



Intelligent Plans
and examinations

Report on the Burnham Neighbourhood Plan 2024 – 2045

An Examination undertaken for Buckinghamshire Council with the support of Burnham Parish Council on the Burnham Submission Version Neighbourhood Plan.

Independent Examiner: Andrew S Freeman BSc (Hons) DipTP DipEM FRTPI

Date of Report: 20 January 2026

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Office 10, 5 Argyle Street, Bath BA2 4BA

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

Contents

Main Findings - Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction and Background	4
Burnham Neighbourhood Plan 2024 - 2045	4
The Independent Examiner.....	5
The Scope of the Examination.....	5
The Basic Conditions	6
2. Approach to the Examination	7
Planning Policy Context.....	7
Submitted Documents	7
Site Visit	8
Written Representations with or without Public Hearing	8
Modifications.....	8
3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights.....	8
Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area	8
Plan Period	8
Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation	9
Development and Use of Land.....	9
Excluded Development	9
Human Rights	10
4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions	10
EU Obligations.....	10
Main Issues.....	10
Issue 1 – Format of Documents.....	11
Issue 2 – Design Code	12
Issue 3 – Green and Blue Infrastructure	13
Issue 4 – Local Green Spaces	13
Issue 5 – Urban Greening.....	14
Issue 6 – Sustainable Travel.....	14
Issue 7 - Local Community Uses and Village Centre Uses	14
Issue 8 – Zero Carbon Buildings	14
Other Policies	15
Other Matters.....	15
5. Conclusions.....	16
Summary	16
The Referendum and its Area.....	16

Overview 16

Appendix: Modifications 17

Main Findings - Executive Summary

From my examination of the Burnham Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan) and its supporting documentation, including the representations made, I have concluded that subject to the policy modifications set out in this report, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- the Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – Burnham Parish Council;
- the Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – Burnham Neighbourhood Area – Plan A in the section of the Plan on the Neighbourhood Area;
- the Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect – 2024 - 2045; and
- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum on the basis that it has met all the relevant legal requirements.

I have considered whether the referendum area should extend beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates and have concluded that it should not.

1. Introduction and Background

Burnham Neighbourhood Plan 2024 - 2045

- 1.1 Burnham is a large village and civil parish in south Buckinghamshire within the administrative area of Buckinghamshire Council (formerly South Bucks District Council). The southern part of the parish is traversed by the M4 motorway and by the main line railway between London Paddington and Reading. The town of Maidenhead lies a short distance away to the west-southwest, with Slough to the east-southeast. The nature reserve of Burnham Beeches is in the centre of the parish.
- 1.2 The neighbourhood area includes the whole of the parish of Burnham but also a small area within the adjacent Dorney Parish to the south of the M4. This area was formerly part of Burnham Parish but was transferred to Dorney Parish following boundary changes on 1 March 2025. The Neighbourhood Plan is being progressed with the agreement of Dorney Parish Council.
- 1.3 The area was designated by the former South Bucks District Council in 2018. Since that time, and with one or two delays, plan preparation has proceeded under the auspices of a Steering Group and has been informed by discussions and consultations with residents and others, evidence

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Office 10, 5 Argyle Street, Bath BA2 4BA

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

gathering and the formulation of 'seven visions for Burnham'. Publicity has been given through the Burnham Round and About magazine and through other initiatives. The resultant Plan has an overall vision, four objectives and eight key policies.

The Independent Examiner

- 1.4 As the Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the Burnham Neighbourhood Plan by Buckinghamshire Council, with the agreement of Burnham Parish Council.
- 1.5 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector with over fifty years' experience. I have worked in both the public and the private sectors. I am an independent examiner and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

The Scope of the Examination

- 1.6 As the independent examiner I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
- (a) that the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
 - (b) that modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or
 - (c) that the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 1.7 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) ("the 1990 Act"). The examiner must consider:
- Whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions;
 - Whether the Plan complies with provisions under Sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ("the 2004 Act"). These are:
 - it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body, for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;
 - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
 - it specifies the period during which it has effect;
 - it does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development'; and

- it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area.
 - Whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the Plan proceed to referendum.
 - Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) ("the 2012 Regulations").
- 1.8 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

The Basic Conditions

- 1.9 The "Basic Conditions" are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the neighbourhood plan must:
- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
 - contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
 - be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
 - be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations (under retained EU law)¹; and
 - meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.
- 1.10 Regulation 32 of the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the making of the Neighbourhood Development Plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.²

¹ The existing body of environmental regulation is retained in UK law.

² This revised Basic Condition came into force on 28 December 2018 through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.

2.Approach to the Examination

Planning Policy Context

- 2.1 The Development Plan for this part of Buckinghamshire Council, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, includes the South Bucks Core Strategy together with policies from the South Bucks Local Plan saved from 2011. There is an emerging Local Plan in the form of the Buckinghamshire Local Plan but this is at an early stage of its preparation.
- 2.2 The planning policy for England is set out principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). A revised version of the NPPF was published in December 2024. Paragraph 239 of that version includes transitional arrangements for neighbourhood plans, stating that the revised NPPF only applies to neighbourhood plans submitted after 12 March 2025. As submission of the Burnham Neighbourhood Plan to Buckinghamshire Council was completed on 10 March 2025, unless otherwise stated, all references in this report read across to the earlier December 2023 version of the NPPF.³ In addition, the accompanying Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) offers advice on how the NPPF should be implemented.

Submitted Documents

- 2.3 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents I consider relevant to the examination, including those submitted which comprise:
- the draft submission version Burnham Neighbourhood Plan 2024 – 2045 (undated);
 - a map which identifies the area to which the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan relates;
 - the Consultation Statement, undated;
 - the Basic Conditions Statement, February 2025;
 - the Burnham Design Code, March 2025;
 - all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation;
 - the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Full Screening Outcome, November 2024, prepared by Buckinghamshire Council; and
 - the request for additional clarification sought in my letter dated 24 November 2025 and the response from Burnham Parish Council dated 3 December 2025.⁴

³ View at:

<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ukgwa/20231228093504/https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>

⁴ View the documents at: <https://www.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/the-plans/>

Site Visit

- 2.4 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 4 December 2025 to familiarise myself with it and visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the Plan and evidential documents.

Written Representations with or without Public Hearing

- 2.5 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. I considered hearing sessions to be unnecessary as the consultation responses clearly articulated the objections to the Plan and presented arguments for and against the Plan's suitability to proceed to a referendum.

Modifications

- 2.6 Where necessary, I have recommended modifications to the Plan (**PMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For ease of reference, I have listed these modifications separately in the Appendix.

3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights

Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area

- 3.1 The Burnham Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by Burnham Parish Council, which is a qualifying body for an area that was designated by the former South Bucks District Council on 17 May 2018 (the statutory designation is carried over for the purposes of Buckinghamshire Council). It may be noted that the designated area covers the whole of Burnham Parish and a small part of Dorney Parish.⁵
- 3.2 It is the only Neighbourhood Plan for Burnham Neighbourhood Area and does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Plan Period

- 3.3 The Plan specifies clearly the period to which it is to take effect, which is from 2024 to 2045.

⁵ Paragraph 1.0 of the Plan explains "...the area coincided with the Parish Boundary as of the time of designation (see Plan A). The Burnham Neighbourhood Plan area includes 7 houses that are separated from Burnham by the M4. These houses were in Burnham Parish up to 1st March 2025, and from that date moved to Dorney Parish. The two Parishes have agreed to proceed on the existing *[statutory]* neighbourhood plan boundaries and will continue to work together on any issues affecting this area."

Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation

- 3.4 Details of plan preparation and consultation are set out in the Parish Council's Consultation Statement. Following designation of the (then) parish by the former South Bucks District Council on 17 May 2018, plan preparation was progressed by a Steering Group of parish councillors and local residents. Consultants ONH were later appointed to work alongside the councillors and residents in the preparation of the draft Plan.
- 3.5 Section 2.2 of the Consultation Statement contains summary details of the activities followed in plan preparation. Formal consultation under Regulation 14 took place between 22 October 2024 and 8 December 2024. Details of persons and bodies consulted are recorded in Appendix 4 of the Statement. Appendices 5, 6 and 7 include information on how consultation took place.
- 3.6 The Consultation Statement records that some 15 representations were made at the Regulation 14 stage. Seven of these were from statutory bodies. The remainder were from local residents, either in the form of emails or completed comments forms. A summary of the main issues raised is set out in Section 3 of the Consultation Statement. Section 3.2 of the Statement and Appendix 10 indicate how these issues were addressed.
- 3.7 At the Regulation 16 consultation stage between 22 May 2025 and 10 July 2025, ten representations were submitted. In addition to comments from Buckinghamshire Council, three of the representations were from local residents, five were from public bodies and one was submitted by a planning consultant on behalf of clients with land interests around Burnham. I have taken all these representations into account in making my recommendations.
- 3.8 I am satisfied that, at both the Regulation 14 and the Regulation 16 stages, the consultation process met the legal requirements and there has been procedural compliance. Regard has been paid to the advice on plan preparation and engagement in the PPG.

Development and Use of Land

- 3.9 The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with Section 38A of the 2004 Act.

Excluded Development

- 3.10 The Plan does not include provisions and policies for "excluded development".⁶

⁶ See section 61K of the 1990 Act.

Human Rights

- 3.11 Burnham Parish Council is satisfied that the Plan does not breach Human Rights (within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998). From my independent assessment, I see no reason to disagree.

4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions

EU Obligations

- 4.1 The Neighbourhood Plan was screened for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) by Buckinghamshire Council, which found that SEA was not required. Having read the Full Screening Outcome, I support this conclusion.
- 4.2 The Burnham Neighbourhood Plan was further screened for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), which also was not triggered. Although in close proximity to a European designated nature site (the Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is within the boundary of the Parish), none of the policies in the Plan should have an impact on any SAC or Special Protection Area. Natural England agreed with the screening conclusion.⁷ From my independent assessment of this matter, I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, I am satisfied that the Plan is compatible with the relevant EU obligations, as retained in UK law.

Main Issues

- 4.3 Having regard for the Burnham Neighbourhood Plan, the consultation responses and other evidence, and the site visit, I consider that there are eight main issues relating to the Basic Conditions for this examination. These concern:
- Format of Documents
 - Design Code;
 - Green and Blue Infrastructure;
 - Local Green Spaces;
 - Urban Greening;
 - Sustainable Travel;
 - Burnham Village Centre; and
 - Zero Carbon Buildings.

⁷ See email dated 24 October 2024 forming Section 9.1 of the Full Screening Opinion.
Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Office 10, 5 Argyle Street, Bath BA2 4BA
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

- 4.4 Before I deal with the main issues, I have a few observations to make with regard to the representations. First, the Burnham Neighbourhood Plan should be seen in the context of the wider planning system. This includes the South Bucks Local Plan as well as the NPPF and PPG. It is not necessary to repeat in the Neighbourhood Plan matters that are quite adequately dealt with elsewhere.⁸ Having said that, there may be scope to give emphasis to matters particularly relevant in the context of Burnham.
- 4.5 Secondly, the Neighbourhood Plan does not have to deal with each and every topic raised through the consultation. In this regard, the content of the Neighbourhood Plan and the scope of the policies is largely at the discretion of the qualifying body, albeit informed by the consultation process and the requirements set by the Basic Conditions.
- 4.6 Thirdly, my central task is to judge whether the Neighbourhood Plan satisfies the Basic Conditions. Many of the representations do not demonstrate or indicate a failure to meet those conditions or other legal requirements. Similarly, many of the suggested additions and improvements are not necessary when judged against the Basic Conditions.
- 4.7 The following section of my report sets out modifications that are necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions. Some of the proposed modifications are factual corrections.⁹ Others are necessary in order to have closer regard to national policies and advice. In particular, plans should be succinct and contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous.¹⁰ A decision maker should be able to apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. In addition, the policies should be supported by appropriate evidence.¹¹

Issue 1 – Format of Documents

- 4.8 As a preliminary matter, I have considered the format of the documents. The draft Neighbourhood Plan has been published as a digital document. Notwithstanding the fact that, for those with the facilities, it is possible to run off paper copies, there are issues of accessibility for those unfamiliar with, or without access to, “modern” technology, irrespective of any difficulties that may be encountered in attempting to navigate around the documents. In addition, there are likely to be technical issues surrounding the need to publish the Plan on the Council’s website.
- 4.9 Whilst it is commendable that the opportunities provided by a digital approach have been embraced, I feel compelled nonetheless to conclude that, for the purposes of clarity, the “made” version of the Neighbourhood

⁸ See NPPF Paragraph 16 f).

⁹ Modifications for the purpose of correcting errors is provided for in Paragraph 10(3)(e) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act.

¹⁰ NPPF, Paragraphs 15 and 16 d).

¹¹ PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

Plan should be published in a conventional format, one that lends itself to the generation of paper copies. This is covered in proposed modification **PM1**.

- 4.10 As to the Design Code, also in digital format, I have had regard to the comments of the Parish Council.¹² I appreciate that the interactive maps, in particular, are an integral feature of the publication, a feature that is central to its interpretation. I am given to understand that the relevant software is already used by Buckinghamshire Council and that, as such, there should be no problem in hosting the Design Code. Whilst a document version of sorts could be prepared if found to be necessary, I am satisfied that there would be no related breach of the Basic Conditions.

Issue 2 – Design Code

- 4.11 As to the Design Code itself, this is given effect through Policy BUR1. Amongst other things, proposals should reflect “design preferences” and demonstrate a positive response to the “relevant design strategy”. However, an applicant will need to know what is meant by these phrases and where relevant information is to be found in the Design Code.
- 4.12 There is an implication that there are (or should be) sections of the Design Code, perhaps under a heading such as “Design Preference” or “Design Strategy”, where an applicant can find a description of such topics and hence a definitive steer to matters to be reflected in applications or positively reflected in proposals.
- 4.13 As it is, the Parish Council’s response to my questions¹³ suggests that the references are to *design expectations* that are informed by guidance throughout the code. For clarity, I consider that “design preferences” and “design strategy” should be replaced in the policy by “design expectations”. “Design expectations” should also be used in the supporting text.
- 4.14 I found that the structure of the Design Code is not the most logical. It is possible that this is an issue related to attempts to interpret the digital document in paper format. However, consideration can be given to the organisation of the material without changing the actual content.
- 4.15 Having said that, there are a couple of references (or lack of references) that add confusion. The first is in the section, “What type of development does the Code apply to?”. According to the Code, this is “likely to include” six proposal types. However, this appears to be a comprehensive list. No other development types are covered in the Code.

¹² Email dated 3 December 2025 in response to my questions.

¹³ Email dated 3 December 2025 in response to my questions.

- 4.16 At the same time, the section “How to use this Design Code” guides readers to the relevant code; but there is no reference to the parish-wide code that applies to development proposals across the parish of Burnham.
- 4.17 Certain design codes have been criticised in representations. There is a desire to introduce exceptions or qualifications to the codes. For my part, I find this to be unnecessary. The codes deal with the thrust of the design issue, as perceived and expressed by the Parish Council. As indicated in Paragraph 5.6 of the Plan, there is scope to introduce proposals that do not follow the requirements of the code, albeit that the exception would need to be justified.
- 4.18 There is also a suggestion that, in Design Code OCI.1.2, the code is seeking to control the location and infrastructure delivery of development, going well beyond the legitimate scope of such a code. For my part, I recognise that the code has a spatial dimension. However, this is a reflection of the principle of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF; but the purpose of the code is to reflect the consequent design rationale.
- 4.19 I find that there is no need to amend any of the codes. The remaining matters are addressed in proposed modification **PM2**.

Issue 3 – Green and Blue Infrastructure

- 4.20 Policy BUR2 concerns green and blue infrastructure. Clause E indicates that the Policies Map shows those parts of the designated Green Infrastructure Network that are known or likely to have biodiversity value. However, I am advised by the Parish Council¹⁴ that this information is in fact shown on Plan J: Green Infrastructure Map, save only for those sites shown as “Recreation Audit” where the primary value is amenity.
- 4.21 Missing from Plan J itself are details of what the various acronyms stand for (CFPGM through to TORCH) in respect of the Priority Habitats Inventory. Clarity would be added through proposed modification **PM3**.

Issue 4 – Local Green Spaces

- 4.22 Policy BUR3 (Local Green Spaces) states that proposals for development will only be supported in very special circumstances. This ignores the fact that development may be “not inappropriate” and be acceptable in the circumstances of the case. Proposed modification **PM4** would ensure consistency with national policy for Green Belts as set out in Paragraph 107¹⁵ of the NPPF. Otherwise, I am satisfied that the nine nominated sites meet the criteria set out in national policy and guidance. As an aside, it may be helpful to add a reference in the supporting text to footnote 45 of the current NPPF (against which proposals for development will be

¹⁴ Email dated 3 December 2025 in response to my questions.

¹⁵ This is now paragraph 108 in the December 2024 NPPF.

assessed) to make clear that national policy in relation to 'grey belt' (as set out in Chapter 13 of the December 2024 NPPF) does not apply to Local Green Spaces, but this is not strictly necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions.¹⁶

Issue 5 – Urban Greening

- 4.23 Policy BUR4 on Urban Greening would apply to "major development". However, the term is undefined. To avoid any doubt, reference should be made to the definition of major development as contained in the Glossary of the NPPF. Proposed modification **PM5** refers.

Issue 6 – Sustainable Travel

- 4.24 Policy BUR5 concerns Sustainable Travel and includes reference to Plan L. Plan L shows, in various colours, four types of rights of way; but there is no indication of the type of right of way that is represented by the respective colours. Necessary detail would be added under proposed modification **PM6** which would also secure updating of the Policies Map and the Policies Map Inset.

Issue 7 – Burnham Village Centre

- 4.25 Burnham Village Centre is addressed in Policy BUR7. Clause A states that the Neighbourhood Plan defines the centre "as shown on the policies map". The Policies Map shows "Burnham High Street" but does not define the village centre as such. In fact, Burnham Village Centre" and "Burnham High Street" are one and the same. Under proposed modification **PM7**, the notation on the Policies Map and Policies Map Inset would be changed to "Burnham Village Centre".

Issue 8 – Zero Carbon Buildings

- 4.26 Policy BUR8 is entitled "Addressing the Sustainability Performance Gap" and deals with the Parish Council's proposed approach to zero carbon buildings. The policy sets out various requirements regarding energy efficiency.
- 4.27 Buckinghamshire Council has raised two key points. The first is to draw attention to a Written Ministerial Statement dated 13 December 2023. This states that "...the Government does not expect plan-makers to set local energy efficiency standards for buildings that go beyond current or planned building regulations."¹⁷ Any policies that do, "should be rejected at examination if they do not have a well-reasoned and robustly costed

¹⁶ See paragraph 4.32 below.

¹⁷ View at:

<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201415/cmhansrd/cm150325/wmstext/150325m0001.htm#15032586000004>

rationale...". The text supporting the policy offers a reasoning for the policy. However, there is no robustly costed rationale.

- 4.28 On a second point, Buckinghamshire Council states, "While the policy is proposed in the context where such an approach to energy efficiency is 'feasible', it does not offer any definitive guidance on how feasibility would be assessed beyond that an applicant must demonstrate those factors which would make the delivery of Passivhaus technology unfeasible. The effect of such an approach would be that BC and the developer concerned would need to engage in an onerous and detailed technical debate on this point."
- 4.29 Although, on other occasions¹⁸, I have accepted wording along the lines of that suggested by the Parish Council, I acknowledge that the provisions of Policy BUR8 could be perceived as unclear and potentially contrary to Government policy. Buckinghamshire Council could have difficulty in applying the policy consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications.
- 4.30 In the circumstances, a replacement policy would be appropriate (proposed modification **PM8**), as suggested by Buckinghamshire Council. The wording is consistent with that recommended in my report on The Farnhams' and Stoke Hammond Neighbourhood Plans, also within the administrative area of Buckinghamshire Council, where conditions are the same.¹⁹ Clarity would be achieved through the application of consistent policy.

Other Policies

- 4.31 There remains one policy that has not been the subject of scrutiny in the above report. This is Policy BUR6, Local Community Uses. To a greater or lesser extent, this topic is covered in NPPF Section 8 (Promoting healthy and safe communities). I find that there has been regard for national policy and that the Basic Conditions have been met.

Other Matters

- 4.32 All policy areas have been considered in the foregoing discussion. With the modifications that I have recommended, the Plan would meet the Basic Conditions. Other minor non-material changes (that do not affect

¹⁸ See my reports on the Stoke Poges Neighbourhood Plan and Westbury Neighbourhood Plan:

[https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/FINAL Stoke Poges NDP Examiner Report 030325.pdf](https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/FINAL_Stoke_Poges_NDP_Examiner_Report_030325.pdf)

[https://buckinghamshire-gov-uk.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/Westbury NDP Examiner Report 2105824 6XCL0LO.pdf](https://buckinghamshire-gov-uk.s3.amazonaws.com/documents/Westbury_NDP_Examiner_Report_2105824_6XCL0LO.pdf)

¹⁹ View at:

[https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/The Farnhams Neighbourhood Plan Examiner Report 030625.pdf](https://media.buckinghamshire.gov.uk/documents/The_Farnhams_Neighbourhood_Plan_Examiner_Report_030625.pdf); [Stoke Hammond Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report](#)

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Office 10, 5 Argyle Street, Bath BA2 4BA

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

the Basic Conditions), including those suggested by Buckinghamshire Council as well as consequential amendments, corrections and up-dates, could be made prior to the referendum at the Councils' discretion.²⁰ One such example is an erroneous reference to 'cartilage' in the introduction to the Design Code (should read 'curtilage').

5. Conclusions

Summary

- 5.1 The Burnham Neighbourhood Plan has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has investigated whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements for neighbourhood plans. I have had regard for all the responses made following consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan and the evidence documents submitted with it.
- 5.2 I have made recommendations to modify a number of policies and text to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum.

The Referendum and its Area

- 5.3 I have considered whether or not the referendum area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. The Burnham Neighbourhood Plan as modified has no policy or proposals which I consider significant enough to have an impact beyond the designated Neighbourhood Plan boundary, requiring the referendum to extend to areas beyond the Plan boundary. I recommend that the boundary for the purposes of any future referendum on the Plan should be the boundary of the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.²¹

Overview

- 5.4 It is evident that a considerable amount of time and effort has been devoted to the development and production of this Plan and I congratulate those who have been involved. The Plan should prove to be a useful tool for future planning and change in Burnham over the coming years.

Andrew S Freeman

Examiner

²⁰ PPG Reference ID: 41-106-20190509.

²¹ See footnote 5 above.

Appendix: Modifications

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no/ other reference	Modification
PM1	Whole Plan	The “made” version of the Plan shall be published in a PDF format or such other format as lends itself to the generation of paper copies where necessary and appropriate.
PM2	Policy BUR1 and Design Code	In Policy BUR1, replace both “preferences” and “strategy” by “expectations”. In Paragraph 5.6, substitute “expectations” for “strategy”. In that section of the Design Code headed “What type of development does the Code apply to?”, change the text to read: “The Code is largely intended to guide development proposals which require planning permission and, in the parish of Burnham, address the following:”. In that section of the Design Code headed “How to use this Design Code”, add, after point 4: “In addition, the Parish-wide code will apply throughout the neighbourhood area.”.
PM3	Policy BUR2 and Plan J	In Clause E of Policy BUR2, amend the opening so that it reads: “Save only for the sites identified under “Recreation Audit” (amenity value), Plan J shows...”. In the key to Plan J, under “Priority Habitats Inventory”, give the full name of the habitats identified (not just an acronym).

PM4	Policy BUR3	Change Clause B of Policy BUR3 so that it reads: "Proposals for development in a Local Green Space should be consistent with national policy for Green Belts."
PM5	Policy BUR4	To the supporting text to Policy BUR4, add: "Major development has the meaning set out in the NPPF at Annex 2: Glossary."
PM6	Policy BUR5 Policies Map and Inset	On Plan L, and on the Policies Map and Policies Map Inset, state the type of right of way depicted by the various colours in the key.
PM7	Policy BUR7 Policies Map and Inset	On the Policies Map and Policies Map Inset, change "Burnham High Street" in the key to "Burnham Village Centre".
PM8	Policy BUR8	Replace Policy BUR8 with the following: "Development proposals which would be 'zero carbon ready' by design by minimising the amount of energy needed to heat and cool buildings through landform, layout, building orientation, massing and landscaping will be supported. Consideration should be given to resource efficiency at the outset and whether existing buildings can be re-used as part of the scheme to capture their embodied carbon. Proposals for Passivhaus or equivalent standard buildings with a space heating demand of less than 15KWh/m ² /year will be supported. Schemes that maximise their potential to meet this standard by proposing the use of terraced and/or apartment building forms of plot size, plot coverage and layout that are different to those of the character area within which the proposal is located will be supported, provided it can be demonstrated that the scheme will not have an

		unacceptable effect on the character of the area. Proposals for major development should be accompanied by a Whole-Life-Cycle Carbon Emission Assessment, using a recognised methodology, to demonstrate actions have been taken to reduce embodied carbon resulting from the construction and use of the building over its life.”
--	--	--