

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
General	Comments are set out by section/sub section as the paragraphs are not numbered. Suggest numbering is added at least to the introduction section for clarity before submission.	Noted	paragraph referencing added
	Introduction – the first paragraph confuses the development plan situation. The Chiltern and South Bucks plan was withdrawn, in the time period for the neighbourhood plan the Buckinghamshire Local Plan will emerge, however at present the development plan for the South Bucks are reverts back to the adopted Local Plan and Core strategy. Suggest re-wording as below.	Noted	wording amended to ', the other part being the emerging Buckinghamshire Local District Plan and the adopted South Bucks Local Plan (Adopted Mar 1999) and South Bucks Core Strategy (Adopted Feb 2011). The South Bucks adopted documents will be replaced by the emerging Buckinghamshire Local Plan during the life of the Gerrards Cross Neighbourhood.'
	'This document represents a draft version of the Neighbourhood Plan for Gerrards Cross Parish. It represents will form one part of the development plan for the parish over the period 2017 to 2040, the other part being the Adopted emerging-Chiltern and South Bucks Local District Plan/Strategic Local Plan/and the South Bucks Core Strategy. The South Bucks adopted documents will be replaced by the emerging Buckinghamshire Local Plan during the life of the Gerrards Cross Neighbourhood plan.'	Noted	
	Third paragraph suggest amending '(revised July 2021).' With '(as amended)' because different parts of the regulations have been revised at different stages and covers ant subsequent changes made during the preparation of the neighbourhood plan. Note not aware of any changes made to the neighbourhood planning regulations in 2021.	Noted	wording amended as suggested
	Fourth paragraph – Technically neighbourhood plans cannot grant planning permission for development. This is enabled by another part of the neighbourhood planning process. To cover this suggest replacing the word 'Plans' with the word 'Planning'.	Noted	wording amended as suggested

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
1 Introduction	Fifth Paragraph – this is both a bit wordy and oversimplifies the decision-making process – the neighbourhood plan will only be one set of policies against which a planning decision will be determined. The rest of the development plan and national guidance will also need to be considered. Suggest re-wording as follows. ‘Under each heading there is the justification for the policies presented which provides the necessary understanding of the policy and explains what it is the plan is seeking to achieve. The policies themselves are presented in the coloured boxes. It is these policies, alongside the development plan and national guidance, against which planning applications will be assessed. It is advisable that, in order to understand the full context for any individual policy, it is read in conjunction with the supporting text.	Noted	wording amended 'e. Under each heading there is the justification for the policies presented which explains what the plan is seeking to achieve'
	Sixth Paragraph – to make the document more user friendly suggest replacing the words ‘contiguous with’ with the words ‘the same as’.	Noted	wording amended as suggested
	Eighth paragraph – the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan was withdrawn – so firstly it’s not emerging but secondly has no weight in planning law so shouldn’t be referred to.	Noted	wording amended, reference to the emerging South Bucks & Chiltern Local Plan removed
	Tenth para – some of the issues listed go beyond the planning related powers of a neighbourhood plan.	Noted	wording amended ‘..the community engagement and local research undertaken offers the opportunity to investigate a wider range of issues and opportunities, including...’
	‘The Plan seeks to answer two questions:’ the draft plan could seek to answer these questions but by submission the questions should be answered. May need to delete this text before the submission version.	Noted	No action taken
	Sustainable Development – 4 th bullet – need a comma after the word ‘biodiversity’.	Noted	wording amended as suggested
	National Policy		
	Although as part of the creation of Buckinghamshire Council it was required to have a Local Plan in place by April 2025 due to impending changes to national planning legislation and the requirements for Local Plan production this date is not achievable – maybe better to state Buckinghamshire has started work on a new county wide Local Plan but this is not going to be in place before the Gerrards Cross Neighbourhood plan. the end of the paragraph should also refer to the South Bucks Local Plan 1999 as this also forms part of the Development Plan for the former South Bucks area until it’s replaced by the Buckinghamshire Local Plan.	Noted	wording amended 'Although as part of the creation of Buckinghamshire Council it was required to have a Local Plan in place by April 2025 due to impending changes to national planning legislation and the requirements for Local Plan production it is understood that this date is not achievable. Buckinghamshire has started work on a new county wide Local Plan but this is not going to be in place before the Gerrards Cross Neighbourhood plan. As the Plan is not expected to be complete before the GXNP, the existing South Bucks Local Plan and South Bucks Core Strategy remains of relevance.'
Site selection			

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
	Last bullet point – while the statement doesn't say the Green Belt areas will be released by the neighbourhood plan it does give the impression that Green Belt boundaries might be changed. Green Belt boundaries can only be changed by a neighbourhood plan if a higher tier strategic plan suggests Green Belt boundary changes are required. At the moment work around the Buckinghamshire Local Plan is not suggesting any Green Belt changes.	Noted	wording added '...should the strategic policy identify this need.'
	Suitability – 4 th bullet – effects on community – surely this should look at the effects on existing surrounding residents. New residents will be able to gauge for themselves the effects of the development on their new community.	Noted	wording amended to include existing residents
	Monitoring of the plan – this section is very repetitive particularly on the need to review the plan in five years. This could be re-written to remove duplication. The word 'debar' is not particularly well used suggest changing it to 'prevent'.	Noted	second paragraph removed
	2.1 History of Gerrards Cross First para – 'South Bucks District' no longer exists – could change to 'southern Buckinghamshire' or add the words 'the former' before the word 'South'.	Noted	wording amended as suggested
Section 3	3 Profile of the community today 'South Bucks district' – no longer exists – change to Buckinghamshire or add 'the former' before the word 'South'.	Noted	wording amended as suggested
Section 4	4 Local Infrastructure		
	4.1 Local Plan		
	Given the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan was withdrawn do not consider its necessary or appropriate to refer to it in the Local Plan section.	wording left in to show historical completeness	No action taken
	4.2 Housing Numbers and Allocations		
	Again, the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan is not relevant suggest deleting the reference to its withdrawal and starting this section at 'GXNP'. When referencing South Bucks as an area suggest adding the words 'the former' before the word 'South' (lines 4 and 7 of the para)	Noted	wording amended 'Due to the withdrawal of the South Bucks and Chiltern Local Plan and the current situation with the Buckinghamshire Local Plan...'
4.3 Housing Needs Assessment No comments on this sub section and those that follow in the rest of Section 4.			
4.4 Medical Infrastructure			

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
	4.5 Road Network 4.6 Public Transport 4.7 Sport & Recreation 4.8 Council Tax Bands 4.9 Local Plan relevant policies		
Section 5	5 Vision and Objectives No Planning comments on this section 5.1 Challenges for Gerrards Cross 5.2 Vision for Gerrards Cross		
	5.2 Vision for GX – Comment from BC Climate change Team		
	<i>There is an aspiration for fast charging Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure (EVCI), which will encourage active travel. It is not clear that electric charging will encourage active travel, which I would understand to mean e.g. cycling and walking. This sentence should be changed so that the rationale for EVCI is made more clear – ie. to encourage low emission travel. Alternative methods to encourage active travel should be encouraged.</i>	Noted	BP 5 amended to 'Fast electric charging points are available throughout the town which has helped promote low emission travel.'
	5.2 Vision for GX – Comment from BC Transport Strategy Team		
	“A safe community where people feel comfortable using the local facilities at all times of day or night due to measures in place to improve traffic management and good community policing” Include reference to Wayfinding and signage to make it easier for locals and visitor to navigate.	Noted	BP 4 amended ' ..New walkways and cycle routes <i>with clear wayfinding and signage</i> have been introduced creating a safer pedestrian environment <i>and encouraging active travel</i> .
	<u>“Fast electric charging points are available throughout the town which has helped promote active travel.” Consider referencing the potential air quality benefits and overall emission reductions, or decarbonisation. Buckinghamshire EV Action Plan is here for reference: https://www.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/parking-roads-and-transport/parking/electric-vehicles/</u>	Noted	No action taken

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
	5.3 Neighbourhood Plan Objectives		
Section 6	Objective/Policy Matrix No comments on this section 6 Policies Development 6.1 Introduction to the Policies		
Section 7	7 Town Centre Policies		
	Policy 1 – marketing – 6 months is a very short marketing period – would recommend a longer period. Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan requires a two-year marketing period to support loss of an employment site.	Noted	Amended to 12 months
	Policy 2 and Policy 3 both appear to cover new business developments. Although policy 2 references small scale business developments small scale is not defined. As such it would appear any new business would have to meet the criterion on policy 3. Suggest two policies are merged to cover re-use and new business developments.	Noted	Policy 2 & 3 deleted and replaced with new policy 'Maintaining a vibrant Town Centre' Planning proposals that generate new employment opportunities, support existing ones or provide opportunities for start-up businesses and that are within the built-up areas of the town centre (as identified on map XX) will be supported subject to the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals do not severely and negatively impact on traffic. • The proposal respects the built character and landscape character of the town centre. • The proposal does not cause an unacceptable impact on the amenities of nearby residential properties; and • The proposal provides adequate parking, servicing and access arrangements'
	Although in the town centre section policy 3 as written would appear to cover any retail developments outside of the defined town centre. As such the retail element of the policy would be applicable throughout the neighbourhood plan area. if this is not the intention, then the area to which the policy is applicable will need to be clearly defined on the policies map.	Noted	Policy reworded (shown above) to reflect feedback
The criterion in policy 3 are a bit vague and as such would be difficult to implement by Development Management officers, what is a satisfactory access? What is an appropriate level of car and cycle parking. A developer and a DM officer could well interpret these points differently which makes determination of a planning application difficult and tricky to defend if it's taken to appeal.	Noted	Policy reworded (shown above) to reflect feedback	

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
	<p>Paragraph 7.1.20 references the provision of new and retention of existing residential uses within the town centres. However, policy 2 and 3 as written would support new business uses over the loss of residential because the policies make no mention of the retention of existing town centre residential use. To protect existing residential uses the revised policy will need to include a clause/reference to that effect.</p>	Noted	Policy reworded (shown above) to reflect feedback
	<p>8 Housing Policies</p>		
	<p>Paragraph 8.1.1 – don't consider reference to the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan examination is relevant and it's also been mentioned earlier in the plan. in this context the relevant housing data is referred to and the reasons why the Chiltern and South Bucks were withdrawn are not relevant.</p>	Information kept in for completeness	No action taken
	<p>The current development plan for the area seeks to protect the existing Green Belt and doesn't propose any changes to the Green Belt boundaries. At the moment the emerging work on the Buckinghamshire Local Plan is seeking to avoid any Green Belt release. As such there is no strategic plan policy basis for the Gerrards Cross Neighbourhood plan to be considering Green Belt amendments even if only as part of a call for sites exercise. Thus, could be considered to be not in conformity with the strategic planning policies for the area.</p>	Noted	wording added to 8.1.7. It is understood that the South Bucks Core Strategy seeks to protect the Green Belt and the emerging work on the Buckinghamshire Local Plan is seeking to avoid any Green Belt release.
	<p>Policy 4 – this site allocation appears to be one of the Chiltern Railways Car parks for Gerrards Cross station according to station website the car park is operated by Chiltern Railways and contains 129 car parking spaces. The policy makes no mention of the provision of replacement parking. This runs contrary to Objective 11: Provide parking for commuters, shoppers and residents and to the challenges for Gerrards Cross set out at paragraph 5.1 which reference provision of sufficient infrastructure including parking and specifically reference the need for adequate parking to meet the needs of commuters. Given the parking concerns as set out in the plan how can the allocation of one of the Station car parks for housing development be justified.</p>	due to the NP being created before/after the pandemic, commuter needs have changed since the objectives were first written.	Objective reworded to 'Provide parking for visitors, shoppers and residents'

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
	Given the extensive areas of railway land around the identified site why has the site been restricted to the existing car park area only.	the area surrounding is mostly embankment and therefore unsuitable for development	No action taken
	Clause e. of the policy refers to discussions with the Highways Authority and South Bucks, while the Highways Authority is Buckinghamshire Council and South Bucks is no longer in existence- the Highways Authority is often specifically referred to in legislation so suggest keeping that phrase but changing 'South Bucks' to Buckinghamshire Council planning department.	Noted	wording amended as suggested
	Paragraph 8.2.4 is un-necessary and should be deleted – reference to withdrawn Local Plan.	Noted	wording deleted as suggested
	Paragraph 8.2.5 if this is felt necessary to retain then delete the words 'Following this' although its not clear while highlighting a wider area need of nearly 5000 dwellings is relevant to a single very small site allocation of 7 dwellings within the neighbourhood plan. all that the reference would seem to imply is that the neighbourhood plan should be making more significant site allocations to go some way to meeting this considerable housing need. As such the neighbourhood plans own content may be used against it by developers seeking to develop or redevelop other sites in the town which could potentially provide more significant levels of housing.	Noted	wording deleted as suggested
	Policy 5 – without some form of guidance/standards to apply its difficult for the decision maker to determine if adequate bin storage or cycle storage facilities. For example, is this a fixed stand to secure a bike to or is it an indoor storage facility to keep the bike secure and out of the weather. Is the storage for one bike or a bike for each potential resident etc.	Noted	guidance added: 8.3.5 C ycle Storage should match The London Plan 2016 guidance for cycle parking of 1 space per studio/1 bedroom unit and 2 spaces per all other dwellings. Cycle storage should be secure, fit-for-purpose and well-located. 8.3.6 B in/recycling storage should conform to the local authorities storage and collection strategies and requirements.

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
Section 8	Clause d – while it is assumed the aim of this policy is to prevent a new row of dwellings all looking the same how is this applied to one new building. As written, you could say the policy requires a new development to have a different look to the remainder of the street and its possible some developers may seek to exploit this clause if it's not further clarified.	Noted	amended to 'have a varied appearance which reflects the surrounding buildings'
	Clause i. leaves the door open for different styles of development but how the decision maker determines what justifies a departure is left open to them this could lead to inconsistency in decision making and risk of varying decisions being made if applications are taken to appeal.	Noted	clause I delted
Policy 5 – BC Climate Change Team comment:			
<p data-bbox="120 668 1025 762">“In addition, dwellings will be expected to meet the highest possible standards of construction, Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method) standards or equivalent.”</p>			
<p data-bbox="120 767 1025 932">Recommend that this be made if possible more specific and up to date, suggesting for example a specific “minimum” BREEAM rating or indicating what standard is expected. It is my understanding that the Code for Sustainable Homes has been discontinued. No further comments from Climate Change.</p>			
Policy 6			
<p data-bbox="120 970 1025 1297">This sets the housing mix requirement at 10 dwellings or more. Given the acknowledged lack of potential development sites within the town area excluded from the Green Belt the possibility of developments proposing 10 or more dwellings appears to be limited. Given the strategic policy sets a threshold of five dwellings before a suitable mix of housing types should be considered it seems to run contrary to the strategic policy to set the neighbourhood plan threshold at 10. Setting a lower threshold would avoid this policy conflict and hopefully ensure a mix of dwelling types on the smaller developments more likely to come forward in the area.</p>			

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
	<p>Policy 7 – its not clear what this policy is trying to achieve its opening lines reference the re-use of buildings to meet the objectively Assessed Housing needs assessment. The policy is also located in the housing section which suggests its intention is to provide a housing source of development. However, the clauses a – c seem to apply to any form of development/re-use and the justification below the policy appears to be talking about the options for commercial re-use and how existing commercial sites could be reused to provide sites for difficult to locate commercial uses.</p>	Noted	<p>Policy 7 reworded 'The re-use, conversion, and adaptation of permanent, structurally sound, buildings of substantial construction which would lead to an enhancement of the character of the area and will be supported.</p> <p>Proposals for the demolition, redevelopment or substantial alterations to these buildings should demonstrate the consideration that has been given to retaining:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the important character building itself; • its most distinctive and important features; • the positive elements of its setting and its relationship to its immediate surroundings; and • the contribution that the building and its setting makes to the character of the local area.'
	<p>As the policy does not define the area to which it operates it could be assumed to be a plan wide policy. Therefore, if the policy permits residential conversion/re-use it could be in conflict with policies 2 and 3 and if it relates to commercial re-use there could be some overlap with those earlier policies.</p>	Noted	Policies 2,3 & 7 have been reworded. Any conflict has now been resolved
	<p>Policy 8 – assuming any greenfield land /open space in the town is protected. Given the built up area is surrounded by the Green Belt the effect is to focus development onto previously developed land as such although it reflects an objective of the neighbourhood plan the policy is not really necessary.</p>	Noted	No action taken
	<p>Policy 9 – this is more of a statement of intent or aim of the plan rather than a policy. Building regulations will be applied to new developments outside of the planning policy system. Again, stating in a policy that something, gated developments, will be discouraged doesn't mean it can be refused on that basis. Not sure policy as written could be implemented by a decision maker.</p>	Noted	Final sentence reworded 'Gated developments will not be supported.'
	<p>9 Transport & Movement</p>		

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
Section 9	<p>Policy 10 clause a) this is a plan aim not a policy. Therefore, Clause a) cannot be included in the policy text. Highways improvements beyond those specifically related to the increased transport movements from a new development fall outside of planning control and hence the remit of a neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood plans often cover these wider community aims/aspirations by including a section on non-planning matters as part of the neighbourhood plan.</p>	Noted	BP (a) removed to community aspirations (Comm Aspiration No 5)
	<p>Policy 11 – although entitled off street parking the policy only applies standards to new residential homes to be built. As such there don't appear to be any standards for commercial/community uses and its unclear if the parking requirements would apply to building conversions from commercial to residential uses.</p>	Noted	Policy renamed 'RESIDENTIAL off-street parking'
	<p>Looking at the proposed parking standards its unclear why 1 bedroomed properties would need more parking provision when part of a 10 or more development or why 4 bedroomed houses would require less provision. This is especially so given the policy aim to include all parking within or adjacent to each property.</p>	Noted	Typo for 1 bedroomed properties amended to match 10 dwellings and below. 4 bed properties in the above 10 dweelings amended to match 10 dwellings and below
	<p>Policy 12 by stating that all existing public car parking should be retained unless equivalent replacement parking can be provided. Reinforces the need to justify why this isn't a requirement of the allocated housing site on the Orchehill car park.</p>	due to the NP being created before/after the pandemic, commuter needs have changed since the objectives were first written.	Policy 12 has been reworded: '-change of use of <i>the following existing public car parking (shown in Appendix K) will not be permitted unless equivalent and equally accessible parking can be provided as a replacement: Station upper car park- Ethorpe Close, Cinema car park, Bulstrode Way car park, Packhorse Road car park, Station Road car park, Tesco car park, Memorial Centre car park, Gerrards Cross Train Station car park.</i> ' Appendices also added accordingly.
	<p>Policy 13 – clause b is really an ambition as improvements to walkways are unlikely to be directly related to a planning application unless the development site is adjacent to a walkway.</p>	Noted	No action taken

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
	Clause c – given there is a community Infrastructure Levy in place across the former South Bucks area its unlikely a developer would be willing to contribute additional funds to offsite walkway improvements unless it can be proven that the new development would add sufficient users to the walkway routes that they needed to be enhanced.	Noted	No action taken
	Paragraphs 9.3.6-9.3.10 Comments from BC Transport Strategy Team:		
	These paragraphs reference a parking review and parking restriction measures in relation to ‘Pedestrian access and walkway routes’ policy. Consider relating the parking interventions to the impact on active travel infrastructure and accessibility – It is not clear whether the parking issues relate to on street parking which impedes on walking and cycling?	Noted	paras 9.3.6-9.3.10 moved to evidence for policy 12, new para's 9.2.8-9.2.12
	Consider accessibility requirements for those with mobility difficulties such as the elderly and young children in this policy	Noted	para 9.3.6 added '9.3.6 All walkway routes are expected to consider accessibility requirements for those with mobility difficulties such as the elderly and young children.'
	10 Environment		
	Policy 14 – clause b refers to Safeguarded land. As the land beyond the settlement boundary is Green Belt its unclear what safeguarded land is referring to. Safeguarded land is generally land that has been removed from the Green Belt and kept as a future area where a settlement could expand.	Noted	BP 10.1.5 added '10.1.5 It is understood that there is currently no safeguarded land (land between the urban area and the Green Belt) surrounding Gerrards Cross. However, to ensure the longevity of the Neighbourhood Plan, safeguarded land has been included in this policy.'
	The neighbourhood plan has no powers to safeguard land/review the Green Belt without a direction from a higher tier plan. as outlines in the neighbourhood plan the last comprehensive Green Belt assessment of the County didn't suggest any significant changes to the Green Belt boundaries around Gerrard cross. As such it is considered that reference to safeguarded land could be contrary to the strategic polices of the higher tier plan.	Noted	Policy renamed 'Gerrards Cross settlement boundary'. Clause (b) amended 'Outside the settlement boudary within any safegaurded land, only development...'. Clause (c) amended 'development should comply with Policies 5 (General design of residential development) and 6 (Housing Mix) in this plan'

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
Section 10	<p>Paragraph 10.1.3 – this para mentions areas of land which could be considered for removal from the Green Belt. as mentioned before as the higher tier plan makes no mention of Green Belt boundary changes/release the neighbourhood plan should not be looking at this issue at this point in time. In advance of any Buckinghamshire decision on Green Belt review and any criterion for Green Belt boundary changes that review might set it is considered that the neighbourhood plan is being premature in suggesting areas which might not meet the Buckinghamshire criterion for potential release.</p>	Noted	wording added into para 10.1.3 '10.1.3 Although it is understood that at the current time the emerging work on the Buckinghamshire Local Plan is seeking to avoid any Green Belt release..'
	<p>Given 93% of respondents supported retaining and protecting the Green Belt around the town the neighbourhood plan seems to run contrary to that public opinion by suggesting future Green Belt changes.</p>	Noted	No action taken
	<p>Policy 15 – no comments on list of local green spaces identified – however see comments on Appendix D.</p>		
	<p>Policy 16 – no comments on this policy.</p>		
	<p>Policy 17 – From the descriptions in the neighbourhood plan – Gerrards Cross Common although old and designated as common land is not designated as a heritage asset as such not sure it should be listed in the policy text. Nationally designated Buildings, monuments (Bulstrode Camp), historic parkland (Bulstrode park) etc are given protection by national legislation and Guidance. In this case does the neighbourhood plan need to refer to national designated heritage assets in a policy or is this merely duplication of national protection?</p>	Noted	Reference to GX Common removed from policy 17. Wording in para (a) amended to '..Those of particular community value include...' to show assets of high community value within the policy
	<p>Clause c – be aware that Buckinghamshire is compiling a list of local heritage designated buildings – may want to ensure that there is no duplication.</p>	Noted	No action taken
	<p>Policy 17 comment from BC Archaeology Team:</p>		
	<p>17(a) This policy is not needed as Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings are already protected at a higher level</p>	Noted	No action taken
<p>17 (b) and Appendix F - Care should be taken with the term Non Designated Heritage Asset. This should not be used to define all buildings/sites that the NP team feel to be important, it is only for those assets defined either through inclusion on the Local Heritage List or through the planning process.</p>	Noted	BP C deleted	

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
	<p>17 (c) and Appendix F - We would recommend Appendix 7(<i>Ed. – I think the Team meant "F"</i>) is omitted. As well as potentially becoming 'out of date' very quickly, it does not include all archaeological assets, and is misleading in terms of NDHAS. Instead we suggest that the NP recommend that development proposals consult with the Historic Environment Record (HER), as a minimum. This would be in accordance with paragraph 194 of the NPPF which states that in determining applications "As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.</p>	Noted	BP C deleted
	<p>Archaeology General - Buckinghamshire Council is currently compiling a local list of heritage assets, which will include archaeological sites. Any archaeological sites confirmed on the local list will be taken into consideration in the planning process. For further information, see Home - Buckinghamshire's Local Heritage List (local-heritage-list.org.uk)</p>	Noted	No action taken
	<p>Policy 18 – the neighbourhood plan accepts that all of the identified gap sites are Green Belt. one of the purposes (purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent settlements from merging. As such 3 of the 4 identified gaps would be protected by existing policy. However, it acknowledges that there is the ability for Buckinghamshire at some point in the future to review the Green Belt status of these sites so the Town Council may want the re-assurance of an additional Neighbourhood plan Protection for this area. however, identified GA area 2 is not a gap, as acknowledged in the neighbourhood Plan, between the two settlements because Gerrards Cross is physically joined to Chalfont St Peter. As such it is not considered that the identified gap 2 can be described as such and possibly shouldn't be included in this policy.</p>	Noted	BP reference amended to 'Gerrards Cross to Chalfont St Peter parish boundary'

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
	<p>Appendix A – No comments on the accuracy of the list. However, as an observation given the current fast changing face of retail and support services would be good to add a date as to when the list was compiled – i.e. List correct as at XX 2023 as the list of business may change and you don't want people questioning the accuracy of the plan because the list of retail uses is out of date.</p>	Noted	date included on title page
	<p>Appendix B – this refers to South Bucks district in a number of places. As mentioned, South Bucks District no longer exists but appreciate many statistical facts are still based on the former districts. Suggest that each time South Bucks is mentioned the words – 'the former' are added to avoid any confusion.</p>	Noted	'the former' added to both references of South Bucks
	<p>Appendix C – it may be helpful to add the pale green shading to the map key to avoid any doubt as to what that colour represents.</p>	Noted	green space within Gerrards Cross key added
	<p>Appendix D – While the maps A and B are useful to identify the location of the Local Green Spaces these need to provide more detail if they are to be used by Planning officers to determine planning applications. The level of detail is better on Map C where a planning officer or potential developer would be able to clearly identify the areas covered by the local green space policy. In some cases Neighbourhood plan examiners have requested more detailed mapping to show sites/facilities that a neighbourhood plan is seeking to protect to aid the decision makers and avoid any possible confusion. As such its suggested better mapping is inserted before submission.</p>	Noted	Professional Maps will be created for the examination copy of the Neighbourhood Plan
	<p>Appendix E - This shows sites with potential for Green Belt release. The sites shown on the plan start at GX3 and run to GX7 its unclear if site GX1 and 2 were assessed but not considered suitable for release or if they are missing from the plan. Given its not considered the Green Belt release plan should feature in the neighbourhood plan to be submitted this shouldn't be an issue. However, if the plan is retained in any form it needs to be made clear what the decision is on sites GX1 and GX2.</p>		Sites renumbered GBR1-4 for clarity

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
Appendices	<p>It's also worth noting that site GX6 was considered as part of the Buckinghamshire Green Belt work as the whole area from the Chalfont St Peter area though to the Gerrards cross area indicated at GX6 – this area was discounted as a site for potential Green Belt release because of the TPO and local nature wildlife site designations. As such even if release was agreed it wouldn't provide any development potential which is why the Chiltern and South Bucks Local Plan didn't propose the area for release from the Green Belt.</p>	Noted	No action taken
	<p>The mapping is not clear and any study to justify Green Belt changes would require more detailed mapping and a reasoned justification analysis of each site proposed for removal from the Green Belt. However, based on the Appendix E map the proposed release sites GX5 and GX7 don't appear to have development on two sides. GX7 in particular appears to move from a permanent defensible Green Belt boundary the A413 into less well-defined Green Belt boundaries and expand the settlement outwards into the Green Belt. Proposed site GX3 would appear to leave an isolated pocket of Green Belt land between it and the remainder of the town. This is not generally favoured in any Green Belt review and if removed would leave the isolated Green Belt portion open to development or pressure for its removal as part of the neighbourhood plan process.</p>	<p>Maps updated to make location of GX5 clearer & identify dwellings on both sides of site. Re: GX3, the 'isolated pocket' is identified in policy 15 (GS4)- Gerrards Cross C of E School playing/sports fields.</p>	<p>GX7 removed from Neighbourhood Plan (sites also renumbered in reference to comment above). Updated maps added to plan to make locations clearer.</p>
	<p>Appendix F – no specific comments on Appendix list – see comments on Policy 17.</p> <p>Appendix G – See comments on Policy 18</p> <p>Appendix H – the map keys on both maps are not readable.</p> <p>Appendix I – no comments</p> <p>Appendix J – No comments</p>		

Section	Comment, Section Numbering and any change required	SG Response	Action Taken
General Comments	The neighbourhood plan is lacking a policies map to bring all its designations together in one place. Again this is something that neighbourhood plan examiners often request as a modification if there isn't one produced at submission stage.	Noted	maps will be created for examination draft of NP