilding in the rear garden without planning permission. Reported 15/01/26 and an enforcement case was opened 11/03/26.

### **Updates on Major Developments**

#### **Airfield**

Amended plans have been submitted for the northern area of the site (see agenda).

The Clerk has been unable to contact anyone at Cala Homes to discuss the transfer of the phase 2 public open space, it appears that key contacts have left, and the office phone was not answered.

#### **Aston Road (Dandara)**

A blossom tree semi-circle has been planted on the Country Park area in collaboration with ReLeaf. This is the first phase of planting to replace dead trees. A resident has complained about an area of trees and hedging that has never been planted according to the landscaping plan. This has been raised with Dandara.

The legal transfer of Phase 3 is in progress through the solicitors with a site inspection scheduled at the end of April prior to hand-over.

#### **Land west of Churchway (Redrow)**

Concerns have been raised by a new resident of the development regarding the play area which has recently been opened for public use and is unfenced and with dog fouling. They were under the impression that the Parish Council would be adopting the play area, however it has been explained that Redrow refused to transfer to HPC and preferred to set up a Resident's Management Company to look after the Public Open Space. The resident was referred back to Redrow and advised to check what management and safety measures have been put in place.

#### **Land East of Churchway (Greencore)**

No updates.

#### **Dollicott (rear of Carwithen Close)**

No updates.

#### **Land at Station Road**

No updates.

#### **Lower Road**

No updates.

### **Project Updates**

#### **New burial ground Aston Road**

It has taken a month to get a copy of the planning officer's report for the phase 2 reserved matters planning application for land at Aston Road (Glebe site) from Buckinghamshire Council, as this document wasn't available online as is standard practice. This has now been passed to CDS planning consultant.

Changes in staff at CDS have led to omissions and delays in putting together the plans for the layout and design of the new burial ground. It has come to light that a questionnaire that should have been completed by HPC at the start of the design process was never requested so details we have asked for haven't been included. A new planning consultant who has taken up the project from a former colleague would charge an additional £500 to carry out a site visit and asked PC staff to visit the site to take photographs instead, which we consider unacceptable. We do not feel that we are getting the level of professional service we would

expect from CDS as successive staff have badly managed the project, and there is currently no admission of this or attempt to rectify.

Quotes are being obtained from other consultants recommended by the Institute of Cemetery and Crematorium Management for the Council to consider progressing the project through an alternative company.

#### **Aston Road Pavilion**

The tenders for the construction of the pavilion are being reviewed on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2026 and will go to the full PC meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2026 for selection of the winning bidder.

#### **Banks Cottage Extension**

The tenders for building the extension are being reviewed on 17<sup>th</sup> April 2026 and will go to the full PC meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2026 for selection of the winning bidder.

#### **Village Hall Improvements**

The working group has not met recently.

#### **Future Haddenham**

This project is under review since the publishing of the New and Extended Settlement Study for the Local Plan for Bucks which allocates significant growth for Haddenham.

#### **Speedwatch Report**

None for this meeting.

#### **Correspondence**

Nothing not covered elsewhere.

## Appendix

### Haddenham Parish Council Comments

**25/02417/AOP** Outline planning application for the erection of up to 700 dwellings, public open space, landscaping, drainage, and other associated works, alongside land for a 1FE primary school (if required). All matters reserved, except for the principal means of access off Pegasus Way and Tibbs Road. EIA Development  
Land At Former Haddenham Airfield Haddenham Buckinghamshire

#### Overview

1. Buckinghamshire Council has failed to protect our community and has put Haddenham in an impossible situation by:
  - (a) failing to meet its undertakings and its legal deadline of adopting a Local Plan by 2025 within 5 years of becoming a unitary authority; and as a result having to find land for nearly twice as many houses;
  - (b) not bringing forward sufficient development under the VALP;
  - (c) never undertaking any assessment of Haddenham's infrastructure and ability to absorb growth. Unlike other settlements identified for growth, we have never had a supplementary planning document, area action plan, transport, reviews of schools and health facilities, or other community impact assessment of any description. The Neighbourhood Plan commitment to undertake an education needs review has not materialised.
2. The VALP's allocation of 1082 dwellings to Haddenham in the period 2013-33 has already been far exceeded. 1134 homes (about 2,800 people) have been started and indeed nearly completed, including all the major allocated sites, long before 2033. A further 103 dwellings have been approved and are expected to start.
3. Moreover new speculative applications for nearly 1300 dwellings (about 3,200 people) have been submitted or are known to be imminent:
  - (a) 23/04009/AOP Land south of Lower Rd – 86 dwellings
  - (b) 24/01624/AOP Land off Carwithen Close, Dollicott – 15 dwellings
  - (c) 25/02417/AOP Airfield north - c.700 dwellings
  - (d) 25/02006/AOP Station Road - 392 dwellings
  - (e) 25/01090/SO Call for Sites ref 693 Land east of Stanbridge Rd application expected imminently - c.100 dwellings
4. Doubtless yet other sites around Haddenham shown in the Local Plan's "Call for Sites" are being prepared to take advantage of the "tilted balance" open season for hostile development which has been created by the Council and is being fuelled by financial gain, not forward planning.
5. The concept of sustainability underpins both NPPF and VALP. It is clear to the Parish Council that this community has reached saturation point in its ability to absorb so much growth so quickly. Our public services - schools, doctors, dentist, water supply, drains, sewage, roads, and railway - are all struggling to cope. The Parish Council is not

against more housing, but objects to further development in the continued absence of a plan-led approach entailing a spatial plan and infrastructure impact assessment.

6. **The Parish Council objects to this application and seeks a moratorium on new permissions in Haddenham pending a review of spatial growth options and a full sustainability impact appraisal.**
7. **If the Council is minded to approve the application, the PC asks that our comments and suggestions are taken fully into account and that no further developments in Haddenham are permitted in advance of a full sustainability appraisal and adoption of the new Local Plan.**

### The Development Plan

8. The Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013-2033 (VALP) provides the main basis on which this application must be determined. Its key policies are shown below, with text we have highlighted in bold.
9. Policy S1(c) requires that “All development must comply with the principles of sustainable development ... in assessing development proposals, consideration will be given to delivering **strategic infrastructure and other community needs to both new and existing communities.**”
10. Policy S2 states that “Strategic growth and investment will be concentrated in sustainable locations as follows ... Haddenham will accommodate growth of 1,082 new homes. **This will be supported by infrastructure.**”
11. Policy S5 requires that “All new development must provide appropriate on- and off-site infrastructure ... in order **to avoid placing an additional burden on the existing community** (and) avoid or mitigate adverse social, economic and environmental impacts ...”. It goes on to state that “In planning for new development, appropriate **regard will be given to existing deficiencies in services and infrastructure provision.** Development proposals **must demonstrate that these have been taken into account** when determining the infrastructure requirements for the new development. The provision of **infrastructure should be linked directly to the phasing of development to ensure that infrastructure is provided in a timely and comprehensive manner to support new development.**”
12. In respect of considering proposals on unallocated sites, Policy D3 states that “The proposal must **contribute to the sustainability of that settlement ... and ... provide appropriate infrastructure.**”
13. Finally, Policy I3 on Infrastructure states that “In considering applications for residential development, the council will **consider the need for new community facilities and community infrastructure arising from the proposal.** Conditions will be imposed on permissions, or planning obligations sought in order to secure appropriate community facilities, or financial contributions towards community facilities, reasonably related to the scale and kind of development proposed.” Its supporting text notes that “new development, depending on its scale, creates an additional need for community

facilities and community infrastructure. This may be new provision or enhancement of existing provision. The type of facilities and infrastructure needed **depends on existing infrastructure facilities in the locality, and the type of development proposed**” (§11.28).

14. The position adopted by VALP is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF Feb 2025) as follows, again with key text highlighted:
  - a. The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, **including the provision of ... supporting infrastructure** in a sustainable manner (§7)
  - b. Achieving sustainable development means ... **identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure** (§8)
  - c. Strategic policies should look ahead ... from adoption to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, **such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure** (§22)
  - d. The supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as ... significant extensions to existing villages ... **provided they are ... supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities** (§77)
  - e. To provide the ... facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions **should ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing ... and community facilities and services** (§98)
  - f. It is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities ... should give **great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools** through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications; and work with school promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to identify and **resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted** (§100)
  - g. To ensure faster delivery of other public service infrastructure ... local planning authorities should also work proactively and positively with promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies **to plan for required facilities and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted** (§100)
  
15. In our view the proposal is in clear breach of VALP Policy D3 which acts as a pressure valve in circumstances where allocated sites are not being delivered at the anticipated rate. It only allows larger scale proposals on non-allocated sites, like this one, in carefully worded exceptional circumstances. Such proposals are only to be approved “exceptionally”, i.e. wholly outside the norm and commensurately benefitting from an unusually robust justification. But a proposal must still contribute to the sustainability of that settlement and provide appropriate infrastructure provision. The following section shows that this has not been the case. There has been no delay in the delivery of homes at Haddenham, quite the reverse. Knowing the VALP-led growth would require improvements to infrastructure, it is not rational for Haddenham to be used to release pressure from under-delivery elsewhere in the VALP area, or indeed to counter the historic absence of any local plan in the south of the County.

## **The Impact of VALP Growth on Haddenham’s Infrastructure**

16. The Parish Council considers there is a very clear thread running between policies S1, S2, S5, D3 and I3 that recognises the dependency on the timely provision of the right infrastructure in the right place if sustainable development is to be achieved. At Haddenham this must go beyond the LPA simply collecting S106 contributions in an unstructured way depending on what application is being submitted. Crucially it requires the infrastructure is delivered which is clearly recognised by the VALP policies and the NPPF references highlighted above.
17. This has not been the case. Although the Parish Council estimates that approx. £5m has been collected in S106 funds over the last decade to invest in social infrastructure from approved schemes in the village, it has not had any effect in addressing education or health provision. The Feb 2024 Buckinghamshire Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS) shows that £340,000 has been spent on improving St. Mary's Infant School. Other funding has been allocated to improving a number of secondary schools that serve the village, none of which lie within walking, cycling or funded public transport distance of Haddenham.
18. The primary school place provision remains wholly insufficient and lagging behind demand. Evidence presented to the 23/00311/AOP appeal from the three primary (two infants and one junior) schools showed that all three schools are at capacity with classrooms at the maximum allowed numbers. The Junior School's roll has increased from 230 to 400, but with no extra money for additional classroom space beyond the existing school budget. The outcome is that contrary to the housebuilders' marketing brochures, some village children will have to find places in schools outside the village meaning inevitable car trips.
19. The secondary school position is also stark. The IFS shows that S106 funds have been collected, and some spent, from Haddenham schemes at a selection of schools. However the way in which transport to schools are funded means that only transport to the closest secondary school is funded. The closest secondary school to Haddenham is Lord Williams's School in Thame and transport to this school from Haddenham is funded. But Haddenham does not lie within the catchment area of Lord Williams's which is in the adjoining county of Oxfordshire with its own growth pressures at Thame. As a result, fewer students from Haddenham now attend Lord Williams's and benefit from the public transport to it. Most Haddenham students attend secondary schools elsewhere including Aylesbury, Princes Risborough and Waddesdon. This has led to local parents having to self-finance a service with a private company or inevitably to drive long distances for their children.
20. No funds have been collected to secure improvements to increase the capacity of the Haddenham Medical Centre until the new Integrated Care Board (ICB) requested a contribution of £85,000 (yet to be paid) towards relatively minor works at the Centre under 23/00311/AOP. The ICB's submission to the present application states there is insufficient capacity. This was evidenced to the Inspector at the 23/00311/AOP public inquiry by the Centre's Patient Participation Group. They result from a village population increase under VALP of around 2,800, almost all of whom have registered with the Centre. If approved, the current proposal will generate an additional 1750 patients, leading to an increase in demand for which no new capacity has been created. Yet the Centre contains unused space dating back to its construction, while adjacent

land originally intended for the surgery has been sold off. Where's the plan? As appointments become increasingly difficult for patients to secure, so more will be forced to drive to alternative GP provision, counter to VALP policies.

21. Other services not coping include the dentist practice, which undertakes NHS work, but cannot serve its ever-growing waiting list without larger premises. The sewerage system is struggling to cope, as evidenced by recent spillage episodes in heavy rainfall incidents. LLFA colleagues have advised that Thames Water's principal waste pipe exiting the village is insufficient for the demands now being made of it. The recently completed development on the southern half of the airfield (14/03289/AOP) requires the regular attendance of tankers at Tibbs Road to pump out stored sewage. In response to this new application Thames Water (itself close to bankruptcy and the worst performing water company in England) says they do not have capacity for additional water supply, sewage or drainage. There have been surface water flooding incidents (September 2024 and March 2025) damaging village properties. The LLFA has accepted that a formal Section 19 (Floods & Water Management Act 2010) flooding investigation should be carried out as referenced in the LLFA response to both the EIA and to the current application. This should be done before approving more development.
22. There is a significant and widespread parking problem, compounded by commuters parking on residential roads near the station to avoid station car park charges. The local authority undertook some initial double yellow lining on one local road in 2017 with the promise of a wider review. This still has not been done. Meanwhile the upper storey of the station car park was closed off a few years ago as unsafe, but no replacement funding has been forthcoming. Chiltern Railways is operating at or near capacity because of the cumulative growth of all settlements along on the Chiltern line; standing room only to London has become commonplace, and not only at peak times.
23. It has been a 30-year ambition to connect Haddenham to Thame, our principal service centre, by a dedicated safe cycle and walking route also to connect with Aylesbury. Despite a feasibility in 2016, inclusion in Bucks Council's LCWIP, active Thame Town Council support, inclusion in Oxfordshire CC's Strategic Active Travel Network, and a top 15 cross-boundary active travel links for modal shift potential identified by England's Economic Heartland, no viable plan has come forward. Yet every recent development has made a financial contribution to this project, with the increasing risk of repayment.
24. The Parish Council has done what it can to address the failure of infrastructure delivery to keep pace with new development. Notably we have worked with the Council's Parks & Recreation to provide significant additional facilities for pitch-based sports, including building a £1.6m Bucks Council design-awarded pavilion and adopting an asset management strategy with future earmarked reserves. We have agreed to pay for an extension to the dentist practice which is located in a building belonging to a local charity of which the Parish Council is sole trustee. We are becoming a burial authority following the closure of the local churchyard because it has no more space. The Parish Council has undertaken its "Streetscape" project with consultants Phil Jones Associates which has recommended a number of improvements to address speeding, pedestrian crossings, junction design, and the local environment, which Bucks Council Highways

are helping to fund in part. The Parish Council is currently running a public consultation, "Future Haddenham" on options for growth and appropriate levels of infrastructure; no officers from Bucks Council attended.

25. The planned growth of Haddenham by VALP has been far exceeded. This growth should have been accompanied by timely social infrastructure improvements addressing the lived experience of the community but hasn't (with the exception of recreation). We now have the prospect of speculative applications for about 1300 more homes which will only exacerbate the problem of the failure of the plan-led system to meet the needs of the local community. Continuing to bat away the matter into the long grass via S106 agreements in the absence of approved plans to invest is not a sustainable strategy. An application like this one for another 700 homes surely requires a more considered approach.

### Site-specific Comments

26. **Viability.** It is very likely that as a proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> tier settlement in the draft Local Plan for Bucks Haddenham will be identified for further allocation of development. The Parish Council is reviewing the Call for Sites. The land on the northern part of the former airfield is likely to be the most viable site for the following reasons:
- (a) Haddenham has already been substantially extended on its northern boundary. The permission for Pegasus Way opened up the airfield, to be followed by the airfield business park and Cala etc (14/03289/AOP) developments, while the adjoining HAD007 (17/02280/AOP - Redrow) site also moved the boundary northwards.
  - (b) Proximity to the railway station, which is within walking distance.
  - (c) The railway remains as the traditional settlement boundary. In past decisions, the railway has been established as the westernmost edge of the village for housing. Beyond is countryside, indeed open countryside. It is separated from the development in Haddenham by a physically robust and historically respected boundary – a busy railway.
  - (d) Harm to the Parish Council's designated nature reserve at Snakemoor is avoided. This would certainly not be the case with sites west of the railway and north of Thame Road which surround Snakemoor.
  - (e) Subject to confirmation, surface water discharge is unlikely to impact the Haddenham stream, an EA-designated main river, which was the source of recent flooding incidents in the village.
  - (f) Similarly the catchment of the stream further east known as Folly Farm ditch is avoided, which will bring a whole new set of problems into play with any further eastwards extension.
  - (g) Although in the last few years since the departure of the gliding club the land has reverted to agriculture, it has not been exclusively in agricultural use for several decades.
  - (h) In assessing this site, the 2017 HELAA prior to VALP's adoption cited concern about the potential visual impact of the development from the designated AAL ridge further to the north. This proposal leaves a large area of landscaping on the higher ground towards the A418 which may help alleviate this matter.

- (i) Residents moving into the recently completed Cala development on the southern section of the airfield (14/03289/AOP) have been aware from the outset of likely proposals for the rest of the land up to the A418 which has been promoted by the applicant for some time. One well-attended session of our “Future Haddenham” consultation was held in the Airfield Pavilion and suggested a level of acceptance.

### 27. Tibbs Road access

The same consultation did find concern about the access from Tibbs Road because of existing parking problems, including commuter parking (para. 21 above). There is an outstanding TRO due to restrict parking by the Co-op which really needs to be implemented quickly. The drawings appear to include a road within the development connecting the eastern and western sections. This is a potential safety problem where it crosses the open space corridor, and may suggest that the Tibbs Road access is unavoidable. If it really is not possible to design a development that directs all motorised traffic directly onto Pegasus Way, then not only should a parking scheme for Tibbs Road be included in the promised commuter parking review, but also significant improvements for pedestrians and cyclists in the area around the Coop, including priority raised crossings to help them negotiate the much busier roads as well as providing traffic calming on both sides of the Co-op building (Pegasus Way and Tibbs Rd).

### 28. Active Travel

The ‘movement vision’ in the design and access statement states that:

‘Walking and cycling for trips within Haddenham would increase as a result of improved conditions delivered within the site itself, by the streetscape project proposals and the introduction of a 20mph speed limit throughout the village. Haddenham and Thame Parkway station’s role as a mobility hub for the village and wider catchment would be enhanced, facilitating greater levels of integration of bus, rail and cycling for multi-modal journeys. Delivery of greenway connections to Thame and Aylesbury would enable trips from Haddenham and also improve the accessibility of the station from Thame.’

- (a) This is indeed a wonderful vision, but there is no suggestion of how or when any of this will be delivered. We have outlined the lack of progress on the Haddenham-Thame Greenway above. A safe connection to Aylesbury appears an even more distant prospect, with no active work currently underway. If these links are to be used as arguments in favour of the sustainability of a development, there must be some mechanism for their delivery included in the planning permission. The applicant’s travel plan, for instance, lists Thame as being within cycling distance, yet the current road conditions mean that such a journey is unthinkable for almost all residents.
- (b) We are in full agreement with **Active Travel England**’s comments on the application’s failure to adequately promote active travel, in particular their assessment that the travel plan is ‘likely to be highly ineffective in its current format’, and their concerns over the status of active travel links out of the site. We too would like to see these secured by agreement at outline planning stage, otherwise we share the fear that they will remain ‘merely as dotted lines on a plan’ – as has already been our experience with the connection between the Redrow and Platers Road developments.
- (c) For the avoidance of doubt, we would like to see a clear commitment to create links suitable for walking AND cycling: to the south, via the industrial estate and onwards into the centre of the village; to the east into the Redrow development. Given the likely

duration of works across the whole site, these should also be in place and accessible prior to first occupation. Otherwise, we will simply embed reliance on driving by failing to provide a direct, attractive alternative from the outset.

- (d) We are especially pleased to see ATE highlighting the importance of measures from the Parish Council's "Streetscape" study: allocating funds from this development to the measures they suggest would recognise the need for improvements beyond the limits of the proposed site. Future residents would clearly need to travel into the centre of the village and beyond: the current road network is already feeling the strain of existing overdevelopment, and without significant improvements as outlined in Streetscape, the addition of significant extra traffic from this development would have a particularly detrimental effect on walkers, wheelers and cyclists. The Parish Council welcomes further discussion with Highways.
- (e) The Parish Council understands Land Improvement Holdings is committed to establishing active travel links to the station and the Co-op via the business park for both this and the HAD007 Redrow developments. These routes will utilise the former mobile mast track adjoining the Site N (19/01084/ADP) development, and Land Improvement Holdings land around the southern and western boundaries of the GGR factory including an access to the Land Improvement Holdings development site (24/01624/AOP) north of Carwithen Close. The Parish Council suggests that this all needs to be covered in an agreement between Land Improvement Holdings, Bucks, the Parish Council and the owners/managers of the Business Park.

#### **29. Proposed School**

- (a) The Parish Council prefers the "with school" option and notes it is shown as a full primary school (ie all ages to 11). A school provides an excellent focus for community identity. If this application is approved, the airfield will have c.1000 homes in a brand-new community some distance from the village centre. We are already aware of feelings of isolation, which are likely to be more pronounced further north. The school will greatly help foster relationships and community development, along with the sports facilities, and activities like the annual youth football tournament and summer beer festival now being held on the airfield.
- (b) The alternative is to grow the existing schools. This should be resisted because the existing schools may need to expand in the future irrespective of this development, and are better located to serve future potential growth closer to them. The distance from the airfield would very likely mean adverse implications of car journeys at the Woodways or Church End schools which both have problems enough with parking and traffic.
- (c) The Parish Council questions the proposed school's location within the development because of the impact of parking and traffic around schools, including those ostensibly within walking distance. It is also possible that some intake could come from other parts of the village or villages nearby. We support Jo Haley's (Designing out Crime Officer) comments about school parking causing neighbourhood issues for the surrounding homes, and here it may be difficult to avoid spilling over into Tibbs Road. Would an alternative location, perhaps closer to Pegasus Way, within the western parcel, be better?

#### **29. Climate and energy.**

Given that Haddenham has declared a climate emergency and set a 2030 target for carbon neutrality, we are disappointed with the lack of ambition in the applicant's sustainability and climate change statement. This stands in stark contrast to the plans submitted by Greencore Homes for Land East of Churchway (25/02312/ADP). The proposals for an upfront embodied

carbon target of 900kgCO<sub>2</sub>/m<sup>2</sup> represent little more than business as usual, in contrast with Greencore's target of below 300 kg excluding sequestration. Similarly, Greencore is planning to deliver onsite renewable generation exceeding usage across the development ('better than net zero'), whereas the applicant merely states that residents will be 'able to purchase certified renewable electricity'. The applicant states that heat pumps are "likely". The Parish Council has been advised during our "Future Haddenham" consultation that the water pressure on the recent airfield development is too low to support heat pumps which indicates further investigation given Thames Water's comments about capacity.

### **30. Sport & Recreation**

The Parish Council has concerns about the off-site proposals at the Junior School:

(a) Whilst the PC doesn't doubt the likely popularity of the proposals for the Junior School, there is a wider picture to be considered and potential for missed opportunities. Bucks Council are currently consulting the Parish Council on sports provision for their Sports Strategy. The Parish Council has its own priorities arising from the Neighbourhood Plan and VALP developments beyond pitch-based activities for an indoor facility to replace the Woodways pavilion and also for skateboarding. We are also aware of ambitions for Haddenham by Sport England. To allocate significant funding in the absence of a wider plan would undermine the new strategy.

(b) The proposals leave little space for the further extension of the Junior School's buildings given the likelihood that this will be needed under LP4Bucks and to accommodate approved and imminent applications for future growth of the village to the east.

(c) The proposals require an assessment of their parking and traffic impact on and around Woodways which is already a major problem.

(d) We question whether, in view of the Parish Council's work on this subject, either Bucks Council or the School have the necessary asset management capacity, budget, and reserves to maintain, upgrade or replace these facilities over their life-time.

(e) The Junior School has in the recent past expressed serious concern about public access on or around its premises for safeguarding and insurance reasons.

### **31. Community café**

Along with a school, there is a clear requirement for further amenities in order to create a proper community for the Airfield development as whole. As mentioned above, the current residents already feel quite isolated from the rest of the village, likely to be amplified further northwards. A community café to support the new sports facilities, as appeared in earlier iterations of the design during the Sportsmith consultation for Land Improvement Holdings, would be ideal. The Parish Council would like to see this incorporate an art and exhibition facility to add a cultural element to the enhanced sporting provision and a shared workspace.

### **32. Considerations as Adjoining Owner**

(a) The central pitches and open space look likely to require an agreement with the Parish Council to facilitate work on the adjoining land which is now in the Parish Council's ownership. Whilst this work may be acceptable, it will be opposed until a clear plan of how this will be achieved without disruption to the current users of the facilities and any loss of trees and hedging which are now well established.

(b) The Parish Council notes the Local Lead Flood Authority comments about potential SUDS discharge rate westward under the railway being “agreeable to downstream water drainage network owners”. The first such owner after the railway land is the Parish Council at Snakemoor, a registered nature reserve. While some discharge may be acceptable, the PC will oppose unless we are properly consulted.

### **33. S106 Agreement**

The Parish Council understands that Land Improvement Holdings is minded to pass the ownership of the public open space and other facilities to the Parish Council on completion in preference to a residents’ management company. We ask Bucks Council to incorporate this preference in the draft S106 agreement so that it is also binding on any future developer or constructor.