

Wycombe District Council
Initial Sustainability Appraisal of Strategic Options
February 2014



people place pounds
getting our priorities right



Contents

1.Introduction	1
2.Methodology.....	6
3.Key Issues for the District	9
4. List of strategic issues and options for sustainability appraisal.....	23
5. Appraisal Findings	29
Strategic Issue 1: How Many Homes to Build During 2011-31	29
Strategic Issue 2: How Many Jobs.....	38
Strategic Issue 3: Options for Where New Housing Should Go	44
Strategic Issue 3a: Major Expansion at Princes Risborough	54
Strategic Issue 3b: Major Expansion at other key locations on the Transport Network.....	58
Strategic Issue 4: Approaches to providing new land for business	62
Strategic Issue 5: Approaches to accommodating retail and leisure development.....	65
Strategic Issue 6: Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople - setting a pitch/plot target	68
High Wycombe sites.....	72
Chepping Wye Valley Sites.....	104
Marlow Sites	121
Princes Risborough sites	124
6.Next steps	139

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Wycombe District Council is currently preparing a new Local Plan, the Wycombe District Local Plan (WDLP), which will set out policies and proposals to address the District's growth needs for the period 2011-31. The plan is being prepared under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004, as amended) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, will, once adopted, have the status of a Local Plan (previously referred to as a Development Plan Document). As such, it will form a key part of the Council's development plan, and will constitute the prime consideration when determining planning applications.
- 1.2 The preparation of the WDLP must be carried out in parallel with a Sustainability Appraisal, under the National Planning Policy Framework, and incorporating a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA), under the European Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive (2001/42/EC). This is because the directive states that an environmental assessment must be carried out to inform the preparation of Local Development Plans (Local Plans) because they are likely to have significant environmental effects. Sustainability appraisal ensures that potential environmental effects are given full consideration alongside social and economic issues.
- 1.3 This document outlines the approach and findings of the sustainability appraisal (SA) work carried out in preparing the Options Consultation Document for the WDLP.
- 1.4 This report is an interim report and we would welcome your comments on the findings to date. Please send your comments by 4th April 2014 to:

Email: newlocalplan@wycombe.gov.uk

By post to:

Planning Policy Team

Wycombe District Council

Council Offices

Queen Victoria Road

High Wycombe

Bucks HP11 1BB

Sustainability Appraisal

- 1.5 The SA Scoping Report, published in October 2013, was the first stage of the plan preparation and sustainability appraisal process. This set out the methodology for the SA and scope and level of detail to be included in the SA Report which will be published at the end of the plan preparation process (as well as in any Interim SA Reports which are published at various milestones of the plan preparation process).
- 1.6 The Scoping Report also:
- presented a portrait of the social, economic and environmental characteristics of Wycombe District;
 - identified the key sustainability issues facing Wycombe District; and
 - set out the framework to form the basis for the Sustainability Appraisal of the WDLP.
- 1.7 This Initial SA of the strategic options is informed by the Scoping Report as well as national policy and guidance and the various technical reports which have been carried out as part of the plan-making process (all of which will be listed in a future version of the SA Report).
- 1.8 Carrying out the SA is an on-going process throughout the preparation of the plan. Feedback from this current consultation stage of the Plan will be fed into subsequent iterations. Subsequent versions will also be further informed by the outcomes of this appraisal and refined options and plans.

The Wycombe District Local Plan

- 1.9 Following the revocation of the South East Plan¹ and in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, the WDLP is setting locally-derived housing targets for Wycombe District and sub-areas of it as appropriate, incorporating strategic and other housing allocations, and addressing the need for and allocation of employment land. It is also looking at the need for new pitches for gypsies and travellers in the District, and setting out allocations for other forms of development which may be needed in the plan period.
- 1.10 In short, the WDLP is setting out the scale and direction of growth in the District up to 2031, reviewing and replacing the existing adopted Wycombe Core Strategy (adopted 2008) and remaining saved policies from the current Wycombe District Local Plan (adopted 2004). It is also addressing a range of detailed development management policy issues.

¹ The Plan was fully revoked with the exception of one policy that does not impact on Wycombe District

- 1.11 The plan is not intended to be a Core Strategy, or a Site Allocations document: it is both. The WDLP will cover strategic objectives and the means for delivering these objectives, incorporating topic policies and site allocations.
- 1.12 The only area which the WDLP is not covering is that covered by the Delivery and Site Allocations Plan, which covers proposals for the District's town centres and other development management topic policies. The DSA Plan was adopted by WDC in July 2013. It is therefore intended that the WDLP will sit alongside the DSA Plan when adopted.
- 1.13 As the local plans prepared are long-term strategic plans, it is too early to definitively appraise their effects on sustainability objectives. However, the monitoring of the impacts of such plans will be an on-going exercise, and the objectives which the SA incorporated for these plans forms the starting point for the new SA Framework, although the latter is comprehensively modified to reflect the different context, and to reflect evolving methodological trends in the SA process.

The SA Process and the SEA Directive

- 1.14 The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process is a way of ensuring that all plans and programmes which relate to land use issues are compatible with the aims of sustainable development. It is a requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that SA should be an "integral part of the plan production process". Consequently, the Wycombe District Local Plan (WDLP) is required to be subject to this process.
- 1.15 The appraisal is carried out through an evaluation of the social, environmental and economic implications of emerging plans, to ensure that their objectives and policies are in accordance with the underlying principles of sustainable development. As set out in the UK Sustainable Development Strategy, these principles are:
- Living within Environmental Limits;
 - Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society;
 - Achieving a sustainable economy;
 - Promoting good governance; and
 - Using sound science responsibly.
- 1.16 The origins of the SA process lie with the European Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive, which acts to ensure that all plans/policies with

land use implications take into consideration environmental issues. Through the Directive, an environmental assessment is formally required for all plans and programmes which are likely to have significant effects on the environment. Again, this means the WDLP is required to undergo this process.

1.17 The procedure required by the Directive comprises:

- Preparation of an Environmental Report on the likely significant effects of the draft plan or programme;
- Carrying out consultation on the draft plan or programme and accompanying Environmental Report;
- Taking into account the Environmental Report and the results of consultation in decision-making; and
- Providing information when the plan or programme is adopted and showing how the results of the environmental assessment have been taken into account.

1.18 Although the requirement to carry out both an SA and SEA is mandatory, it is possible to satisfy the requirements of both pieces of legislation through a single appraisal process, and government guidance illustrates how the two processes can be integrated into one for the purposes of plan-making. The final output of the process is a combined SA and SEA 'Environmental Report' which meets the regulatory requirements for SA and SEA.

1.19 In carrying out the SA of the Wycombe District Local Plan, the Council has sought to follow the method set out in government guidance. At the time of starting work on the scoping stage, this comprised the SEA Practice Guidance 2005, and the CLG's 'Plan-Making Manual', on the Planning Advisory Service's website, and which contained a section on carrying out Sustainability Appraisals. Whilst the former document is still extant and relevant, the latter guide has been replaced by an updated section on plan making on the PAS website, including guidance on the SA process. This is therefore all being taken into account in the process of scoping and carrying out the SA, and further updates will be provided in a future SA Report.

1.20 Furthermore, the government has recently launched its online National Planning Practice Guidance tool for feedback on usability and content. This online guidance includes a section on strategic environmental assessment and sustainability appraisal, and it is likely to be formally published in final form sometime later in 2014. It is therefore also being taken into account in the SA process.

1.21 The SA will be integrated into the plan preparation process, and will help inform decision-making with regard to the WDLP. The SA process will follow the requirements of the SEA Directive (which are also the requirements which are listed in Schedule 2 of the SEA Regulations 2004).

2. Methodology

What is being appraised?

- 2.1 All options are assessed against the objectives using the appraisal criteria from the SA framework as outlined in the SA Scoping Report, and presented here in the following sections.
- 2.2 The various options are grouped under various strategic issues (such as how many homes to build or where to build new homes) and strategic sites (split into different sections according to which area they fall under), and they are then assessed comparatively in a short form table. Each option is assessed compared to the likely situation if the plan were not to be adopted. At this stage, only the strategic issues and sites are being appraised; further options and sites (such as for development management policies and non-strategic sites) will be appraised and this appraisal reported on in a later report.
- 2.3 Options have been selected for full appraisal where they are considered to constitute a 'reasonable alternative', under the terms of the SEA Directive. If there is no realistic chance of the option coming to fruition then the option was not assessed fully, although in some cases a fuller appraisal of unlikely options has been carried out due to their scale or due to the importance of the strategic issue being considered.

How have the appraisals been carried out?

- 2.4 For each option, an appraisal is made of direct effects, and also of the potential measures which could mitigate any potential negative effects identified, such as by way of limiting the scale of the option or using existing policies to secure benefits or enhancements in particular areas. **It is important to note that the resulting appraisal commentary and score takes account not only of the direct impacts of each option, but also of the potential mitigation of any potential effects identified.**
- 2.5 Assessment is made of each option on the grounds of: the likelihood of the effect, the scale of the effect, whether it is temporary/permanent, and whether it would be a short, medium or long-term effect. The assessment also considers the likelihood, the scale and timing of impacts as well as significance.
- 2.6 The objectives are summarised under environmental, economic and social sub-headings and are set out in detail in Table 2 of section 3 of this report. Colour coding is used to highlight negative (two shades of red), neutral (yellow) and positive (two shades of green) effects of each option, alongside

symbols (+ for positive effects, 0 for neutral effects and – for negative effects). **It is important to note, however, that the ‘scoring’ and colour coding assigned to this assessment is primarily as a visual aid; this is not a final judgement on the suitability, or sustainability of that option against that objective.**

- 2.7 Therefore these scores should always be read in conjunction with the full commentary for each option. **It is this commentary on the options which provides a fuller insight into the anticipated potential effects from implementation of the options as well as the scope for mitigation measures under each option.**
- 2.8 At this stage, there is much uncertainty over the effect of the options, and therefore in many cases it has not been possible to draw firm conclusions over the nature of these effects. This is because they will be dependent upon further locational strategies, and the various implementation and mitigation measures available to policy-makers and decision-takers. For example, the design of individual development schemes and the scope for securing public transport improvements from developments will be critical to appraising accurately the sustainability effects of certain developments, and these would not be known until a later stage in the plan-making process. Therefore a question mark (?) has been used to denote instances where the effects are uncertain at this stage. Further work will be able to draw greater clarity on many of these effects as the plan moves forward. SA is an ongoing process and these currently unknown factors will become more predictable as the plan approaches its later stages
- 2.9 Symbols have still been used where the outcome of the appraisal indicates a possible positive or negative effect, subject to the uncertainty identified. The commentary and scoring are designed to clearly identify any potential significant effects of any of the options. Significant effects are indicated by a ++ or a --, and this is also highlighted in the commentary.
- 2.10 Inclusion of options or otherwise has been informed by a range of studies carried out by or for the Council to inform the plan-making process. These include studies into the economic and housing needs for the district, potential transport impacts and also assessments of the landscape, ecological and environmental impacts of development at key sites. Outcomes of these studies can suggest if an option should or should not be assessed further and the studies have also been used to inform the appraisal process itself.
- 2.11 The following lists present an outline of the strategic issues subject to SA at this stage, and the various alternatives considered for appraisal under each issue. **For some of the options, it has been considered that they do not**

constitute reasonable alternatives. This can be for various reasons, including that government policy means that the options should not be proceeded with, or that the evidence base indicates that the option is not a realistic one. Where this is the case, it has been flagged up in brackets in the list at the beginning of section 4, and the reasons given in more detail in the individual SA templates in section 5.

3. Key Issues for the District

3.1 The Scoping Report identified a number of environmental, social and economic issues and those that were of key relevance to the WDLP. These were derived from the context review and baseline information analyses outlined in the Scoping Report. The table below summarises these issues, which are presented here under the headings of economic, social and environmental issues.

Table 1: Sustainability Issues in Wycombe District

Environmental Issues	
1	A large proportion of land in the District is protected by statutory landscape and other designations (including the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Metropolitan Green Belt), and therefore it is important that measures to conserve and enhance these assets are effective.
2	There are a large number of listed buildings, conservation areas and other features of historic and archaeological importance in the District, and therefore it is important that measures to protect these heritage assets are effective.
3	The extent of carbon emissions means that the need to deliver new development in as sustainable way as possible taking into account the effects of climate change and minimising contribution to further climate change is a key consideration.
4	The high reliance on car journeys indicates a need for a reduction in the dominance of car journeys for short journeys and improving sustainable transport connections for rural areas.
5	Given the ongoing incidences of air pollution at particular locations in the District, the need to improve air quality, especially in some parts of High Wycombe and areas adjacent to the M40 Motorway, remains a key issue.
6	The extent of road and aircraft noise in certain locations in the District means that the need to address impacts on tranquillity is a key issue.
7	The need to support and enhance the role and importance of Green Infrastructure across the District, to deliver a range of ecosystem services, including assisting healthy lifestyles and enhancing biodiversity.
8	Recent flooding incidences, including the summer 2007 floods, mean that flooding is a key issue in the District. This is due both to the extent of the floodplain, particularly in the River Thames floodplain, and the fact that, in

	Wycombe District, fluvial and groundwater issues are closely connected, due to the chalk aquifers feeding the watercourses. Surface water runoff and sewer flooding also represent potential risks, and therefore the need for suitable and robust drainage and sewerage infrastructure is also a key issue.
9	The need for an improvement of water quality to meet Water Framework Directive standards and fulfil the actions in the River Thames Basin Management Plan is a key issue. This includes the requirement to reach a good ecological value (measured by Good Ecological Status or Good Ecological Potential) and encompasses the quality of physical habitat and its riparian corridor as well as the water quantity and quality that help them to function. It also includes the need to protect groundwater quality by applying restrictions which apply to development within a Source Protection Zone 1 (SPZ1) and the need for protection measures during development to avoid polluting the underlying aquifer.
10	The need to ensure that new development protects and enhances local, national and international sites of importance to biodiversity (e.g. SAC, SSSI, LWC, Nature Reserves) and non-statutory designations for nature conservation and protects identified habitats and species, with no net loss to biodiversity; and where possible results in biodiversity gain.
11	There is a high degree of concern amongst stakeholders and the public about infrastructure provision generally, and the transport network in particular. Therefore this will need to be a key consideration when assessing development options in terms of assessing the provision of transport infrastructure in the area, and the impact on traffic congestion, particularly at existing hotspots, together with any opportunities to mitigate these problems or to enhance the existing level of transport and infrastructure provision.
12	There is a high level of support amongst stakeholders and the public for prioritising the redevelopment of brownfield sites over the development of greenfield sites. This will therefore be a key issue to consider as part of the plan preparation process.
Social Issues	
13	Affordability continues to be an issue, and the provision of affordable housing remains a high priority for the District. Much of the priority is for family-sized accommodation.
14	Whilst the quantum of housing completions has been high in recent years, continued delivery of new housing is required to cater for a rising population

	and increasing number of households
15	There is an ageing population in the District, indicating that specific forms of housing will need to be provided to cater for this need.
16	Whilst there are some family-owned gypsy and traveller pitches in the District, more need to be provided to cater for identified need.
17	Whilst the economic picture of the District as a whole is better than the regional average, pockets of deprivation exist, especially within parts of High Wycombe.
18	There is an issue of declining services and poor public transport in the rural areas of the District.
19	The need to improve connectivity between different areas of the District, and between the District and other areas such as the Thames Valley and Milton Keynes.
20	The need to maintain and improve accessibility of communities to key services and facilities is seen as a key issue.
21	There is a high level of concern amongst key stakeholders and the public over the impact of development on local communities.
Economic Issues	
22	The number of jobs in the District has fallen not just since the onset of the global downturn but also before. There is therefore an important issue about how sustainable economic growth is delivered, and the economic and employment base of the District strengthened given the loss of jobs over recent years.
23	Whilst the unemployment rate in the District has fallen slightly since 2009, it is still higher than at pre-downturn levels. Therefore, the retention of existing businesses in a range of sectors will be a key issue, particularly in the targeted growth sectors.
24	The District contains a highly skilled workforce, but manufacturing employment is in steady decline. The need to retain a broad base of business and employment, to offer a range of posts for job-seekers, is a key issue.
25	The need to protect and promote the District's retail economy and town centres, by ensuring a supply of sites for the projected growth of retail spending whilst protecting and enhancing the District's town centres.

26	The need to regenerate High Wycombe town centre by reducing the quantum of empty shops in the centre and promoting regeneration of key sites and improving the environmental quality of the town centre and delivering the High Wycombe Town Centre Masterplan.
27	Attracting more inward investment into the District is seen as a key objective by stakeholders, to assist with economic growth efforts.
28	Maintaining a healthy rural economy is seen as a key issue in the District's large rural areas.

3.2 Drawing on the issues identified in the Scoping Report, a framework was drawn up, which reflected the various Sustainability Objectives identified. The table below outlines these objectives and accompanying indicators and criteria; these cover the three aspects of Sustainability Appraisal: environmental, social and economic impacts. The table also states which SA/SEA issue each objective relates to (set out in the right-hand column). This is the framework which is used to appraise the various options under the strategic issues and sites which the WDLP is taking forward.

Table 2: Sustainability Appraisal Framework

SA/SEA Theme	SA Objective Potential indicators, with targets where appropriate (set out in brackets)	Appraisal criteria	Issue
ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTIVES			
Biodiversity and Geodiversity	1. To conserve and enhance biodiversity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condition of SSSIs and the site integrity of European sites (improve) • Condition of Local Wildlife Sites (improve) • BAP Priority Habitats/Species (not decrease and ideally increase) • Biodiversity Opportunity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option conserve or enhance sites and habitats, both designated and undesignated, of nature conservation or geodiversity value? • Would the option protect against direct impacts to important habitats and species (e.g. as a result of development in close proximity to a SSSI, locally designated site or other important site such as a biodiversity-rich brownfield site)? • Would the option protect against indirect impacts to important habitats and species including from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diffuse forms of pollution • Disruption to water resources 	9

SA/SEA Theme	SA Objective Potential indicators, with targets where appropriate (set out in brackets)	Appraisal criteria	Issue
	<p>Areas (improvement in area and condition of BAP priority habitat within BOAs)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ancient woodlands – amount and condition (not decrease and worsen; and ideally increase and improve) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of habitat quality in the ‘wider countryside’ (which will increase the ecological isolation of important habitat patches) • Hindrance of natural processes or the active management of semi-natural habitats. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased visitor pressure • Would the option have the effect of creating new BAP habitats? • Would the option have the effect of creating wildlife corridors by linking existing habitats? • Would the option have the effect of prejudicing future habitat restoration (e.g. by developing the only land capable of linking two ancient woodland blocks)? • Would the option improve the ecological/wildlife corridor value of rivers? 	
Landscape and countryside	<p>2. To conserve and enhance the District’s landscape and, in particular, those areas designated for their landscape value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape types and character areas (conserve and enhance) • Changes to open space (not decrease and ideally increase) • Major developments in the Chilterns AONB (minimise) • Major development in the Metropolitan Green Belt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option have an adverse impact on designated landscapes (AONB, LLA and AALs), including on tranquillity? • Would the option have an adverse impact on the Metropolitan Green Belt? • Would the option result in the loss of designated Green Space or other open space of value? • Would the option result in new open spaces being created? • Would the option promote the distinctiveness of landscape character including enhancement where appropriate? 	1

SA/SEA Theme	SA Objective Potential indicators, with targets where appropriate (set out in brackets)	Appraisal criteria	Issue
	(minimise)		
Heritage and Townscape	<p>3. To conserve and enhance the District's townscapes and historic environment, and, in particular, those areas designated for their heritage importance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of Conservation Areas • Listed buildings • Scheduled Ancient Monuments • Historic Parks and Gardens • Number of assets on the 'at risk' register (decrease) • Proportion of Conservation Areas with up-to-date appraisals and management plans (increase) • Number of locally-listed assets (increase) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option conserve and enhance heritage and historical features in towns and in the countryside, including historic buildings of historic or architectural interest? • Would the option avoid damage or degradation to designated buildings and areas (Conservation Area, Historic Parks and Gardens, Listed Buildings)? • Would the option safeguard sites and monuments of archaeological importance? • Would the option protect and enhance the settings of valued heritage and historical features? • Would the option improve access to, and broaden understanding of, local heritage, historic sites, areas and buildings? 	2
Water and Flooding	<p>4. To maintain and enhance the quality and quantity of the District's water sources, achieve sustainable water resources management and reduce the risk of flooding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option be consistent with the objectives of the EU Water Framework Directive? • Would the option encourage the reduction of water consumption? (e.g. promote sustainable design and construction measures that reduce water consumption and result in decreased run-off of polluted water (including during construction phase))? • Would the option protect 	7, 8

SA/SEA Theme	SA Objective Potential indicators, with targets where appropriate (set out in brackets)	Appraisal criteria	Issue
	<p>chemical water quality (improve)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water use and availability (decrease and increase respectively) • Water conservation (increase) • Dwellings reaching a standard of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3/4 for water efficiency (increase) • Dwellings at risk of flooding, including fluvial and groundwater flooding (decrease) • Amount of new development in areas at risk of flooding (Flood Zones 2 and 3) (not increase) • Number of developments incorporating SUDS (increase) 	<p>groundwater resources and minimise abstractions?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option contribute towards improving the chemical and ecological status of rivers (including improving the quality of the physical habitat of the river and its riparian corridor)? • Would the option ensure the provision of adequate water infrastructure to ensure the sustainable supply of water? • Would the option provide infrastructure for the sustainable disposal of sewerage? • Would the option minimise the risk of flooding to people and property? • Would the option reduce the risk to those areas susceptible to flooding? • Would the option avoid development in locations at risk from flooding and mitigate any residual flood risk – including from both fluvial and groundwater flooding - through appropriate measures including through design? • Would the option incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS)? • Would the option incorporate flood proofing measures where appropriate, to alleviate the risk of groundwater flooding (e.g. surface water and sewerage flooding)? 	
Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	5. To reduce contributions to climate change, through (a) sustainable building practices, (b) maximising the potential for renewable energy and energy conservation and (c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option encourage sustainable, low carbon building practices and design? • Would the option maximise opportunities for recycling and minimising waste? • Would the option help to promote the sustainable management of waste? • Would the option assist the adaptation to climate change and 	3

SA/SEA Theme	SA Objective Potential indicators, with targets where appropriate (set out in brackets)	Appraisal criteria	Issue
	<p>promoting sustainable management of waste</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installed renewable energy generation (achieve in line with adopted policy in Policy DM17 of the DSA Plan) • Household waste recycling (increase) • Construction, demolition and municipal waste going to landfill (decrease) 	<p>reduce vulnerability to the impacts of climate change?</p>	
Best use of land, including soil	<p>6. To improve efficiency in land use through the re-use of previously development land and existing buildings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of development on previously developed land (not decrease and ideally increase) • Area of best and most versatile land lost to development (zero) • Areas of contaminated land (decrease) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option make the best use of land through the re-use of existing buildings or development on previously developed land? • Would the option contribute towards minimising development on best and most versatile agricultural land? • Would the option involve the remediation or decontamination of land? • Would the option avoid development on contaminated land where remediation is not possible? 	11
Transport	<p>7. To deliver transport improvements, improve travel choice and connectivity, reduce</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option promote good access to sustainable transport, walking and cycling (including distance to nearest bus stop and frequency of service, access to 	3, 10, 4

SA/SEA Theme	SA Objective Potential indicators, with targets where appropriate (set out in brackets)	Appraisal criteria	Issue
	<p>the need for travel by car and reduce the negative impact of transport on the environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility of developments (increase) • Levels of traffic congestion (minimise) • Use of non-car travel modes (increase) • Availability of public transport, particularly in rural areas (improve) • Carbon and other harmful emissions from transport (reduce) • Connectivity between centres (improve) 	<p>cycle routes, safety of pedestrian access)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option result in increased levels of traffic congestion? • Would the option encourage modal shift to more sustainable forms of travel? • Would the option reduce car dependency by providing services and facilities accessible by sustainable modes of transport, particularly in rural areas? • Would the option provide transport infrastructure that would contribute and align with strategic schemes as included in local transport policies or strategies (e.g. the Southern Quadrant Transport Strategy)? • Would the option improve connectivity and access between key centres? • Would local transport networks be resilient and adaptable to shocks and impacts? • Would the option reduce carbon and other harmful emissions and waste associated with transport? • Would the option provide an opportunity to address an existing accident hotspot (i.e. improve site-specific road safety)? 	
SOCIAL OBJECTIVES			
Population - Housing	<p>8. To ensure that existing and future residents have the opportunity to live in a decent home</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing allocations and commitments (meet or exceed the identified housing target) • Housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option contribute towards meeting the overall housing requirements of the District? • Would the option contribute towards the provision of affordable housing in the long-term to meet identified needs? • Would the option contribute towards the provision of appropriate type and mix of homes (including in relation to sizes and tenures), that suit local requirements? • Would the option contribute to the provision of specialist forms of 	12, 13, 14, 15

SA/SEA Theme	SA Objective Potential indicators, with targets where appropriate (set out in brackets)	Appraisal criteria	Issue
	<p>affordability – average income as a proportion of average house price (improve)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting housing need, including for specialist accommodation (meet the range of need identified) 	<p>housing, such as for elderly people, people with disabilities, ethnic minorities, housing for vulnerable people (e.g. homeless people, young people at risk, people affected by domestic violence, people at risk of offending, people at risk of drug and/or alcohol misuse) and Gypsies and travellers, in the long-term, to meet identified needs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option contribute towards the provision of homes which are safe for people to live in and not affected by potential noise problems? 	
Accessibility to services and facilities	<p>9. To improve accessibility for everyone to health, education, recreational, cultural and community facilities and services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percentage of residents within 500m of key services, including post office, food shop, primary school, child care and healthcare services (increase) Provision of cultural facilities (improve) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option be adequately served by existing services and facilities? Would the option improve the level of accessibility for residents to key services and facilities (eg GP surgeries, primary schools, key employment, shopping and community facilities)? Would it directly provide such facilities? Would the option promote high quality and well used public space, community and cultural facilities? 	17, 19
Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	<p>10. To create and sustain vibrant and sustainable communities and to ensure that new development is of a high quality design and reinforces local</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would the option maximise the benefits and minimise the disbenefits of development on new and existing communities, including through enhancing community identity, creating new communities, and encouraging integration with existing communities? Would the option direct new development towards those 	16, 20

SA/SEA Theme	SA Objective Potential indicators, with targets where appropriate (set out in brackets)	Appraisal criteria	Issue
	<p>distinctiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from Council surveys and Quality Counts tours (improve) • Quality of design • Location of development relative to communities • Proportion of people who live in the worst Super Outputs Areas in relation to barriers to housing and services, crime and living environment and health and disability (decrease) 	<p>settlements best able to accommodate it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option avoid coalescence and promote development close to existing communities? • Would the option promote high quality design and enhance the built environment? • Would the option enable the integration of new development into its surroundings by reinforcing existing connections and creating new ones, while also respecting existing buildings and land uses? • Would the option take advantage of existing topography, landscape features (including water courses), wildlife habitats, existing buildings, site orientation and microclimates? • Would the option help create places which are locally inspired or otherwise distinctive in character? • Would the option provide sufficient and well-integrated parking facilities? • Would the option reduce inequalities and encourage social cohesion? • Would the option reduce deprivation in the most deprived areas of the District? • Would the option discourage anti-social behaviour and reduce crime and the fear of crime? • Would option reduce crime and the fear of crime, including through 'designing out crime'? 	
Health	<p>11. To maintain and improve the health, well-being and community cohesion of the population and reduce social deprivation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to healthcare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option promote healthy lifestyles by increasing the number of people who are physically active (e.g. number of those walking and cycling)? • Would the option promote healthy and active lifestyles through the protection and provision of sporting, leisure, recreational and community facilities (including ensuring at least 	4, 5, 6

SA/SEA Theme	SA Objective Potential indicators, with targets where appropriate (set out in brackets)	Appraisal criteria	Issue
	services (improve) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Levels of air pollution (reduce) • Levels of walking and cycling (increase) • Access to sporting, recreational and leisure facilities (improve) • Access to green infrastructure (improve) • Levels of noise pollution within acceptable limits 	no net detriment to the quality and extent to the public right of way network and informal recreational spaces and routes)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option help reduce deficiencies of open space? Would it enhance access to, local multifunctional open space, green space and green infrastructure? • Would the option reduce the negative impacts of, and enable improvements to, air quality (especially in existing air quality management areas, where EU Limit values have been exceeded, and in areas exposed to high emissions from main roads)? • Would the option improve levels of accessibility to healthcare services? • Would the option provide an acceptable noise climate? 	
ECONOMIC OBJECTIVES			
A strong and sustainable economy	12. To promote a strong, balanced and sustainable economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic activity and employment (increase) • Earnings (increase) • Amount of employment floorspace lost to development • Percentage of empty shop units in designated Town and District Centres (reduce) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option promote economic growth and competitiveness? • Would the option provide for employment uses? • Would the option result in the loss of employment land that has a potential continued economic role? • Would the option ensure that there are opportunities for employers to access facilities and services that are appropriate to their needs (including different types and sizes of accommodation, flexible employment space, high quality communications and infrastructure)? • Would the option promote a dynamic, diverse retail sector, protecting the District's town centres, and promoting their vitality and viability? 	25
Levels of	13. To maintain high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option provide for employment uses (including a range 	21,

SA/SEA Theme	SA Objective Potential indicators, with targets where appropriate (set out in brackets)	Appraisal criteria	Issue
employment	<p>and stable levels of employment so that everyone can benefit from economic growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of jobs in the District (increase) • Number of District residents unemployed (decrease) • Number of long-term unemployed (decrease) • Pockets of higher unemployment (decrease) 	<p>of employment uses in terms of size, nature and quality)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option promote employment in areas where unemployment is high? 	23
Education, skills and training	<p>14. To raise educational attainment and develop and maintain a skilled workforce to support long-term competitiveness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of education and training facilities (increase) • Percentage of population with no qualifications at NVQ Level 2 equivalent or above (decrease) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option promote good access to educational and training opportunities for all sectors of the population, particularly amongst deprived communities? • Would the option provide for or result in the loss of training/education facilities? • Would the option encourage and maintain an available and skilled workforce which meets the needs of existing and future employers, reduces skills inequalities, improves opportunities and facilities for all types of learning, and helps address skills shortages? 	23
Business and economic development	<p>15. To retain existing businesses while having a sector focus to develop new business in the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity of economic sectors (not decrease) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option enable the growth and retention of existing businesses? • Would the option help foster new businesses to form? • Would the option maintain and support the District's diverse economy whilst supporting its resilience? 	26, 27, 22

SA/SEA Theme	SA Objective Potential indicators, with targets where appropriate (set out in brackets)	Appraisal criteria	Issue
	<p>and ideally increase)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of new VAT-registered businesses set up in the District (not decrease and ideally increase) • Level of inward investment (increase) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would the option encourage inward investment? • Would the option help develop new businesses to the area from the target sectors (Life Sciences/Biopharma/Medical devices, Software/IT Security/Telecom Equipment, Advanced engineering, food and drink? • Would the option help develop a dynamic, diverse and knowledge-based economy that excels in innovation with higher value, lower impact activities? • Would the option enhance the rural economy, and help economies thrive in market towns and villages? • Would the option help promote sustainable tourism? 	

4. List of strategic issues and options for sustainability appraisal

Set out below are the strategic options including key strategic site options that are the subject of this assessment at this stage in the process. The options are the more strategic options drawn from the Wycombe District Local Plan Options Consultation document (January 2014). Not all the site options have been tested at this stage but will be at a later stage in the process, alongside other site options that may emerge in the process. As a result of the outcome of the consultation and further technical work, other strategic options may emerge and these will be included in a later stage of the SA process also.

Strategic Issue 1: How Many Homes?

- A: 9,600 total homes (480 d.p.a)
- B: 10,900 total homes (545 d.p.a.)
- C: 12,200 total homes (610 d.p.a.)
- D: 14,300 total homes (715 d.p.a.)
- E Affordable Housing Led Scenario - 26,000 total homes (1,300 d.p.a.)
- F: Employment forecast-led housing scenario (***not a reasonable alternative***)
- G: Zero Migration(***not a reasonable alternative***)

Strategic Issue 2: How Many Jobs?

- A: 7,000 job growth – Limited job growth
- B: 13,500 job growth – Balanced Growth
- C: 26,500 job growth - Economic Forecast Scenario

Strategic Issue 3: Where Should The New Housing Go?

- A: Enhanced Development within Urban Area and Main Villages
- B: Rural Brownfield Sites
- C: Reserve Sites
- D: Major Expansion of Princes Risborough (appraised under Strategic Issue 3a)
- E: Limited Expansion of the Main Villages in the AONB and beyond - north and west of the District
- F: Green Belt Review – focused on the south east of the District
- G: Major Expansion at other key locations on the Transport Network
- H: New Settlement

Strategic Issue 3a: Major Expansion of Princes Risborough

- Di: A very major westward expansion (approximately 2,000 – 2,500 homes)

- Dii: Significant westward expansion (approximately 800-1,000 homes)
- Diii: More limited westward expansion (Park Mill Farm) (approximately 450 homes)

Strategic Issue 3b: Major Expansion at other key locations on the Transport Network

- Gi: Major expansion at Kimble
- Gii: Major expansion at Saunderton
- Giii: Major expansion at Stokenchurch

Strategic Issue 4: Approaches to providing new land for business -Towns

- A: High Wycombe
- B: Marlow/Bourne End
- C: North of High Wycombe/Princes Risborough

Strategic Issue 5: Approaches to accommodating retail & leisure development

- A: Town Centre Approach – focusing on existing and new town centres
- B: Alternative approach - focus outside town centres

Strategic Issue 6: Gypsies & travellers -Setting a pitch target

- A: Set a target based on the GTAA
- B: Set a higher target than the GTAA
- C: Set a lower target than the GTAA (*not a reasonable alternative*)
- D: Set no target for pitch provision (*not a reasonable alternative*)

Sites: High Wycombe

- HW1: Abbey Barn North
 - A: Housing on limited site area
 - B: Housing and business (*not a reasonable alternative*)
 - C: Housing (and potentially business) on larger site area than Option A (*not a reasonable alternative*)
- HW2: Abbey Barn South
 - A: Housing and business (option 1)
 - B: Housing and business (option 2)
 - C: Housing only
 - D: Development on area larger than in Options A, B and C above (*not a reasonable alternative*)
- CW1: North of Heath End Road (NB part within Chepping Wye Valley)

- A: Business with possible limited housing
- HW3: Gomm Valley
 - A: Housing and business on area avoiding areas of sensitive and very sensitive landscape
 - B: Housing and business on area avoiding areas of very sensitive landscape
 - C: Housing only on area avoiding areas of very sensitive landscape
 - D: Development on area larger than in Options A, B and C above (***not a reasonable alternative***)
- HW4: Terriers Farm
 - A: Housing and park and ride
 - B: Housing only
 - C: Housing and business (***not a reasonable alternative***)
 - D: Development options encompassing a larger site area than Options A-C (***not a reasonable alternative***)
- HW5: Wycombe Air Park (NB part falls within South West Chilterns)
 - A: Enlargement of business

Sites: Chepping Wye Valley

- CW2: Ashwells
 - A: Housing

- B: Housing and business (***not a reasonable alternative***)
- C: Development on area larger than in Options A and B above (***not a reasonable alternative***)
- CW3: Slate Meadow
 - A: Housing
 - B: Housing and business (***not a reasonable alternative***)
 - C: Development on area larger than in Options A and B above (***not a reasonable alternative***)

Sites: Marlow

- CW4: Westhorpe (east of Bypass)
 - A: Business

Sites: Princes Risborough

- PR2: Park Mill Farm
- PR3i: North of Longwick Road
 - Housing
 - Housing and business (***not a reasonable alternative***)
- PR3ii: Mill Lane
 - Housing
 - Housing and business (***not a reasonable alternative***)

5. Appraisal Findings

Strategic Issue 1: How Many Homes to Build During 2011-31

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Code	Option	Description of nature and characteristics of option. Where appropriate, including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	9,600 total homes (480 d.p.a)	This option is based on migration trends during the period 2001-6. It would deliver a level of housing below the natural growth rate of the district. This housing target would represent an increase of 78.5 dwellings per annum (dpa) over the existing Core Strategy housing target. Under this target, the Reserve Locations and significant amounts of other greenfield land would need to be used for development.
B	10,900 total homes (545 d.p.a.)	This option is based on migration trends during the period 2001-11. It broadly matches natural housing growth without in or out migration. This housing target would represent an increase of 142.5dpa over the existing Core Strategy target. Under this option, the Reserve Locations and very significant amounts of other greenfield land would need to be used for development.
C	12,200 total homes (610 d.p.a.)	This option is based on migration trends during the period 2006-11 when migration levels were at their highest. This housing target would represent an increase of 207.5 dpa over the existing Core Strategy target. Under this option the Reserve Locations and very significant amounts of other greenfield land would need to be used for development.
D	14,300 total homes (715 d.p.a.)	This option is also based on migration rates during the period 2006-11 but uses older (but higher) household formation rates (from 2008). This option would deliver the same increase in labour supply as Option C as it is based on the same population increase. This housing target would represent an increase of 312.5 dpa

		over the existing Core Strategy target. Under this option, the Reserve Locations and very significant amounts of other greenfield land would need to be used for development.
E	26,000 total homes (1,300 d.p.a.)	This option is based on providing full affordable housing provision. It would mean that the full affordable housing requirement would be met via an average of 30% provision from residential developments without compromising viability, recognising that some smaller housing schemes may not provide affordable housing at all. Applying a 30% level of provision may be a cautious approach as emerging viability evidence suggests that greenfield sites may well be capable of delivering 40%, and as such this scenario tests an upper end and may need to be refined. This housing target would represent over three times the annual housing target in the existing Core Strategy. Under this option, the Reserve Locations and extremely significant amounts of other greenfield land would need to be used for development. This option would be consistent with the instruction in the NPPF that local authorities should meet their objectively-assessed need for market and affordable housing in full.
F	Employment forecast-led housing scenario	This option would meet housing need associated with the higher job growth (26,500 jobs growth 2011-31) based on a positive view of future economic growth. No detailed modelling of the housing level implied by this level of job growth has been undertaken but it would result in housing levels well in excess of those set out in the High Trend (Scenario D) and is likely to be between 2 and 3 times the the existing annual housing target in the Core Strategy. Under this option, the Reserve Locations and extremely significant amounts of other greenfield land would need to be used for development. However advice from the Economy Study and Employment Land Review indicates that the economic forecast on which this scenario is based is not a realistic scenario in terms of what the commercial development market is likely to deliver and hence this option has not been assessed further.
G	Housing target based on no migration (530pa)	Not factoring in migration is not realistic, and is not consistent with the NPPF. For these reasons this option has not been assessed further.

Outcome of Full Appraisal

Strategic Issue 1: How many homes to build during 2011-31?						OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Option D	Option E	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	-/--	--	--	--	-	<p>Whilst it is the distribution strategy that will determine the precise impact upon biodiversity, growth on the scale envisaged by all the options would entail significant amounts of development, including greenfield development. Therefore, all options are likely to place pressures on sites and habitats, both designated and undesignated, of nature conservation or geodiversity value. Option A, which envisages the lowest quantum of development, is likely to have the least negative effect. DSA policies DM13 and DM14 offer significant scope for mitigation and enhancement, but this would still be more difficult to achieve the higher the growth option chosen. The significantly enhanced scale of Option E is likely to result in greatest biodiversity impacts.</p>
2. Landscape and Countryside	-/--	--	--	--	--	<p>Whilst the distribution strategy will determine the precise impact on landscape and countryside, growth on the scale envisaged by all the options would result in the loss of significant amounts of greenfield land. This could include the loss of land in areas with local landscape designations, and in areas designated as Green Belt. It is possible that it could also include areas within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), although government policy applies strict tests regarding major development in the AONB. Option A, which envisages the lowest quantum of development, is likely to have the least negative effect. The significantly enhanced scale of Option E is likely to result in greatest</p>

						biodiversity impacts.
3. Heritage and Townscape	-/--	-/--	-/--	-/--	-/--	Whilst the distribution strategy will determine the precise impact on heritage and townscape, it is likely that growth on this scale could result in some impact on designated sites and historical features, or their settings, although designations would minimise this impact.
4. Water and Flooding	-/--	--	--	--	--	In terms of flooding, the National Planning Policy Framework requires development to be located away from areas at highest risk of flooding. Where new development is proposed, it requires that this does not increase flood risk. Therefore, there should be no negative effects of the options on flooding issues. Nevertheless, an option which entails a lower rate of growth is likely to make it easier to avoid locating development on areas of high flood risk. Avoidance of areas of higher flood risk could place greater pressure on other environmentally sensitive areas, particularly for the higher growth options. In terms of water resources, all the options would entail significant population growth and could therefore bring increased pressure on water resources. Growth could also affect water quality by increasing run-off and sewage that would need treatment. Thames Water has already raised the issue of water and waste water infrastructure and this will be a key issue for the Local Plan to address. Options B, C, D and E, in proposing greater quantum of growth, are likely to have the most significant negative effects. Advice we are receiving is that water use should be capable of being mitigated.
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	?	?	?	?	?	Whilst more development is likely to lead to increased demand for energy usage and waste management, higher growth may offer more opportunities for sustainable design and construction techniques in new developments (as implemented by DSA Plan Policy DM18). In this way, higher

						growth options could have the effect of reducing carbon emissions per capita through energy efficiency improvements. Ultimately these effects are likely to balance each other out for each option if a scalable mitigation strategy were carried out relative to the scale of development.
6. Best use of land, including soil	-	--	--	--	--	Whilst the distribution strategy will determine the precise use of land, growth on the scale envisaged by all the options would result in full useage of previously developed land opportunities. However, all options would also entail the loss of significant amounts of greenfield land, with the proportion increasing through from Option A to Option E, some of which could be best and most versatile agricultural land. Option A, which envisages the lowest quantum of development, is likely to have the least negative effect assuming that an approach which directed as much development as is sustainable onto previously developed land.
7. Transport	-	--	--	--	--	The distribution strategy and the strategy towards balancing housing and employment growth would determine the precise nature of the effects. However, growth on the scale envisaged in all the options would lead to increased levels of traffic, with potential impacts on levels of traffic congestion and increases in carbon emissions. The higher the growth option, the more likely that development would need to be located in areas more remote from existing urban centres and where growth would result in an increased burden on existing transport infrastructure. However, there could be scope for mitigating these effects through improvements in public transport facilities and walking/cycling facilities to encourage modal shift (improvements which could be implemented through DSA Policy DM2), and highway mitigation measures. The higher the growth quantum, the

						<p>more likely that large-scale schemes capable of delivering such improvements would come forward, although whether such improvements are possible or capable of delivering improvements in accessibility will be dependent on the location of the proposed schemes and the location of new services.</p> <p>Overall effects are therefore difficult to quantify. However, it is likely that Option A, which envisages the lowest quantum of development and therefore more likely to focus growth near to existing public transport facilities, is likely to have the least negative effect, whereas there may be a higher possibility of an effective mitigation strategy and implementation of improved infrastructure justified from larger scale development. If new transport infrastructure were to be introduced in a piecemeal way then that may not secure the overall larger scalepieces of infrastructure needed for the long term.</p>
<p>Environmental objectives summary</p>	<p>The higher the level of growth the greater the potential negative environmental impacts. However there is scope for mitigation and/or enhancement of some of these potential negative impacts through the spatial distribution strategy and detailed design of schemes, particularly in relation to Water & Flooding; Energy efficiency, climate change and waste and transport. Some environmental impacts may be more difficult to mitigate. The scale of growth associated with Option E would have potentially much greater environmental impacts.</p>					
<p>8. Population – Housing</p>	-	+	++	++	++	<p>Option A would deliver a level of housing below projections based on most recent trends and below the natural growth rate (ie no migration scenario) of the district. It is unlikely to meet the expected demand for housing in the plan period, and would risk exacerbating affordability problems in the district. Options B, C and D would all contribute towards ensuring that existing and future residents have the opportunity to live in a decent home through meeting the</p>

						<p>housing requirements of the district and contributing towards affordable housing and specialist forms of housing. Options C and D would have the most significant positive effects . None of Options A-D meet the need for affordable housing in full, which Option E does. Option E risks potential oversupply of market housing to deliver the affordable housing, and there are uncertainties about the longer term need for affordable housing due to the nature of forecasting models and the potential impact on changing levels of market housing provision.</p>
9. Accessibility	0/?	0/?	0/?	0/?	0/?	<p>It is difficult to quantify the exact nature of the options in terms of their effects on accessibility. The distribution, location and design of growth and individual developments would determine the accessibility to existing services and facilities as well as the level of high quality and well used public space.</p> <p>In terms of the provision of services and facilities, greater growth and development quanta could lead to greater opportunities for the direct provision of new services and facilities, as well as the generation of greater Community Infrastructure Levy receipts which could then be used to provide or assist in the improvement of such services. Therefore this could improve general accessibility to such services and have potentially positive effects. However greater scales of growth could lead to location of development in more remote/peripheral locations and less accessible locations relative to existing services and facilities.</p>

10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?	-/?	-/?	-/?	-/?	Overall effects are likely to be dependent on the location, site and design strategy. Higher growth quanta are likely to have significant negative effects on community cohesion and identity, with the potential for community coalescence and the need for development in more peripheral locations from existing communities. However the higher the growth quanta, the greater contribution to addressing affordability problems and thereby helping reduce social deprivation.
11. Health	0	0/?	0/?	0/?	0/?	A higher overall growth quantum could lead to greater opportunities for securing more or improved health and leisure services as well as open space provision, although this would primarily be to mitigate the impact of development. Higher growth levels could also lead to a greater access to local green infrastructure, depending on the design and policy framework for developments, particularly if peripheral greenfield sites deliver strategic levels of open space. However such development would also potentially make access to the wider countryside more difficult for existing residents, and may not assist with addressing deficiencies (eg open space) other than in the local area. Impacts on air quality and noise would be dependent on the locational/site strategy. [Links with transport objectives mean air quality could be affected by new infrastructure located in development] Overall, there may be scope for positive effects under Options B- E,
Social Objectives Summary	The higher growth options offer the greater opportunities to meet housing need. Impacts upon the other social sustainability objectives are difficult to assess accurately, but it is likely that the greater the growth quanta, the better the opportunity to secure the provision of new and improved services and facilities, but the greater growth options also have the greatest potential for negative impacts. The effects would depend largely on the approach of implementing the options and the ability to secure benefits.					

12. A strong and sustainable economy	0	+	+	+/?	+/?	<p>Delivering housing below the natural growth rate and most recent migration trends of the district (Option A) would not contribute to economic growth; the higher growth rates envisaged in Options B-E would be more likely to contribute to economic growth by providing a spur to the construction industry and more opportunities for a higher population to support the District's town centres and ensuring a dynamic retail sector.</p> <p>Higher growth options would be more likely to enable employment uses to be delivered alongside housing sites. Option E, which entails the highest development quanta, is likely to bring the most positive effects, although this may not be matched by job growth resulting in other disbenefits (eg outcommuting and its potential impact on the local economy in transport terms).</p>
13. Levels of employment	0	+	+	+	+	<p>The scale of growth envisaged under all options would have a direct short-term effect on employment opportunities in the construction industry, but the longer term direct job creation impacts are more limited. Beyond this, the larger the growth quanta, the more likely there is to be opportunities to secure employment uses in housing development sites.</p>
14. Education, skills and training	-	+	+?	+?	?	<p>Higher growth quanta are likely to offer more opportunities to secure the provision of new and/or improved education and training facilities.</p> <p>Option A could have negative effects by leading to a decreased workforce and therefore increasing the need for in-commuting. Option B would potentially broadly match job growth based on a more realistic balanced job scenario (see Issue 2 below) Options C, D and particularly E would potentially provide for an increase in the workforce in excess of job growth, although there are particular uncertainties in forecasting job growth. This would result in potential</p>

						outcommuting problems although would provide a wider pool of labour for local employers to choose from.
15. Business and economic development	0	+	+	+	+	Higher growth quanta would be likely to help the rural economy, and help economies thrive in market towns and villages.
Economic Objectives Summary	The higher growth options show greater positive effects in economic terms by helping to maximise employment opportunities and assisting with the provision of an available and skilled workforce.					

Strategic Issue 2: How Many Jobs

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	7,000 job growth – Limited job growth	This option is limited to a growth in employment land limited to growth proportionate to known housing supply using the increase in housing to broadly estimate growth in labour supply and extrapolating the need for employment floorspace. Under this option, lower amounts of greenfield land would need to be used for business development as the onus would be on making better use of existing sites. However, there is no certainty that this would happen if the market is not interested in such locations, and not providing enough land for business would therefore risk continuing the decline in jobs in the district and increasing commuting.
B	13,500 job growth – Balanced Growth	This scenario matches job growth with the housing (and resulting labour supply) growth, using the demographic-led Housing Scenario B. Under this option, some greenfield land would need to be used for business development.
C	26,500 job growth - Economic Forecast Scenario	This option is based on an Experian economic forecast of the District positive view of future economic growth It assumes there are no constraints to delivering this option including no market constraints. Under this option, significant amounts of greenfield land would need to be used for land for business development.

Outcome of Full Appraisal

Strategic Issue 2: How Many Jobs?				OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	0/?	-/?	--/?	<p>Whilst the distribution and locational strategy will determine the precise impact upon biodiversity, Options A, B & C would all entail the development of greenfield land and would therefore be likely to place pressures on sites and habitats, both designated and undesignated, of nature conservation or geodiversity value. Option C would entail significant development on greenfield land and would therefore be likely to have the most significant negative effects. Conversely, Option A would entail the more intensive use of existing sites rather than extensive development of greenfield sites, and would therefore not be likely to have as severe negative effects on biodiversity and geodiversity interests. DSA policies DM13 and DM14 offer scope for mitigation and enhancement, but this would still be more difficult to achieve the higher the growth option chosen. There would be opportunities for mitigation from any business development so on any scale of growth there is the potential for an improvement in biodiversity both locally to new development.</p>
2. Landscape and Countryside	?/-	?/--	?/--	<p>Whilst the distribution and locational strategy will determine the precise impact on landscape and countryside, Options A, B and C would all entail the loss of greenfield land. In the case of Option C, significant amounts of greenfield land could be lost and therefore it is more likely to have significant negative effects on areas of designated importance. As Option A entails the more intensive use of existing sites rather than the development of greenfield sites, it would therefore not be likely to have the negative effects associated with the other three options. Under any option, mitigation would be achievable through design, but this would be more difficult the higher growth option chosen.</p>

3. Heritage and Townscape	0	-	-	<p>Whilst the distribution and locational strategy will determine the precise impact on heritage and townscape, it is likely that the level of development envisaged by Options A, B and C could result in some impact on designated sites and historical features, or their settings, although designations would minimise this impact. . As Option A entails the more intensive use of existing sites rather than the development of greenfield sites, it would therefore not be likely to have the degree of negative effects associated with the other options.</p>
4. Water and Flooding	0	-	-	<p>In terms of flooding, the National Planning Policy Framework requires development to be located away from areas at highest risk of flooding. Where new development is proposed, it requires that this does not increase flood risk. Therefore, there should be no negative effects of the options on flooding issues. Nevertheless, an option which entails a lower rate of growth is likely to make it easier to avoid locating development on areas of high flood risk. Avoidance of flood risk areas may put pressure on other environmentally sensitive areas, particularly with the higher growth options. In terms of water and waste water resources, it is difficult to determine the precise impacts as effects could vary depending on the type of employment use envisaged. However, in general the options which entail new development on greenfield land could bring increased pressure on water resources. Growth could also affect water quality by increasing run-off and sewage that would need treatment. Thames Water has already raised the issue of water and waste water infrastructure and this will be a key issue for the Local Plan to address.</p>
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	0	0	--	<p>Whilst more development is likely to lead to increased demand for energy usage and waste management, higher growth may offer more opportunities for sustainable design and construction techniques in new developments (as implemented by DSA Plan Policy DM18). In this way, higher growth options could have the</p>

				effect of reducing carbon emissions per capita through energy efficiency improvements. Ultimately these effects are likely to balance each other out for Option B. However, particularly excessive levels of growth as proposed in option C could promote excessive energy use disproportionate to the capacity of the district, and is therefore likely to have significant negative impacts.
6. Best use of land, including soil	+	-	--	Whilst the distribution and locational strategy will determine the precise impact on landscape and countryside, Options A, B and C would all entail the loss of greenfield land, some of which could potentially be best and most versatile agricultural land. Option C, which entails a much higher growth level, would have the most significant negative effects.
7. Transport	-	--	--	The distribution strategy and the strategy towards balancing housing and employment growth would determine the precise nature of the effects. However, business development growth on the scale envisaged in all the options would lead to increased levels of traffic, with potential impacts on levels of traffic congestion and increases in carbon emissions. Option A, being focused on intensifying existing sites, would have the least negative impacts. Options B and C could have significant negative impacts with Option C in particular being very likely to result in significant increases in the burden on existing transport infrastructure. There could be scope for mitigating these effects with respect to Option B and C through improvements in public transport facilities and walking/cycling facilities to encourage modal shift (improvements which could be implemented through DSA Policy DM2), and through potential highway improvements, although whether such improvements are possible or capable of delivering improvements in accessibility will be dependent on the location of the proposed schemes. The level of job growth in Option C would potentially increase in-commuting to the district with increased traffic impacts. The impacts of increased business growth would be mitigated not

				only by implementation of upgraded transport infrastructure as part of wider development, but new development would not be viable in an area where existing accessibility is poor and the market would seek to ensure that new business development did not exacerbate any existing transport issues and work towards improving connectivity.
Environmental objectives summary				<p>The larger the scale of employment growth the larger the potential negative environmental impacts. The environmental impacts could be more or less significant dependant on the type of uses and depending on the spatial and locational strategy and the approach to balancing housing and employment growth.</p> <p>Option A is likely to have the smallest impact as much of this level of growth is likely to be able to be accommodated on previously assigned employment land therefore is deemed to be the preferable option in environmental terms.</p> <p>It could be argued that there are other potential benefits from higher employment growth overall, apart from the wider economic benefits there is more potential to introduce schemes which go beyond mitigation of the impacts of growth, but also improve on baseline indicators.</p>
8. Population – Housing	0/?	0/?	0/?	There would be no direct effect from the options on the provision of housing, and it would be the distribution strategy and the strategy towards balancing housing and employment growth which would determine the precise nature of the effects.
9. Accessibility	0	+	+	There wouldn't be a direct link between the level of employment growth planned and accessibility to key services and facilities, although the higher the growth option, the more likely that key employment facilities will be delivered. Location of business and employment facilities in suitable locations could improve accessibility to facilities and services.
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?	?	?	<p>The precise effects would be dependent on the locational and design strategy.</p> <p>However, the more employment growth delivered, the greater opportunity to reduce deprivation in the most deprived areas of the district. On the other hand, the higher the growth option, the greater potential for negative impacts on community identity and</p>

				coalescence of communities. Overall effects are likely to be dependent on the location, site and design strategy.
11. Health	?	?	?	There would be likely to be few direct impacts on this objective and impacts on air quality and noise would be dependent on the locational and site strategy.
Social Objectives Summary	There are many variables that could influence the relative social impacts of the various employment growth options. The balanced job growth (Option B) option is likely to offer the most appropriate social benefits, within the District.			
12. A strong and sustainable economy	-	++	++	The higher the level of employment growth, the greater the contribution of the option to creating an economy that is strong and sustainable. The high rates of job growth envisaged in Options B and C would therefore deliver significant positive benefits; Option A would be likely to have a negative impact through the creation of too few jobs. However in relation to Option C the questions about whether the market would actually deliver that level of job growth through new commercial development.
13. Levels of employment	0	+	++	Direct correlation between the amount of planned employment growth and levels of employment meaning the higher the employment growth the better the outcome. The low levels of job growth envisaged in Option A could result in significant negative impacts on the ability to maintain high levels of employment in the district.
14. Education, skills and training	0	+	+	The higher job growth rates envisaged in Options B and C are likely to bring improved access to educational and training opportunities in the district. The lower job growth rates envisaged in Option A are likely to make no contribution to the education and training opportunities in the district.
15. Business and economic development	0/-	++	++	The higher growth rates envisaged in Options B and C are likely to bring significant positive impacts on this objective. Option A is likely to have neutral or negative effects.

Economic Objectives Summary	The higher the level of jobs planned for in the plan the higher the economic benefits are likely to be. Provided that locations and associated delivery of infrastructure is appropriate then planning for higher levels of job growth would be expected to have a 'virtuous circle' effect of encouraging further job growth stimulating the local economy. Effects are likely to be long lasting and reach beyond the boundaries of the district.
------------------------------------	---

Strategic Issue 3: Options for Where New Housing Should Go

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Enhanced Development within Urban Area and Main Villages	This option would comprise of additional homes within towns and villages, using mainly employment land, intensifying residential areas, and using surplus green space. It has historically been a very significant source of housing land and whilst still significant there is less identified potential than in the past.
B	Rural Brownfield Sites	This option would comprise of the redevelopment of brownfield (previously-developed) sites in the countryside. It is likely to make only a small contribution towards meeting housing need due to the limited number of sites likely to become available.
C	Reserve Sites	The Reserve Locations are greenfield sites excluded from the Green Belt which are already reserved for future development in current plans and their status has been endorsed by planning inspectors in the past. There are five of these sites in the district: four on the edge of High Wycombe and one on the edge of Bourne End.
D	Major Expansion of Princes Risborough	This option would entail greenfield expansion on the western side of Princes Risborough, where the land is unconstrained by the Green Belt and the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There are three greenfield housing options which would have various scales of

		<p>impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) very major expansion of approximately 2,000-2,500 homes; (ii) significant westward expansion (approximately 800-1,000 homes); and (iii) more limited westward expansion of the Park Mill Farm site only (approximately 450 homes).
E	Limited Expansion of the Main Villages in the AONB and beyond - north and west of the District	This option would involve the limited greenfield expansion of the main villages in the north and west of the District, namely: Marlow Bottom, Lane End, Great Kingshill, Naphill/Walter's Ash, Stokenchurch and Longwick. It is likely to make only a limited contribution towards meeting housing needs.
F	Green Belt Review – focused on the south east of the District	The option would entail a Green Belt Review, focused on the south-east of the District, around High Wycombe, Hazlemere, Loudwater, Wooburn Green, Wooburn, Flackwell Heath, Bourne End, Little Marlow and Marlow. The option would not be focused outside these areas due to the national policy limitations on major development in the AONB, and the fact that the Council does not control the extent of the AONB. This option could entail potentially significant or very significant development on Green Belt land.
G	Major Expansion at other key locations on the Transport Network	This option would entail major greenfield expansion of villages at key locations on the transport network – namely at Kimble, Saunderton and/or Stokenchurch.
H	New Settlement	<p>This option would entail the building of a new settlement in the far north of the District, related to potential new road infrastructure associated with the High Speed Rail 2 project (HS2). It would be located in the vicinity of Terrick/Ellesborough.</p> <p>Potential locations for considering a new settlement are limited in the District due to the extent of the AONB and the limited amount of infrastructure in the area outside the AONB.</p>

Outcome of Full Appraisal

Strategic objective 3: Where should the new housing go?				OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	+	+	?/-	Although option A would be envisaged to have the least significant negative impact on biodiversity it also presents a more limited scope for development opportunities. Option B also offers only very few opportunities across the District. The impacts of option C could present significant negative impact depending on the current biodiversity present on the reserve sites. There is significant potential for mitigation and enhancement through the design and enhancement strategy.
2. Landscape and Countryside	+	+/-	-	Options A and B should present the least negative impact being on already developed land, though there could be some impact on views from poor design on rural brownfield development. Option C would both involve the loss of greenfield land, but have been chosen as sites to minimise the impact upon designated landscape elsewhere in the District, although there area number of landscape sensitivities at the reserve sites
3. Heritage and Townscape	?	+	+	The effect will be dependent on the design and locational strategy. Options B&C present less opportunities for negative impacts on townscapes by being directed outside of the existing urban fabric. There are potential risks to the conservation of the identity of Princes Risborough with large scale of growth, but these could potentially be mitigated through sensitive design and implementation.
4. Water and Flooding	0	-	?/-	All options are likely to increase water consumption and pressure on water infrastructure, as well as increasing the risk of flooding. Smaller scale developments will have a lesser impact, and negative impacts could be mitigated through sensitive design strategy and sustainable drainage solutions. Larger scale schemes would potentially be able to

				offer enhanced mitigation through SUDS. Implementation of upgraded water and waste water infrastructure may be required to mitigate the impacts of larger scale options.
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	+	-	?/-	All options have potential to reduce contributions to climate change through design and implementation strategy.
6. Best use of land, including soil	++	++	--	Option A&B offer the best use of land with the focus being on the use of previously devalued land. However these options can only provide a limited amount of the housing need for the district. Option C involves use of greenfield land and there are significant amounts of best and most versatile agricultural land included on some sites.
7. Transport	0/-	--	-	All options will likely have a negative impact on the transport system through growth in demand, but the scope to mitigate may be more limited in more remote rural areas, particularly in terms of achieving more sustainable modes of travel. Option A potentially enables best integration with the transport network, including existing public transport networks. Significant improvement/mitigation packages would be required for Option C.
Environmental objectives summary	Option A is likely to have the least negative environmental impact, but is becoming a more limited source of housing supply due to limited urban brownfield land available for redevelopment. Although options C will likely have the largest negative impact due to the potential scale for development there is potentially greater scope for this to be mitigated through the provision of appropriate infrastructure and the locational and design strategy.			
8. Population – Housing	+	0/+	+	Option B offers only limited opportunities to contribute to the housing requirements of the district due to limited rural brownfield land availability therefore would only contribute to this objective as part of a wider combination of delivery and location options. Options A and C offer better potential dependent on the scale of development in these locations, also as a part of a wider mix of delivery strategies.

9. Accessibility	++	0/-	+	The design and locational strategy for each would define the options for achieving the objective. There would be significant potential for option A being located in already built up areas assuming that services and facilities are already in place. Option B would have a likely negative or neutral effect being in rural areas without the appropriate demand to support services and facilities required. Option C though dependent on the design strategy in relation to existing facilities may be able to deliver growth on a scale suitable to support provision of new services and facilities, with larger scale site options more likely to deliver meaningful levels of new services and facilities.
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?	--	-/?	The contribution to creating sustainable communities would be reliant on the locational and design strategy. Option C could deliver the scale of growth required to help provide the necessary components of sustainable communities, but would be reliant on being able to integrate with existing communities. Local concerns regarding coalescence of communities is a factor under Option C. Option B would maybe contribute on a very small scale, but would be unlikely to contribute beyond the very local area to the delivery of new homes.
11. Health	?	0	?	The ability of all options to contribute to achieving health objectives would be highly dependent on the design and implementation strategy.
Social Objectives Summary	Options A and C offer the best outcome for increased growth. Option B is generally quite negative in social factors being that development will be relatively removed from most services and community facilities, but by the nature of this option it will only offer a relatively small quantum of the District wide housing need. Impacts upon the other social sustainability objectives cannot be accurately assessed in the absence of a locational or design strategy. Each option could see significant positive or negative effects depending on the approach of implementation of the options and the potential for mitigation of negative consequences.			
12. A strong and sustainable economy	0	-	0	With the potentially higher scales of growth from options A and C there is a degree of contribution to this objective from providing homes for potential employees and increased retail demand, assuming that the demand is met within the District this could potentially have positive impacts.

13. Levels of employment	?/+	0	?/+`	No direct long term impact on employment levels from any option as all are concerned with housing delivery. The larger the scale of growth the larger the short term impact on improving employment through the construction and development phases.
14. Education, skills and training	?	?	?	No direct impact on education and training from any option beyond the possibility of increased training in the construction industry through large scale housing growth.
15. Business and economic development	?	?	?	No direct impact on this objective from these options. Achieving this objective would be dependent on the wider design and implementation of the full range of polices beyond the housing location strategy.
Economic Objectives Summary	The options that offer the higher levels of development are likely to be considered to contribute to economic objectives more significantly. Much of the long term advantages from this would be dependent on the scale as well as the distributional and design strategy.			

Strategic objective 3: Where should the new housing go? (continued)					OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE
Sustainability Objective	Option E	Option F	Option G	Option H	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	-	?/--	--	?/--	All of these options are likely to have a negative impact upon the biodiversity and geodiversity as they all involve a degree of loss of green field land. Option E due to the small amount of development is likely to have the least effect, options F, G&H the largest with the largest amount of land taken. Effects could be mitigated through the locational and design strategy. Any negative impacts would depend on the pre-existing biodiversity and may be able to benefit biodiversity through a locational approach that avoids development on greenfield land of the most biodiversity value and directs it toward that of a lesser value.

2. Landscape and Countryside	--	--	--	--	<p>All options would be likely to have a significant adverse effect upon designated landscapes. Option E would be limited due to the smaller scale of development but involves locations mainly within the AONB and hence is very sensitive. Option G & H clearly having a very significant impact upon green space or other open space. Option G would also likely have a significant impact upon the character and quality of designated landscapes as all development would be within or close to the AONB and would constitute major development. The focus of Option F is outside of the AONB but there could be significant impacts of development adjoining the AONB, as well as more local landscape impacts.</p> <p>Effects may be capable of being mitigated to some extent through the locational and design strategy, but given the potential scale of development this is unlikely.</p>
3. Heritage and Townscape	-/?	0/?	-/?	0/?	<p>Effects on heritage and townscape for options E&G would be dependent on the design strategy, . There is also a significant risk of degradation to designated buildings and area.</p> <p>Options F & H are less likely to have any negative effect by being located away from main existing heritage townscapes, but there could still be localised impacts depending on locational and design approaches</p>
4. Water and Flooding	-	-	-	-	<p>All options are likely to increase water consumption and pressure on water infrastructure, as well as increasing the risk of flooding. Smaller scale developments will have a lesser impact, and negative impacts could be mitigated through sensitive design strategy and sustainable drainage solutions. Given the peripheral or remote locations of the options, significant improvements to water infrastructure are likely to be necessary for these various options. Option F is likely to be focused on the greatest areas of flood risk and avoidance of these areas could focus development pressure into other environmentally sensitive areas.</p>
5. Energy efficiency,	0	-	-	0	<p>The degree to which reduction to climate change can be achieved through these options would be dependent on the design and</p>

climate change and waste					<p>implementation strategy. Due to the small scale of development in option E negative effects would be minimised, as would benefits from a successful sustainable design strategy.</p> <p>Options F & G are likely to have more significant impacts due to the scale of development. Mitigation is possible through good design and implementation of polices to reduce contributions to climate change.</p> <p>Option H has the most potential to have significant long term impacts on energy efficiency, climate change and waste with the ability to learn from best practice and create a new sustainable community. However the potential could be significant positively or negatively dependant on a successful design strategy.</p>
6. Best use of land, including soil	-	--	--	--	<p>Option E would have the least negative impact due to the small scale of development, but would still involve development of greenfield sites.</p> <p>Options F, G & H could have quite significant negative impacts as they all involve extensive development of green field land to varying degrees, some of which could be best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>
7. Transport	0/-	-	-	-/?	<p>Option E would likely have a negative impact upon the local transport network, but this would be limited to a scale relative to the amount of potential development and associated increase in congestion through this option. There are limited opportunities to improve connectivity and sustainable transport from increased demand.</p> <p>Option F is likely to have a negative impact with increased demand on already congested road network. However the area of search for green belt review is located closer to public transport networks so there are opportunities to use increased demand to improve transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Option G key locations were chosen as they are on the transport network, however growth is likely to add to existing congestion. Whilst there may be scope for some increased use of more sustainable means in some locations, this would be limited in other locations.</p> <p>Option H is likely to result in negative impacts and the broad location</p>

					may not be able to make use of or maximise public transport use. However major scale development associated with this option would need to deliver major transport infrastructure improvements. The relationship between growth and transport could benefit from larger scale growth providing an appropriate level of transport infrastructure upgrade is provided.
Environmental objectives summary	All options would have a negative impact upon the environment, to varying degrees largely dependent on the scale and implementation of development. Option E would have the least significant impact by the nature of the small quantity of development that it can provide. Options F & H both have the most potential for negative effects and the most potential for mitigation through design on large scale development.				
8. Population – Housing	0	++	+	++	Option E would only offer small amounts of housing, so could only be considered as significantly contributing to meeting the overall requirement for the District as part of a wider strategy. Options F, G & H all have potential to make significant contributions dependant on the quantum of growth and design strategy.
9. Accessibility	0/+	-/?	--/?	--/?	All options would depend on locational and design strategy. Option E would offer potentially good access to local services, but being in smaller villages would likely still require significant amounts of travel to many services. This level of growth would be unlikely to be large enough to promote an increase in local services but may help to sustain existing local services. Option F involves peripheral development to existing settlements with accessibility dependent on size of settlement and the ability to improve facilities as part of a development. Options G and H involves locations that are poorly located for major services and facilities and hence would require new provision – depending on the precise scale of development there should be scope to improve provision.
10. Place-making – Creating	?	-/?	-/?	?	Options E would have potential to contribute to sustainable communities, but this would require cohesive integration with pre-existing communities, and has risks of inhibiting sustainable

Sustainable Communities					communities through poor design and fractured communities. The potential scale of growth associated with Option G could prove difficult to integrate satisfactorily with existing communities. For Option F success in this objective would be very reliant on good design and locational choices, but there is a risk of coalaescence of communities with this option. Option H has potential in setting out the prerequisites, but also significant challenges in establishing a new community from scratch – design and implementation is critical.
11. Health	?	?	?	?	The ability of all options to contribute to achieving health objectives would be highly dependent on the design and implementation strategy.
Social objectives summary	Meeting social objectives would be dependent on the design and locational strategy. All options offer significant potential for damaging impacts, notably in relation to accessibility and creating sustainable communities, but also mitigation and enhancement of positive outcomes.				
12. A strong and sustainable economy	0/?	0/?	0/?	-/?	Housing location options will not have significant direct impact upon this objective. A degree of contribution to the objective will be achieved from providing homes for potential employees and increased retail demand, assuming that the demand is met within the District this could potentially have positive impacts, but with the greatest benefits where development adjoins existing settlements
13. Levels of employment	0	?	?	0/?	These options are housing opttinos so their impact on employment levels, other than short term construction benefits, are likely to be limited. With option H, it is expected that a large scale new development would bring new employment opportunities, and also contribute to wider employment demands, although the location may not be attractive to the market. If a suboptimal quotient of employment opportunities is delivered then there is the risk of exacerbating employment pressures in the wider district and beyond.
14. Education, skills and training	?	?	?	?	No direct impact on education and training from any option beyond the possibility of increased training in the construction industry through large scale housing growth.
15. Business and economic	?	?	?	?	No direct impact on this objective from these options. Achieving this objective would be dependent on the wider design and implementation

development					of the full range of polices beyond the housing location strategy. Option F is likely to be closest linked to existing employment and business opportunities.
Economic objectives summary	The options that offer the higher levels of development are likely to be considered to contribute to economic objectives more significantly. Much of the long term advantages from this would be dependent on the scale as well as the distributional and design strategy.				

Strategic Issue 3a: Major Expansion at Princes Risborough

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
Option A	A very major westward expansion (approximately 2,000 – 2,500 homes)	Development here would involve extending beyond the current limits of the town onto land to the west of the town which is unconstrained by Green Belt or AONB designations. This option would entail very major expansion of approximately 2,000-2,500 homes.
Option B	Significant westward expansion (approximately 800-1,000 homes)	This option would entail a medium growth scenario which would add the sites north of Longwick Road and Mill Lane to Park Mill Farm. , bringing the total westward expansion to around 1,000 homes
Option C	More limited westward expansion (Park Mill Farm) (approximately 450 homes)	This option would consist of the development of Park Mill Farm only. Park Mill Farm is a flat site adjacent to the Princes Risborough to Aylesbury railway line, just to the west of the town, where the land is unconstrained by Green Belt or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designations.

Outcome of full appraisal (for more detailed assessment of the sites making up Options B and C, see the individual site assessments for Park Mill Farm, Longwick Road, and Mill Lane sites later in this report)

Strategic Issue 3a: Major Expansion at Princes Risborough				OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	--	--	?/0	All options will have impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity through green field development. The larger the development the likely the larger the impact. The indirect impact on SACs on the escarpment is still to be assessed. Opportunities for mitigation through design strategy.
2. Landscape and Countryside	-	-	?/-	All options will have an impact on the countryside being greenfield development on the periphery of Princes Risborough. This impact will be more significant the larger the development, but all proposed development locations are outside of protected landscapes, although there will be views from protected landscapes that are likely to be affected.
3. Heritage and Townscape	-	-	0	There is potential impact on Alscott conservation area which would need to be carefully considered and mitigated for Options A and B in particular. Broader impacts on the overall townscape of Princes Risborough and the town centre conservation area would have to be considered in detailed design and implementation.
4. Water and Flooding	?/--	?/--	?/-	There are significant pressures on the existing water infrastructure. Large scale development would have potentially significant impact upon water consumption. Potential to mitigate flood risk through Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems. Upgrades to sewage treatment facilities may well be necessary for the larger scale development options. There are relatively limited areas affected by Zone 3 flood risk, but these would have to be taken into account.
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	?/+	?/+	?/+	Impacts from construction should be mitigated through best practice of sustainable construction methods. The degree of contribution to climate change and waste production will be increased in line with the scale of development. Impacts should be reduced through maximising potential for renewable energy

				and sustainable management of waste.
6. Best use of land, including soil	--	--	--	All options include loss of significant amounts of greenfield land including some best and most versatile agricultural land.
7. Transport	?/--	?/--	?/--	<p>It is acknowledged that any major development in Princes Risborough would be dependent on an appropriate level of road infrastructure upgrade to cope with the extra demand.</p> <p>The greater the level of growth the greater the impact but also the greater potential for large scale enhanced transport connectivity. Option C in particular may not deliver significant transport improvements, including a new route, to ensure full mitigation of the impact.</p> <p>Access to public transport is generally poor on this side of the town, although some areas are within 800m of either the main railway station or the Monks Risborough station. Overall significant improvements to public transport accessibility would be necessary on the western side of the town.</p> <p>The area is separated from the rest of the town by the Aylesbury railway line and provision of grade separated crossings to improve accessibility to the town centre are essential under all 3 options.</p> <p>The lack of scope for significant new business development in the town means that housing options will increase out commuting putting additional pressure on the road network</p>
Environmental objectives summary	<p>Any level of growth at Princes Risborough is likely to have a significant negative environmental impact in line with any development on a similar scale, although designated landscapes are not infringed upon..</p> <p>Larger scale development does offer potential to minimise negative impacts through design and implementation, particularly with the possibility of planning for an appropriate level of infrastructure required for large scale growth, rather than incremental provision, but there are many uncertainties at this stage regarding the ability to deliver this.</p>			
8. Population – Housing	++	++	++	The larger the scale of housing the better for helping meet objective 8. There is a possibility that in option A that the full delivery of that degree of housing would take beyond the end of the plan period to 2031.
9. Accessibility	?/--	?/--	?/--	Dependent on design and locational strategy. Significant opportunities as well as significant threats are present at all scales for new development in the area.

				Integration with the existing community to ensure best access to services and facilities is very important, and providing the necessary additional grade separated links for pedestrians and cyclists over the Aylesbury railway line is very important. Larger scale of delivery does present more opportunity to ensure that there is provision for facilities and services within a reasonable level of accessibility, within the new development.
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?/-	?/-	?/-	Dependent on design and locational strategy. Significant opportunities as well as significant threats are present at all scales for new development in the area. Potentially the larger the scale of development the better the opportunity to contribute to sustainable development. Again provided the right type of connectivity to the remainder of the town is critical to securing an integrated community and creating a sustainable community.
11. Health	?	?	?	Dependent on design and locational strategy. Significant opportunities as well as significant threats are present at all scales for new development in the area.
Social Objectives Summary	Successfully meeting social objectives will largely be dependent on the design and locational strategy, including securing the right integration and connectivity to the rest of the town. Although negative impacts could grow in significance in line with the scale of development, larger development also offers better opportunities to mitigate these impacts through design and implementation.			
12. A strong and sustainable economy	+/_	0/+	0	Increased population may assist with the viability and vitality of the town centre, with greatest positive impacts potentially from larger scale development if expenditure does not leak out more to other centres. Dependent on design and implementation. Dependent on integration with existing community. Option does not consider business development.
13. Levels of employment	+	0/+	0	Option does not consider business floorspace options but there is little scope for additional new business floorspace in the town, even with a significantly larger town. The location of the town makes it commercially unattractive for significant business development. There would be some additional job creation on the back of the provision of new services, facilities and retail development. However most new residents of the development would have to commute out of the town for work. There would be some construction related jobs associated with the options, increasing with the larger options.

14. Education, skills and training	+	+	+	Options would provide additions to the labour supply in significant numbers. By increasing affordability of and access to a wider range of housing, including affordable housing, then more people could live in the district widening the skill-set. However at a local level, the provision of local labour would not be matched by a similar growth in jobs.
15. Business and economic development	0	0	0	These sites are not identified as appropriate locations for business growth so not expected to contribute to business and economic development on a significant scale.
Economic Objectives Summary	<p>As the proposed growth options for Princes Risborough are housing based, none offer significant direct economic benefits.</p> <p>There will be benefits from the construction and increase in demand in services and facilities and additions to the labour supply. The growth in labour supply from new housing is unlikely to be matched by the growth in jobs which is likely to be limited.</p> <p>The scale of growth could exacerbate the negative impacts, or could maximise any positive advantages brought about by improvements in infrastructure.</p>			

Strategic Issue 3b: Major Expansion at other key locations on the Transport Network

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Major expansion at Kimble	Greenfield expansion at Kimble identified due to its location on the A4010 and the railway station.
B	Major expansion at Saunderton	Greenfield expansion of Saunderton identified due to its location on the A4010 and the railway station on the main Birmingham to London railway line.
C	Major expansion at Stokenchurch	Greenfield expansion at Stokenchurch identified due to its location at junction 5 on the M40.

Outcome of full appraisal

Strategic objective 3b: Major Expansion at other key locations on the transport network				OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	--/?	-?	-?	All options are likely to have biodiversity impacts given their scale, greenfield nature and proximity to designated areas, with Option A being particularly close to significant designations. Detailed location and design would be essential to avoid major impacts.
2. Landscape and Countryside	-	--	--	Options B and C are within the AONB and these options would constitute major development within the AONB. Significant adverse impacts are likely and on the scale envisaged full mitigation may prove to be difficult. Option A could potentially be located just outside the AONB but would be visible from it and is likely to still have a significant impact. All options would involve significant encroachment into the countryside.
3. Heritage and Townscape	0	0	0	Impacts are potentially more limited, although detailed design and implementation would need to address local heritage and townscape issues.
4. Water and Flooding	-	-	-	All options are likely to increase water consumption and pressure on water infrastructure, as well as increasing the risk of flooding. Given generally small size of the settlements being significant improvements to water infrastructure are likely to be necessary for these various options. These options are not focused on areas of significant flood risk but local flood issues would still need to be assessed.
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	-	-	-	The potential scale of these options could have significant impacts and would require strong mitigation through design and implementation strategies.
6. Best use of land, including	--	--	--	All options involve use of greenfield land, not previously developed land, and this could include an element of best and most versatile agricultural

soil				land.
7. Transport	--	--	--	All options could have significant negative transport impacts. Whilst the locations in the options are on the transport network, growth is likely to add to congestion. Whilst there is scope for some additional use of sustainable modes of travel, particularly at Kimble and Saunderton due to the railway stations, these will have limited capacity and most journeys are likely to still be by car. Stokenchurch does not benefit from a railway line, and a step change in public transport useage, even with improvements, is likely to be difficult to deliver. Homes are unlikely to be matched by commensurate growth in jobs in these locations resulting in additional, longer journeys to work predominantly by car.
Environmental objectives summary	All options would have negative impacts on the environment and potential for mitigation may be relatively limited in relation to some key objectives.			
8. Population – Housing	+	+	+	The options would deliver housing on a significant scale, including affordable housing, helping to meet district wide need and local need.
9. Accessibility	--/?	--/?	--/?	Whilst Stokenchurch has some local services, facilities and jobs, Great and Little Kimble and Saunderton have very few local service, jobs and facilities. Major growth would need to deliver significant improvements in local services and facilities to deliver sustainable expanded settlements and it is very questionable about whether this could be delivered. As a result longer distance car journeys are likely to be encouraged to enable new residents to access services and facilities.
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	--/?	-/?	-/?	The potential sale of growth could well prove difficult to integrate with existing communities, and in the case of Great and Little Kimble are likely to dominate those settlements and potentially merge them.
11. Health	?	?	?	The ability of all options to contribute to health objectives would be highly dependent on the design and implementation strategy including for instance the detailed provision of recreation and green space and

				provision of health facilities within development.
Social Objectives Summary	Whilst all options would help deliver housing objectives, they all raise concerns regarding the accessibility to services and facilities and the impact on existing communities.			
12. A strong and sustainable economy	0/?	0/?	0/?	These housing options do not have a significant direct impact on the this economic objective. They would provide homes for employees and increased retail demand, although the degree to which this is spent in local shops may depend on the ability to provide additional local shopping facilities. Housing growth is unlikely to be matched by commensurate employment growth as these are not attractive locations significant new business development, particularly Kimble and Saunderton.
13. Levels of employment	?	?	?	Other than short term construction jobs and some potentially limited growth in services these options are unlikely to deliver significant job growth
14. Education, skills and training	?	?	?	No direct impact on education and training from any option , beyond pssible increased training in the construction industry through large scale housing growth. These locations may not be well placed to take advantage of existing opportunities.
15. Business and economic development	?	?	?	No direct impact on this objective from these options as they are housing focused options., although additional population may help support local services and facilities and their associated jobs.
Economic Objectives Summary	The direct economic benefits of these options are relatively limited as they are housing options. There may be some economic benefits associated with increased local expenditure but wider economic intelligence suggests these locations are not prime lcoations for economic growth, particularly Kimble and Saunderton.			

Strategic Issue 4: Approaches to providing new land for business

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	High Wycombe	The Economy Study identifies that virtually all of the future economic needs will be around High Wycombe, due to the fact that this is the economic centre of the district and the area that has experienced the most employment and housing growth in the past. Although High Wycombe is located on the M40 and has some sites close to the motorway, the market perception of the town is that it is more an industrial location rather than a strategic office location. This is reflected in the relatively small amount of new office development in the town historically. It is seen to be on the edge of the Thames Valley and as such not as attractive as other towns such as Maidenhead or Reading. This is compounded by the AONB and the Green Belt constraints limiting the provision of land for new developments, the only land available being limited to the Reserve Sites which has been safeguarded for a number of years.
B	Marlow/Bourne End	Marlow is considered to be part of the Thames Valley. It is well-connected via the A404 and M40, which is reflected in the commercial values in the town, which are the highest in the District and as such makes it the most attractive location for the commercial market to invest. Globe Park is the main employment area in the town, but it has experienced intensification as industrial uses have been replaced by office uses creating concerns about parking and amenity in the area. Further commercial development at Marlow is restricted as the town is also constrained by the AONB and Green Belt.
C	North of High Wycombe/Princes Risborough	Princes Risborough is a small market town which has relatively poor connections to the strategic road network and is located on a busy route between Aylesbury and the Thames Valley. There are a number of employment sites in the town and land not yet developed for employment on Princes Estate, but these are catering for a small scale local demand. The Economy Study considered that there was not

	scope for major new employment development here.
--	--

Outcome of full appraisal

Strategic issue 4: Approaches to providing new land for business				OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	-/?	-/?	-/?	Much depends on the detailed location of new business opportunities. Development in the larger more established towns of HW and Marlow should minimise disruption to biodiversity, particularly if located on previously developed sites, but with greater risk of adverse impact on peripheral sites. Greater risk of disruption within rural sites and Princes Risborough, unless to the west of the town. Opportunities for mitigation and enhancement through appropriate design and implementation.
2. Landscape and Countryside	-/?	--/?	-/?	Focusing employment growth in the more built up South East of the District should minimise negative impacts upon the landscape and countryside if it is within the main towns. However peripheral development is likely to have a landscape impact. . Development of land in the District north of High Wycombe would be considerable constrained by Green Belt and AONB designation, other than on the western side of the town. Much depends on detailed site location
3. Heritage and Townscape	?	?	?	Any positive or negative impacts would be dictated by design. Focusing on incorporating employment opportunities has risk of deterioration of heritage and townscape, but equally potential for enhancement.
4. Water and Flooding	-	-	-	Dependent on location and design, any new development will have impact on water resources and potential adding to flood risk.
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	+	+	0/-	Location in towns considered to have more potential to achieve energy efficiency savings. Dependent on design and implementation strategy.

6. Best use of land, including soil	0	0	-	There is potential for using existing or previously developed land for business opportunities more High Wycombe, along with the supporting infrastructure services and businesses. However strategic new employment options are likely to involve low of greenfield land that also include best and most versatile agricultural land.
7. Transport	-	-	--	Improved accessibility and access to public transport connectivity in High Wycombe in particular but greastest congestion issues also. Public transport in the rural North of the District limited although better around Princes Risborough.Princes Risborough and Marlow both have their congestion issues. Economic development options of a peripheral nature in particular in all 3 locations would require significant mitigation measures.
Environmental objectives summary	Employment options in Marlow or High Wycombe would provide the best options from an environmental perspective relative to rural areas to the north. Accessibility and re-use of previously developed land offer significant advantages in these locations rather than in the more rural areas or to the North of the district, although new economic development on peripheral greenfield locations in the south and east are likely to have significant impacts.			
8. Population – Housing	?	?	?	These are economic development location options so not likely to have very diverse impacts on housing in the plan period.
9. Accessibility	+	0	-	High Wycombe has the best range of services and facilities that businesses and their employees can benefit from, followed byMarlow and surrounding area. The rural north and Princes Risborough is less well served. Locating business in or close to the more built up areas is likely to promote an increase in accessibility with colocation of a variety of services and businesses.
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	0	0	0	Dependent on the design and distribution strategy. A good range of employment opportunities would be needed to contribute to sustainable communities. However peripheral greenfield development, particularly in the south east of the district could raise issues of coalescence affecting community identity.
11. Health	?	?	?	
Social Objectives	Social objectives would more likely be met in High Wycombe or Marlow more immediately. Any impacts would be assessed more clearly with a comprehensive design and location strategy.			

Summary				
12. A strong and sustainable economy	++	++	+	All options should help to contribute to a sustainable economy. However the scope for new economic development in Princes Risborough and the north of the District is much more limited due to its relative unattractiveness for business
13. Levels of employment	+	+	+	Increase in employment opportunities should have a direct correlation with levels of employment, with the greatest potential at High Wycombe and Princes Risborough.
14. Education, skills and training	+	+	+	Opportunities likely to be greatest at High Wycombe and Princes Risborough.
15. Business and economic development	+	+	+	The greatest opportunities for business development and inward investment are at High Wycombe and Marlow. Opportunities are limited at Princes Risborough and in the north of the District.
Economic Objectives Summary	Directing new land for business to any of the areas defined will bring positive economic effects to the District. Preference for the location of these would be more influenced by other limitations and potential benefits of the location of new business opportunities. Marlow is particularly strong with increased connectivity to other business in the Thames Valley region, together with High Wycombe where development is well related to the M40.-. There would have to be significant improvements in connectivity to the North of the district and Princes Risborough in order for these areas to become attractive locations for business to relocate to on a decent scale.			

Strategic Issue 5: Approaches to accommodating retail and leisure development

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Town Centre Approach – focusing on existing and new town centres	This option would reflect the approach in the DSA Plan, which focuses on refilling vacant units and delivering a number of town centre site opportunities. This

		approach also encompasses a town centre focus and small-scale development in major urban extensions as being self-contained in centres.
B	Alternative approach - focus outside town centres	This option would entail allowing/allocating more retail and leisure development outside town centres and sites on London Road and other new sites

Outcome of full appraisal

Strategic issue 5: Approaches to accommodating retail and leisure development			OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Option B	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	0	?	Option A would have no impact on this objective. Any impacts of Option B would be entirely dependent on location of any out-of-centre development.
2. Landscape and Countryside	0	?	Option A would be unlikely to have any impact on this objective. Any impacts of Option B would be entirely dependent on the location of any out-of-centre development.
3. Heritage and Townscape	?	?	Any impact of either option would be entirely dependent on the location and design of any particular development.
4. Water and Flooding	n/a	n/a	
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	n/a	n/a	
6. Best use of land, including soil	++	?	Option A would encompass the use of previously developed land as it would focus development on existing units or sites in centres. The impact of Option B would be entirely dependent on the location of any out-of-centre development.
7. Transport	++	?	Option A would have positive impact on this objective as it would focus development on areas well-served by public transport. The impact of Option B would be entirely dependent

			on the location of individual development proposals coming forward under this option.
Environmental objectives summary	Any impacts would be largely dependent on the location of individual developments coming forward under these options, although Option A would be more likely to deliver positive benefits in terms of using previously-developed land and sites well-served by a range of modes of transport.		
8. Population – Housing	n/a	n/a	
9. Accessibility	+	?	Option A would be likely to promote high quality and well-used public space, community and cultural facilities. The impact of Option B would be entirely dependent on the location and design of individual development proposals coming forward under this option.
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	++	?	Option A would be likely to enhance community identity by strengthening existing centres. The impact of Option B would be entirely dependent on the location and design of individual developments coming forward under this option.
11. Health	++	?	Option A would be likely to encourage healthy lifestyles such as walking and cycling by focusing development in accessible locations (i.e. existing centres). The impact of Option B would be entirely dependent on the location of individual developments coming forward under this option.
Social Objectives Summary	Option A is likely to deliver positive benefits whereas Option B would be dependent on the location of individual developments coming forward.		
12. A strong and sustainable economy	++	?/+	Option A would be likely to promote economic growth and also to promote a diverse retail sector by protecting and promoting the district's centres and promoting their vitality and viability. Option B would also be likely to promote economic growth but its impact on the retail sector/town centres would be dependent on the location and scope of individual developments coming forward under this option.
13. Levels of employment	+	+	Both options could provide employment in new retail facilities.
14. Education, skills and training	n/a	n/a	
15. Business	+	?/+	Both options should have a positive impact by enabling the growth and retention of existing

and economic development		businesses and helping foster new businesses to form. Option B could have the potential to harm existing businesses if it takes trade away from existing town centres, but this would be entirely dependent on the location and scale of any individual developments coming forward under this option.
Economic Objectives Summary	Both options are likely to deliver benefits to economic objectives although is greater certainty that these would be delivered under Option A.	

Strategic Issue 6: Gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople - setting a pitch/plot target

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Set a target based on the GTAA	Under this option, a target for additional pitches/plots would be set based on the requirement identified for Wycombe District in the Bucks GTAA. The ten-year requirement therein could be rolled forward five or ten years to provide a 15 or 20 year target.
B	Set a higher target than the GTAA	Under this option, a target for additional pitches/plots would be set which is higher than the requirement identified for Wycombe District in the Bucks GTAA.
C	Set a lower target than the GTAA	Under this option, a target for additional pitches/plots would be set which is lower than the requirement identified for Wycombe District in the Bucks GTAA. This is not considered to be a reasonable alternative - it is a government requirement in NPPF paragraph 14 that Councils should meet their objectively-assessed need, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.
D	Set no target for pitch provision	Under this option, no target for additional pitches/plots would be set. This is not considered to be a reasonable alternative – government policy in Planning Policy

		for Traveller Sites (paragraph 8) states that “local planning authorities should set targets for gypsies and travellers and plot targets for travelling showpeople which address the likely permanent and transit accommodation needs of travellers in their area”. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.
--	--	---

Outcome of full appraisal

Strategic issue 6: Setting a pitch/plot target for Gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople accommodation			OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Option B	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	?	?	The impact of both options would be uncertain because it would be the site selection process which would determine the precise impacts. However, by taking forward a higher quantum of pitches/plots, Option B is more likely to potentially have negative impacts.
2. Landscape and Countryside	?	?	The impact of both options would be uncertain because it would be the site selection process which would determine the precise impacts. However, by taking forward a higher quantum of pitches/plots, Option B is more likely to potentially have negative impacts.
3. Heritage and Townscape	?	?	The impact of both options would be uncertain because it would be the site selection process which would determine the precise impacts. However, by taking forward a higher quantum of pitches/plots, Option B is more likely to potentially have negative impacts.
4. Water and Flooding	0	0	Flooding: The NPPF requires development to be located away from areas at highest risk of flooding. Where new development is proposed, it requires that this does not increase flood risk. Therefore, there should be no negative effects of either of the options on flooding issues – however, the precise impact will depend upon the nature of individual developments coming forward. The steps set out in DSA Policy DM17, including the production of a Flood Risk Assessment and the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), should also ensure that any adverse effects are mitigated. Water resources: The options would be likely to entail small-scale developments for which

			water and waste water supply is likely to be available, although the likely locations in the countryside might mean that network upgrades or additional connections may be required – the precise effect will be dependent on the location and nature of the proposal. Option B could potentially lead to the need for larger sites (depending on the precise target and selection of sites) but it would still be unlikely to have a major negative effect and any effect should be capable of being mitigated.
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	n/a	n/a	No major impacts likely.
6. Best use of land, including soil	?	?	The impact of both options would be uncertain because it would be the site selection process which would determine the precise impacts. However, by taking forward a higher quantum of pitches/plots, Option B is more likely to potentially have negative impacts.
7. Transport	?	?	The impact of both options would be uncertain because it would be the site selection process which would determine the precise impacts. However, by taking forward a higher quantum of pitches/plots, Option B is more likely to potentially require more substantial mitigation measures.
Environmental objectives summary	No major negative effects on environmental objectives are likely; principally because it is the site selection process which will determine precise impacts of delivering additional traveller accommodation at individual locations.		
8. Population – Housing	++	++	Both options would contribute towards the provision of accommodation for Gypsies and travellers. By extrapolating a target to a 15 or 20 year period, both could cater for travellers needs in the long term.
9. Accessibility	?	?	The impact of both options would be uncertain because it would be the site selection process which would determine the precise impacts.
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?	?	The impact of both options would be uncertain because it would be the site selection process which would determine the precise impacts.
11. Health	?	?	The impact of both options would be uncertain because it would be the site selection process which would determine the precise impacts, including on noise and air quality

			issues at particular sites.
Social Objectives Summary	The only identifiable effect on social objectives at this stage is the positive one of delivering accommodation needs for the traveller community.		
12. A strong and sustainable economy	0	0	Unlikely to be any impacts of either option.
13. Levels of employment	n/a	n/a	
14. Education, skills and training	n/a	n/a	
15. Business and economic development	n/a	n/a	
Economic Objectives Summary	No effects on economic objectives likely.		

High Wycombe sites

HW1: Abbey Barn North

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Housing only, covering limited site area due to ecologically-sensitive area in large part of the site.	Abbey Barn North could provide for approximately 60-90 dwellings. Under this option, the developable area of the site would be 3.9ha which excludes the ecologically-sensitive areas of the site.
B	Housing and Business	Due to the size and nature of the site and its location, business development is not considered to be a reasonable alternative – it is not considered an attractive location for commercial business development. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.
C	Housing (potentially with business) covering a larger site area within the site.	Due to the extent of the ecologically-sensitive area, a larger developable area on the site is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.

Outcome of full appraisal

OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE		
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	?/--	<p>The site contains a number of ecologically-important assets, including chalk grassland, scrub, woodland, orchard and hedgerows, of which chalk grassland and hedgerows are priority habitats. There is one designation on the site: the Deangarden Scrubs BNS.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), alongside DSA Policy DM13, affords a strong level of protection for national and local biodiversity designations, and the Botanical Study carried out for the Council in 2009 has identified an ecologically-sensitive area within the site where development should be avoided. Therefore, it is presumed that, under this option, no development would take place within this zone, which as a result severely constrains the developable area of the site.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the option has the potential to have significant negative effects due to its proximity to ecologically-sensitive areas. This is especially the case given that the site borders Deangarden Wood, a local wildlife site (LWS) and ancient semi-natural woodland (ASNW) to the west, and Barrowcroft Wood BNS to the east. It is therefore part of a valuable network of natural habitat and increases the ecological importance of this site.</p> <p>However, there is scope for mitigation. DSA Policy DM14 seeks to maximise biodiversity in the design of development and to secure opportunities to increase biodiversity on development sites. The Botanical Survey 2009 and Landscape Assessment 2014 recommend appropriate buffers to be provided around the ecologically-sensitive areas, and the Botanical Survey recommends the creation of a nature reserve with appropriate management of the most sensitive habitats.</p> <p>The site is also part of the Green Infrastructure Network; therefore development here would be expected to contribute towards the enhancements specified in DSA Policy DM11.</p> <p>Management agreement for natural areas likely to be required to mitigate negative effects – this could deliver improvements to the quality of the ecological interest at the site. The precise nature of the impact would therefore depend on the effectiveness of such mitigation measures.</p>

2. Landscape and Countryside	-	The overall sensitivity of the landscape at this site to development is moderate-high. The option could have an impact on important views from across the valley to the north-east, although lower parts of the site are less visible. Therefore there is potential for some negative effect on landscape and countryside objectives under this option although there is scope to mitigate these impacts, mainly by avoiding development on the higher slopes, which in any case form part of the ecologically-sensitive area within the site.
3. Heritage and Townscape	0	There are no conservation areas or listed buildings within the site, and there are no recorded/observed features of historical interest on this site, although its potential for archaeological interest is raised by the fact that the woodland has protected the site from damaging activities such as ploughing. To mitigate any negative impact, any areas where there is existing or potential archaeological interest should be assessed and appropriate action taken.
4. Water and Flooding	0	Water resources: As this is not a previously-developed site, development there would increase water consumption on the site and the demand for waste water facilities. However, Thames Water does not anticipate any significant issues in terms of the water supply and the sewage network. Flooding: The site is in Flood Zone 1, so is low-risk from a fluvial flood risk point of view, although the site has the potential risk of other forms of flood risk such as surface-water run-off due to its topography. Through the steps set out in DSA Policy DM17, including the production of a Flood Risk Assessment and the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), increased flood risk from development on greenfield land should be mitigated.
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	?/+	The option would present opportunities to increase energy-efficiency through sustainable building practices, thus maximising the potential for renewable energy and promotion of sustainable management of waste. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM18 would help ensure that developments under all three options reduce carbon emissions through the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources and use a design which allows for adaptation to climate change. The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of these implementation measures.
6. Best use of land, including	-	Development on the site would encompass the loss of greenfield land – therefore negative effects on this objective are likely. However, it is presumed that development under this option would avoid the

soil		<p>ecologically-sensitive parts of the site; therefore the loss of greenfield land would be limited.</p> <p>The site contains a small amount of grade 2 agricultural land and therefore this option could involve the some loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, although the majority of the site is Grade 3b and 4.</p>
7. Transport	?/-	<p>Abbey Barn North is in Accessibility Zones 3 and 4, but not particularly well located to frequent public transport, and not within 400m of a half-hourly service. However, the site is adjacent to the former Bourne End-High Wycombe railway line (designated as a new walk/cycle route under DSA Policy DM4) and near to the existing east-west cycle route.</p> <p>The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM2 offers scope for mitigation under this objective. For example, public transport could be improved in the long-term by the re-routing of bus routes or provision of new bus routes passing the site.</p> <p>The option would have an adverse impact on the highway network and securing vehicular access to the site is a particularly challenging issues. However, these issues could be overcome through mitigation and improvement measures, including potential realignment of Abbey Barn Lane and improved Kingsmead Road/Abbey Barn Road/Abbey Barn Lane junction, although there are issues around how much the relatively limited amount of development on this site could fund relative to other sites such as Abbey Barn South.</p> <p>A full transport assessment would be required to identify the likely impact of development and the extent of mitigating measures. Vehicular access of an improved Kingsmead Rd/Abbey Barn Lane/Abbey Barn Rd junction would be needed, as well as secondary emergency access.</p> <p>Contributions towards improving local bus services would be needed to mitigate negative effects.</p>
Environmental objectives summary		<p>Whilst there is the potential for significant negative effects on environmental objectives, particularly with regard to biodiversity and landscape, there is also significant scope for mitigation of these effects, principally by the limitation of the developable area which this option entails. The precise nature of the effects will depend on the effectiveness of the various mitigation measures required.</p>

8. Population – Housing	+	This option would provide some affordable housing and contribute towards meeting overall housing requirements.
9. Accessibility to services and facilities	?/0	No existing facilities are within 500m but Marsh (Primary) School, as well as the shopping facilities at Wycombe Marsh Retail Park, are just outside this buffer, although these are separated from the site by a significant gradient at the junction of Abbey Barn Lane and Kingsmead Road. The site is approx 2-2.5km from the wide range of facilities and employment opportunities in High Wycombe town centre. Development would have to integrate well into the urban area, and financial contributions towards some services could be sought, as part of the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) framework.
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?/-	Development under this option would constitute an urban extension. Although topographically it relates to development in the valley floor, it is somewhat isolated and may be difficult to integrate with the existing community due to level differences. The precise impact would be likely to depend on the design of the development.
11. Health	?/0	<p>Development would exacerbate an existing open space deficiency Leisure facilities at Wycombe Marsh Retail Park; and woodlands of Deangarden Wood and Barrowcroft Wood nearby. Outdoor sport and recreational facilities at Kingsmead just over 1km away, although these facilities are all separated from the site by a significant gradient.</p> <p>To mitigate negative effects, on-site open space would need to be provided, including amenity space and play/teen facilities and a buffer for the ecologically important parts of the site.</p> <p>Financial contributions may be obtained towards improvement of these facilities and accessibility to them – as well as to any improvements to local health facilities - through the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) framework.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of the mitigation measures.</p>

<i>Social Objectives Summary</i>	Whilst the option would contribute towards the delivery of affordable housing and overall housing requirements, there could potentially be negative effects on the other social objectives although there is also significant scope for mitigation.	
<i>12. A strong and sustainable economy</i>	0	No employment opportunities are proposed under this option.
<i>13. Levels of employment</i>	0	No employment opportunities are proposed under this option.
<i>14. Education, skills and training</i>	+	Housing on the site would add to the labour supply.
<i>15. Business and economic development</i>	0	No direct effect as a result of this option.
<i>Economic Objectives Summary</i>	No direct effects on economic objectives apart from the addition to the labour supply which new housing would entail.	

HW2: Abbey Barn South

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Housing and business - Option 1	Abbey Barn South could provide for approximately 360-460 homes, with 1.7ha of business. Under this option, the business area would be located off Abbey Barn Lane.
B	Housing and business – Option 2	Abbey Barn South could provide for approximately 410-520 homes with 1.7ha of business. Under this option, the business area would be located on the baseball pitch area adjacent to the former RAF Daws Hill.
C	Housing	Abbey Barn South could provide for approximately 470-580 homes and no business element.
D	A greater quantum of development than Options A, B and C.	A greater quantum of development could be delivered on the site than the above options using the entire site area, including the landscape ride. However, due to the importance of the ride in biodiversity, landscape and historic terms, this is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.

Outcome of full appraisal

OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE				
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	?/0	?/0	?/0	The few remaining hedgerows that remain on the site are Priority Habitats. Deangarden Wood to the north is an ancient semi-natural woodland (ASNW) and a local wildlife site (LWS). The pastures and spinneys of the landscape ride are an important habitat for fauna and flora.

				<p>Most of the individuals and groups of trees that form the landscape ride have Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) on them, and it would be important to ensure the retention of these trees.</p> <p>All three options have the potential to have negative effects but there is also scope for mitigation in the form of enhancements to biodiversity such as through reinstatement of links between habitats on the site and the provision of appropriate buffers between development and ancient woodland..</p> <p>The site is part of the Green Infrastructure Network; therefore development here would be expected to contribute towards the enhancements specified in DSA Policy DM11.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would therefore depend upon the effectiveness of mitigation measures.</p>
2. Landscape and Countryside	?/-	?/-	?/-	<p>The overall sensitivity of the landscape at this site to development is moderate. The landscape ride is a unique feature and impressive in scale, and the dry valley in the north-western fields is an attractive feature in localised views. Therefore the development quanta envisaged under all three options have the potential to have negative effects on this objective.</p> <p>There is scope for mitigation through ensuring the retention of the trees in the landscape ride, keeping building heights below the tree line and restricting development to the areas of open agricultural land.</p>
3. Heritage and Townscape	0	0	0	<p>There are no conservation areas on or adjacent to the site. However, the landscape ride is of historic interest as it was formerly connected to the landscape immediately surrounding Daws Hill House. It is presumed that development would avoid the landscape ride under all three options, otherwise there would be considerable adverse impact.</p>
4. Water and Flooding	0	0	0	<p>Water resources: As this is not a previously-developed site, development here under all the options would increase water consumption on the site and the demand for waste water facilities. However, Thames Water does not anticipate any significant issues in terms of the water supply and sewage network, subject to capacity testing and network upgrades.</p> <p>Flooding: The site is in Flood Zone 1, so is low-risk from a fluvial flood risk point of view. Through the steps set out in DSA Policy DM17, including the production</p>

				of a Flood Risk Assessment and the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), increased flood risk from development on greenfield land should be mitigated.
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	?/+	?/+	?/+	<p>The option would present opportunities to increase energy-efficiency through sustainable building practices, thus maximising the potential for renewable energy and promotion of sustainable management of waste. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM18 would help ensure that developments under all three options reduce carbon emissions through the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources and use a design which allows for adaptation to climate change.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of these implementation measures.</p>
6. Best use of land, including soil	--	--	--	Development on the site would encompass the significant loss of greenfield land (18-20ha) – therefore significant negative impacts on this objective. The site includes Grade 2 and 3A agricultural land. Development would therefore be likely to involve the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.
7. Transport	?/--	?/--	?/--	<p>The site falls within Accessibility Zone 5, and parts of the site are within 400m of an hourly bus service (the number 36 between High Wycombe and Bourne End via Flackwell Heath and Marlow Hill) although northern parts of the site are not within 400m of any route.</p> <p>Combined with gradient differences between the site and the rest of High Wycombe town, this therefore means that the site is relatively inaccessible. Moreover, development envisaged under all three options could potentially have a significant impact on the highway network. These impacts could be particularly severe under the options (A and B) which envisage business use on part of the site.</p> <p>However, the effective implementation of DSA Policy DM2 offers significant scope for mitigation, and potential mitigation packages have been identified as part of initial transport work on the Local Plan. For example, development could help secure improvements to public transport in the area, including potentially the</p>

				<p>provision of a high-frequency bus service through the site connecting with the adjoining RAF Daws Hill development and the planned Handy Cross Coachway/park and ride. Traffic management could ensure traffic queues associated with new development are managed in a way to mitigate their impact on the highway network.</p> <p>The site can be safely accessed by foot and car with improvements.</p> <p>A full Transport Assessment would be required to identify the likely impact of development and the extent of mitigating measures.</p>
Environmental objectives summary	There is scope for negative effects on environmental objectives from all three options, and significant negative effects on the best use of land objective due to the extent of greenfield development envisaged under all three options. There are potentially significant transport impacts and delivering the appropriate mitigation packages will be very important. Any negative effects on the other objectives are not likely to constitute significant negative effects subject to appropriate mitigation.			
8. Population – Housing	++	++	++	All options would provide affordable housing and contribute towards overall housing requirements, all in potentially significant numbers.
9. Accessibility	?/-	?/-	?/-	<p>Site is between approx 1.3km and 2.1km from High Wycombe town centre and approx 2.5km from Flackwell Heath District Centre. Even closest parts of site to High Wycombe town centre are relatively inaccessible due to lack of clear through route (only a footpath) and gradient.</p> <p>Some facilities will be provided on the former RAF Daws Hill site adjacent to the development in the form of a new community centre and primary school.</p> <p>In terms of mitigation, on-site provision of facilities or financial contributions towards some services could be sought, as part of the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) framework, including contributions towards enlarging the school on Daws Hill.</p> <p>Options A and B may be slightly advantageous in offering additional employment opportunities on-site which could potentially relate to the new housing. However, jobs provided here (or at the adjacent former RAF Daws Hill site) would not be accessible within walking distance to employees other than those living on or</p>

				<p>close to the site.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of the mitigation measures.</p>
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?/-	?/-	?/-	<p>The relative inaccessibility of the site raises issues of integration with the community under all the options, and these are exacerbated by concerns that development at the site would create a continuous built-up area between High Wycombe and Flackwell Heath, further adversely affecting community identity. There is arguably a greater possibility of more integration of communities with the options incorporating business uses. Option C would, by increasing the extent of the built-up area on the site, exacerbate the negative effects on this option, particularly as it would mean building on the baseball pitch area.</p> <p>Under all options, an extent of mitigation will be provided through development avoiding the landscape ride. There are also opportunities to incorporate good connections to existing communities and facilities. However, the precise impact would be likely to depend on the scale and design of development.</p>
11. Health	?/0	?/0	?/0	<p>Development envisaged under all three options would exacerbate rather than relieve deficiencies of open space. Options B and C in particular could have significant negative effects by extending built form over the baseball pitch area. However, mitigation could be secured under all three options through the provision of on-site open space, including play space, pitches and, potentially, allotments. Moreover, options provide the opportunity to improve public access to the landscape ride.</p> <p>Development would need to take full account of noise constraints from the motorway in the design and layout of any development, including appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The precise nature of the effect would depend upon the effectiveness of the mitigation measures.</p>
Social Objectives	The level of housing capable of being developed on the site constitutes a significant positive effect from all three options. The evaluation of the other objectives shows that there is scope for negative effects from all three			

Summary	options, particularly arising from the relative lack of accessibility of the site. However, there is also scope for mitigation through securing benefits from the development and in ensuring that the design of the scheme under any of the options integrates well with the existing community.			
12. A strong and sustainable economy	+	+	0	Options A and B would do significantly more than Option C to promote a strong economy by offering employment opportunities as well as access to facilities and services for employers. None of the options would result in a loss of employment land.
13. Levels of employment	+	+	0	Option C would have a neutral effect in the long-term, though would offer employment opportunities in the construction and marketing phase of the development. Options A and B would provide for new employment uses.
14. Education, skills and training	++	++	++	Housing would add to the local labour supply in significant numbers under all the options. More potential opportunities are likely to arise, however, under Options A and B through the provision of employment opportunities and associated education, skills and training facilities.
15. Business and economic development	+	+	0	The business element envisaged under Options A and B could contribute to a diverse economy.
Economic Objectives Summary	Benefits are likely to economic objectives from all three options; particularly the options (A and B) which envisage an element of business development on the site.			

HW3: Gomm Valley (excluding Ashwells)

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Housing and business, encompassing an area which would avoid very sensitive and sensitive landscape areas.	Gomm Valley could provide for approximately 100-140 homes and 1.7ha of business. Under this option, the developable area of the site would be 6.4ha out of the total 67.5ha site area. The development would avoid the various biodiversity designations as well as the sensitive and very sensitive landscape areas.
B	Housing and business, encompassing an area which would avoid very sensitive landscape areas but would include other sensitive landscape areas.	Gomm Valley could provide for approximately 390-530 homes with 1.7ha of business. Under this option, the developable area of the site would be 20.2ha out of the total 67.5ha site area. Development would avoid the various biodiversity designations as well as the very sensitive landscape areas but would include some fo the other sensitive landscape areas.
C	Housing only, encompassing an area which would avoid very sensitive landscape areas but would include other sensitive landscape areas.	Gomm Valley could provide for approximately 450-600 homes. Under this option, the developable area of the site would be 20.2ha out of the total 67.5ha site area. Development would avoid the various biodiversity designations as well as the very sensitive landscape areas but would include some of the other sensitive landscape areas.
D	Development options encompassing a larger site area than Options B and C.	Due to the extent of the biodiversity, archaeological and landscape constraints, this is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.

Outcome of full appraisal

OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE				
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Option B	Option C	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	?/--	?/--	?/--	<p>The site contains a number of important habitats, most notably chalk grassland, scrub, hedgerows and broadleaved woodland. As a result there are a number of designations on the site: Gomm Valley SSSI, Gomm Valley LWS, Little Gomm's Wood BNS and Cock Lane BNS. Little Gomm's Wood and Pimm's Grove are identified as Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland (ASNW). The site also supports five Priority Habitats.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), alongside DSA Policy DM13, affords a strong level of protection for national and local biodiversity designations, and it is presumed in all the options that these would be avoided in any development here.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, all three options have the potential to have significant negative impacts due to the loss or further fragmentation of links between the various biodiversity assets and habitats, even where the key designations are being protected.</p> <p>However, there is scope for significant mitigation. DSA Policy DM14 seeks to maximise biodiversity in the design of development and to take opportunities to increase biodiversity on development sites. Gomm Valley has been identified as a Biodiversity Opportunity Area and as part of the Green Infrastructure Network; therefore development here would be expected to contribute towards the</p>

				<p>enhancements specified in DSA Policy DM11.</p> <p>In accordance with this policy approach, mitigation of potential harm to designated habitats and species could be provided by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • avoiding the loss and fragmentation of all designated sites and valuable habitats, and retaining an appropriate buffer around them; • substantially expanding habitats and improving linkages between them; and • ensuring appropriate management of chalk grassland areas and hedgerows, whilst restricting/managing access to ecologically-valuable areas (i.e. chalk grassland and woodland areas), to avoid deterioration of habitats through human interference. <p>The precise nature of the impact would therefore depend upon the effectiveness of these mitigation measures.</p>
2. Landscape and Countryside	--	--	--	<p>The overall sensitivity of the landscape at this site to development is moderate-high. The rolling topography and the expansive intervisibility of the valley with the wider landscape is an important characteristic, as is the setting that the undeveloped and wooded slopes plan in providing a setting for High Wycombe in the valley floor. Any development here – under all three options - is likely to have a significant negative impact on the landscape and countryside objectives.</p> <p>Whilst there is minimal scope for mitigation, the undeveloped and wooded upper slopes are particularly important in maintaining the characteristic setting of High Wycombe. Therefore development here should be strongly resisted. Development on the lower slopes would still be likely to have significant negative impacts but it would impact less on views from the wider landscape.</p>

				<p>Mitigation could also be achieved to some degree by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including a strong landscape structure to any development and seeking to reinstate the historic field pattern; • Keeping development small-scale to avoid the requirement for extensive manipulation of the topography; • Creating appropriate buffers around hedgerows and trees; • Carefully considering the height of development to ensure that it does not impact negatively on views over and through the valley from the surrounding landscape; and • Maintaining the expansive views out from the site across High Wycombe and towards King's Wood to the south and west.
<p>3. Heritage and Townscape</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>There is no conservation area in or adjacent to the site. Some of the fields on the site are pre-18th century irregular enclosure and are of a type that is declining rapidly – they therefore have historic interest. There is an Archaeological Notification Site (ANS) in the north of the valley where evidence of stone age, iron age and Romano-British habitation has been found.</p> <p>There is therefore the potential for development under any of the three options to have significant negative impacts on these features. However mitigation is possible through (a) seeking to reinstate the historic field pattern through development, (b) avoiding development on the ANS and (c) assessing areas with existing or potential archaeological interest and taking appropriate action.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of these mitigation measures.</p>

<p>4. Water and Flooding</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<p>Water resources: As this is not a previously-developed site, development here under all the options would increase water consumption on the site and the demand for waste water infrastructure. However, Thames Water does not anticipate any significant issues in terms of the water supply and the sewage network, subject to capacity testing and network upgrades.</p> <p>Flooding: The site is in Flood Zone 1 so is low risk from a fluvial flood risk point of view. Through the steps set out in DSA Policy DM17, including the production of a Flood Risk Assessment and the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), increased flood risk from development on greenfield land should be mitigated.</p>
<p>5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste</p>	<p>?/+</p>	<p>?/+</p>	<p>?/+</p>	<p>Opportunities with all options to increase energy-efficiency through sustainable building practices, maximising the potential for renewable energy and promotion of sustainable management of waste. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM18 would help ensure that developments under all three options reduce carbon emissions through the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources and use a design which allows for adaptaion to climate change.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of these implementation measures.</p>
<p>6. Best use of land, including soil</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>--</p>	<p>Development on the site would entail the loss of greenfield land – therefore negative impacts on this objective, significantly so for the larger site area options. The site contains some grade 3A and a small amount of grade 2 agricultural land. Development of the site under all three options would therefore involve loss of some best and most versatile agricultural land, although whether this land could be used to its full productive potential, given gradients on the site, is uncertain.</p>

7. Transport	?/-	?/-	?/-	<p>Gomm Valley is in Accessibility Zone 4/5 and is within 400m of an infrequent bus service (number 27 between Robinson Road and High Wycombe town centre/Cotswold Way. A cycle route is within 800m of some parts of the site.</p> <p>Therefore the site is relatively inaccessible. Moreover, development envisaged under all three options could potentially have a significant impact on the highway network. These impacts could be particularly severe under the options (A and B) which envisage business on part of the site and larger quantities of development.</p> <p>However, the effective implementation of DSA Policy DM2 offers scope for mitigation, and initial transport work on the has identified some potential mitigation measures. For example, development could help secure improvements to public transport in the area, including potentially the provision of a high-frequency bus service through the site, although there are topographical challenges in doing this. Traffic management could ensure traffic queues associated with new development are managed in a way to mitigate their impact on the highway network.</p> <p>The site can be safely accessed by foot and car with improvements.</p> <p>A full Transport Assessment would be required to identify the likely impact of development and the extent of mitigating measures.</p>
Environmental objectives summary	Significant negative effects on environmental objectives are likely under all options, particularly in relation to landscape impact. Whilst there is significant scope for mitigation of the effects on biodiversity and transport objectives, there is likely to be only minimal scope for mitigation of the effects on landscape objectives.			
8. Population – Housing	+	++	++	All options would provide affordable dwellings and would contribute towards meeting overall housing requirements. Under Options B and C, significant

				quantums of housing would be provided.
9. Accessibility	?/-	?/-	?/	<p>Site is poorly located in relation to local facilities (none within 500m). The site is approx 3.5-4km from the wide range of facilities and employment opportunities in High Wycombe town centre</p> <p>Delivery of on-site neighbourhood centre including local shops and a community hall could provide mitigation of negative effects identified, and scale of development might facilitate this local improvement. Similarly, there is potential for a country park to be created in the sensitive landscape areas, improving public access to open spaces, and for improved local nature reserves to be created in the important wildlife areas.</p> <p>Development would have to integrate well with the existing urban area.</p> <p>Option B may be slightly advantageous on accessibility in offering additional employment opportunities on-site which could potentially relate to the new housing.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of the mitigation measures.</p>
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?/-	?/-	?/-	<p>Development of the site raises major concerns about community identity by closing the strategic gap between High Wycombe and Tylers Green. Loss of community identity could be mitigated by maintenance of gap between High Wycombe and Tylers Green as part of any development proposals, which is envisaged under all three options. The site forms a key part of the District’s Green Infrastructure Network running north-west towards Kings Wood, and to the open countryside to the east. Any options would therefore be expected to deliver the enhancements specified in DSA Policy DM11. There are opportunities to</p>

				incorporate good connections to existing communities and facilities. However, the precise impact would be likely to depend on the scale and design of development.
11. Health	?/0	?/+	?/+	<p>Development would exacerbate open space deficiency.</p> <p>Southern-most third of the site is within 800m of sporting, leisure and recreational facilities on Kingsmead and at Wycombe Marsh Retail Park, although these are both separated from the site by the main London Road. Northern two-thirds of the site not within 800m of sporting, leisure or recreational facilities although close to the Little Gomm's Wood and Gomm Valley Nature Reserve.</p> <p>No significant air quality or noise issues although a small part of the site is adjacent to the High Wycombe-London railway line.</p> <p>The site provides scope for provision of major open space and accessible green infrastructure improvements including informal open space, a potential country park, an area for nature conservation and play/teen facilities. Such major open space improvements are more likely to be secured from the larger development quantum envisaged under Options B and C.</p> <p>The portion of the site close to the railway line may require buffering for noise attenuation purposes.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of the mitigation measures.</p>
Social Objectives Summary	Whilst there is the potential for negative effects on place-making objectives, restricting the developable area of the site should provide some mitigation. The options – especially the higher development quantum objectives in Options B and C – offer significant scope for benefits in terms of housing provision and provision of accessible			

	open space.			
12. A strong and sustainable economy	+	+	0	Options A and B would do significantly more than option C to promote a strong economy by offering employment opportunities as well as access to facilities and services for employers. None of the options would result in a loss of employment land.
13. Levels of employment	+	+	0	Option C would have a neutral effect in the long-term, though would offer employment opportunities in the construction and marketing phase of the development. Options A and B would provide for new employment uses directly adjacent to existing business park.
14. Education, skills and training	++	++	++	Housing would add to the local labour supply - and in significant numbers under Options B and C. More potential opportunities are likely to arise, however, under Options A and B through the provision of employment opportunities and associated education, skills and training facilities.
15. Business and economic development	+	+	0	Option C would have a largely neutral effect on business and economic development being residential-only development. More potential opportunities in with options A and B through the provision of employment opportunities and the potential to attract investment
Economic Objectives Summary	Benefits are likely to economic objectives from all three options; particularly the options (A and B) which envisage an element of business development on the site.			

HW4: Terriers Farm

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Housing and park and ride option	Terriers Farm could provide for approximately 310-410 homes and a Park and Ride facility. Under this option, the developable area of the site would be 14.5ha out of the total site area of 23ha. The development would avoid the eastern fields to ensure maintenance of the green infrastructure link.
B	Housing only	Terriers Farm could provide for approximately 370-490 homes only. Under this option, the developable area of the site would be 14.5ha out of the total site area of 23ha. The development would avoid the eastern fields to ensure maintenance of the green infrastructure link.
C	Housing and business	Terriers Farm could provide a mix of housing and business development. However, the evidence base indicates that the site would not be suitable for business so this is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.
D	Development options encompassing a larger site area than Options A-C.	Due to the importance of the eastern segment of the site in maintaining the green infrastructure link between King's Wood and the AONB, this is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.

Outcome of full appraisal

OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE			
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Option B	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	?/0	?/0	<p>Development under both options could impact on the mature hedgerow running north-south through the site, which is of high ecological value, and which is designated as a biological notification site (BNS). The mature hedgerows on the site also contain a large number of trees which make an important contribution to species diversity and overall landscape prominence. However, mitigation can be secured by the creation of appropriate buffers between these features and development.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend on the effectiveness of this mitigation.</p>
2. Landscape and Countryside	?/-	?/-	<p>The overall sensitivity of the landscape at the site to development is moderate. The site is adjacent to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and its key characteristics include mature hedgerows and trees, which preserve the historic field patterns; and the attractive and tranquil fields to the east of the site, which provide an important recreational resource for local residents. The site also plays an important strategic role as an essential green link in the Green Infrastructure Network, extending from the built-up area of High Wycombe to the AONB countryside to the north of the site.</p> <p>Development under either option here could have a negative impact, although the assumption that development would avoid the eastern fields could significantly mitigate this impact.</p> <p>Further mitigation could be provided by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping any development low-rise to avoid negative impact on views from the wider landscape; • Confining development to the areas of open agricultural land and retaining the historic field pattern • Retaining the existing green link between King's Wood in the south and the AONB countryside to the north • Maintaining a substantial buffer between the BNS hedgerow and any development to maintain views through from one landscape to another • Focusing new development towards the existing settlement on Kingsill Road and

			<p>reducing in density to the east.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of these mitigation measures and the design of any schemes coming forward under either option.</p>
3. Heritage and Townscape	0	0	<p>The site adjoins the Terriers Conservation Area, and the archaeological potential of the site is medium to high as the land has not been cultivated. There is also historic interest in the hedgerows which are the remains of an ancient field system.</p> <p>Mitigation could be provided through ensuring that development would not have a visibly adverse effect on the Terriers Conservation Area's special character or appearance; and by assessing and taking appropriate action where there is existing or potential archaeological interest on the site.</p>
4. Water and Flooding	0	0	<p>Water resources: As this is not a previously-developed site, development here under all the options would increase water consumption on the site and the demand for waste water infrastructure. However, Thames Water does not anticipate any significant issues in terms of the water supply and the sewage network, subject to capacity testing and network upgrades.</p> <p>Flooding: The site is in Flood Zone 1 so is low risk from a fluvial flood risk point of view. Through the steps set out in DSA Policy DM17, including the production of a Flood Risk Assessment and the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), increased flood risk from development on greenfield land should be mitigated.</p>
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	?/+	?/+	<p>Opportunities with all options to increase energy-efficiency through sustainable building practices, maximising the potential for renewable energy and promotion of sustainable management of waste. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM18 would help ensure that developments under all three options reduce carbon emissions through the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources and use a design which allows for adaptation to climate change.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of these implementation measures.</p>
6. Best use of land, including	-	-	<p>Development on the site would encompass the loss of greenfield land – therefore negative impacts on this objective, although the developable area is limited under both options. The</p>

soil			site encompasses grade 3A and 3B agricultural land. Development of the site under all three options would therefore involve loss of some best and most versatile agricultural land.
7. Transport	?/+	?	<p>Terriers Farm is in Accessibility Zone 3 and is well located for frequent bus services, including the number 31 between Penn and Downley via High Wycombe town centre and the number 1 to Hazlemere and Amersham. However, the size of the site means that some parts of it are not within 400m of a bus stop. There is no cycle route within half a mile of the site.</p> <p>Development envisaged under either option could potentially have a significant impact on the highway network, including the impact of buses and traffic using the park and ride facility envisaged under Option A. This would require appropriate mitigation to deal with the localised effects of increased traffic, although the park and ride would help improve public transport accessibility for the site and potentially the wider area.</p> <p>However Option A also clearly offers not only significant mitigation but also positive benefits for transport, in terms of helping to achieve modal shift here and elsewhere in the area.</p> <p>Moreover, the effective implementation of DSA Policy DM2 offers significant scope for mitigation under both options and initial transport work on the Local Plan to date has identified potential mitigation packages . For example, development could help secure improvements to public transport and the road layout in the area, Traffic management could ensure traffic issues associated with new development are managed in a way to mitigate their impact on the highway network.</p> <p>The site can be safely accessed by foot and car with improvements.</p> <p>A full Transport Assessment would be required to identify the likely impact of development and the extent of mitigating measures.</p>
Environmental objectives summary	As this is a substantial greenfield site, development options here constitute a negative effect although the developable area would be limited under both options. In general, whilst there are likely to be negative effects on environmental objectives, there is also scope for significant mitigation of many of these effects.		

8. Population – Housing	++	++	Both options would provide affordable dwellings and would contribute significantly towards meeting overall housing requirements.
9. Accessibility	?/-	?/-	<p>The site is within reasonable distance of services and facilities, although the local shop near the site is the only one of the listed essential facilities which is within walking distance (500m). The site is within 30 minutes public transport time of the wide range of facilities in High Wycombe town centre. The site is approximately 2.5km from High Wycombe town centre and 2.5km of Hazlemere district centre.</p> <p>In terms of mitigation, on-site provision of facilities or financial contributions towards some services could be sought, as part of the Council’s Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) framework, including contributions towards expanding the capacity of local schools and GP surgeries.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of such mitigation measures.</p> <p>Site would need to be integrated with the adjoining urban area.</p>
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?/-	?/-	<p>Adjoins/within existing built-up area of High Wycombe</p> <p>However raises concerns in the community that development would close the gap between Hazlemere and High Wycombe affecting community identity.</p> <p>Mitigation could partly secured through the provision of significant green space to form part of the green wedge separating High Wycombe and Hazlemere at the north-eastern end of the site. Therefore the fact that both these options presume that development would avoid this area of the site provides some mitigation, However, the precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of this mitigation and the design of schemes coming forward under either option.</p>
11. Health	?/0	?/0	<p>Development would exacerbate open space deficiency. Sport, leisure and recreational facilities are within 800 metres of site. Impact could be mitigated by the provision of open space, potentially including pitches, play/teen facilities and allotments.</p> <p>Not affected by major air pollution or noise sources.</p> <p>The site forms part of the District’s Green Infrastructure Network running between King’s Wood, and to the open countryside to the north. Any options would therefore be expected to deliver the enhancements specified in DSA Policy DM11.</p>

Social Objectives Summary	The level of housing capable of being developed on the site constitutes a significant positive effect from all three options. In terms of the other objectives, the scope for mitigation could counter-act some of the negative effects arising.		
12. A strong and sustainable economy	0	0	No employment opportunities are proposed under either of these option.
13. Levels of employment	0	0	No employment opportunities are proposed under either of these options.
14. Education, skills and training	++	++	Housing would add to the labour supply, potentially in significant numbers under both options.
15. Business and economic development	0	0	No direct effect as a result of either option.
Economic Objectives Summary	No direct effects on economic objectives apart from the delivery of housing, which would add to the labour supply, and the numbers envisaged under the options would be likely to deliver significant positive effects.		

HW5 Wycombe Air Park

This is a 93ha site on the south-western edge of High Wycombe, in the Green Belt. It is an active site for small-scale flying and related industrial activities. There is scope at the site to either intensify the industrial activities on the site or expand them further, whilst keeping the air park open.

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Expanding employment development on the site whilst keeping the air park operational	Under this option, a business area would be provided adjacent to the existing air park, which would provide 14.6ha of extra land, in addition to the existing area of 10.1ha.
B	Intensifying employment on the existing business area of the site.	Under this option, current employment uses would be intensified within the existing 10.1ha business area of the site. As this option would entail use of the existing business area only, it is not considered that this option would be likely to have significant effects on sustainability objectives. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.

Outcome of full appraisal

OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE		
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	?/0	A site of special scientific interest (SSSI) runs along the western boundary of the site and the western third of the sites lie within 500m of the SSSI. There is a small area of woodland at the southern end of, but not included within the SSSI which has been identified as a priority habitat. Therefore the western quarter of the site has a high sensitivity to development. As development under this option would not take place in this area, no significant negative effect is likely. However, appropriate buffers would need to be provided to the SSSI and the boundary hedgerows.
2. Landscape and Countryside	?/-	The overall sensitivity of the site is moderate. The site is adjacent to the Chilterns AONB, and its dominant characteristics are its open, expansive nature and its plateau location. Combined, these result in the site being highly sensitive to any development which would scale the height of the existing boundary vegetation and break the wooded skyline views that are currently available over the site from the wider landscape, particularly the south. However, existing hedgerows and trees could provide useful screening for carefully located, low-rise development. Therefore there is potential for negative effects on this objective. However there is scope to mitigate this impact, mainly by keeping development heights below the line of existing boundary vegetation.
3. Heritage and Townscape	0	There are two archaeological notification sites on the site and, whilst there are no conservation areas on the site, the aviation history of the site is worthy of interest. Any negative effects can be mitigated by taking appropriate action where there is potential archaeological interest and by taking the opportunity to highlight the aviation history of the site.
4. Water and	0	Water resources: As this is not a previously-developed site, development here would increase water consumption on the site and the demand for waste water facilities. However, Thames Water does not

Flooding		<p>anticipate any significant issues in terms of the water supply and sewage network, subject to capacity testing and network upgrades.</p> <p>Flooding: The site is in Flood Zone 1, so is low-risk from a fluvial flood risk point of view. Through the steps set out in DSA Policy DM17, including the production of a Flood Risk Assessment and the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), increased flood risk from development on greenfield land should be mitigated.</p>
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	?/+	<p>This development would present opportunities to increase energy-efficiency through sustainable building practices, thus maximising the potential for renewable energy and promotion of sustainable management of waste. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM18 would help ensure that developments under all three options reduce carbon emissions through the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources and use a design which allows for adaptation to climate change.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of these implementation measures.</p>
6. Best use of land, including soil	-	<p>Development under this option would result in some loss of greenfield land – therefore there are likely to be negative impacts on this objective.</p>
7. Transport	?/-	<p>The site falls within Accessibility Zone 5, and parts of the site are within 400m of an hourly bus service (the number 32 between High Wycombe and Lane End).</p> <p>Combined with dividing barrier of the M40 motorway between the site and the rest of High Wycombe town, this means that the site is relatively inaccessible.</p>

		<p>Transport impacts of the development could be significant. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM2 offers some scope for mitigation but no assessment of the transport impacts of this option have been undertaken at this point in time. A full transport assessment would be required to identify the likely impact of development and the extent of mitigating measures. A second vehicular access may be needed, which could be provided off the B482 Marlow Road.</p> <p>The extent of mitigation packages is subject to further testing and assessment, which in themselves could also have their own environmental impacts.</p>
Environmental objectives summary		Overall there is scope for this option to have negative environmental impacts. The impact is subject to further detailed assessment especially in relation to the transport objectives, where impacts will depend on the mitigation package required
8. Population – Housing	n/a	
9. Accessibility	0	No direct effects likely
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?/-	Development would slightly extend the build-up area of High Wycombe, but precise impacts would be dependent on design of any schemes coming forward under this option. The restricted developable area envisaged under this option would be likely to limit any negative effects.
11. Health	?	Precise effects uncertain at this stage.
Social Objectives Summary		No significant effects on social objectives likely.

12. A strong and sustainable economy	++	Allocation of this site would promote economic development and increase the competitiveness of the local economy, creating new business floorspace.
13. Levels of employment	++	The amount of land available means that a range of unit sizes could be provided as well as a mix of industrial/warehouse and office uses, in addition the development would contribute towards accommodating the projected increase in jobs forecast.
14. Education, skills and training	+	Potential to provide in-employment training and to provide more opportunities for skills development through the businesses which would be able to expand and locate in this area.
15. Business and economic development	++	The option is likely to allow existing businesses on the site to expand and therefore remain in the area; and to help foster new businesses to form, attract new business and support the diversification of the economy.
Economic Objectives Summary	Overall very positive impact on economic objectives	

Chepping Wye Valley Sites

CW1: North of Heath End Road (“Junction 3A”)

This is an area of agricultural land (of an area of approximately 62ha) situated between High Wycombe and Flackwell Heath. It is located on both sides of the M40 north of Heath End Road and south of Abbey Barn Lane.

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Housing and business development; and the creation of a new motorway junction between the existing junctions 3 and 4 of the M40.	Under this option, North of Heath End Road could provide up to 15ha of new employment land and 100 dwellings linked to the creation of a new motorway junction between junctions 3 and 4 on the M40. This new junction ‘3A’ would provide the ‘other half’ of the existing junction 3, with slip roads allowing London-bound traffic to leave the motorway and Oxford-bound traffic to join the motorway. It would also improve connections to London Road in High Wycombe, in the area near to Kingsmead Recreation Ground, and allow for better connectivity towards the Gomm Valley Reserve Site.
B	Housing and business development with no new motorway junction provided.	Without the new motorway junction being provided, the business component of development in this area would not be delivered, so this is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option

		has been carried out.
--	--	-----------------------

Outcome of full appraisal

OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE		
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	?/0	Part of the area is designated as part of the Green Infrastructure network in the DSA and development would be expected to contribute towards the enhancements specified in DSA Policy DM11. There are a number of hedgerows across the area, the internal ones are likely to be lost as a result of developing the site. There is also an area of undesignated woodland within the site immediately adjacent to Flackwell Heath. Development on the site would have a negative effect, but the impact would be dependent upon the scale and precise location of development as well as mitigation measures that could be put in place.
2. Landscape and Countryside	?/--	The southern part of the site is adjacent to Chilterns AONB and as such is in a sensitive location, part of the area is also partly within the Wycombe Abbey School Local Landscape Area. The area also occupies an area of green belt that separates Flackwell Heath from High Wycombe. There is potential for a significant landscape impact in relation to the AONB and views of the area from across the valley towards High Wycombe subject to further investigation.
3. Heritage and Townscape	?/0	The area includes Abbey Barn Farm and associated outbuildings which are grade 2 listed buildings, there is also an Archaeological Notification Area within the eastern part of the site. The impact on these features is subject to the exact extent of the development and further investigation is required; however there may be scope to mitigate the impact upon these features.
4. Water and	0	Water resources: As this is not a previously-developed site, development here would increase water consumption on the site and the demand for waste water facilities. However, Thames Water does not

Flooding		<p>anticipate any significant issues in terms of the water supply and sewage network, subject to capacity testing and network upgrades.</p> <p>Flooding: The site is in Flood Zone 1, so is low-risk from a fluvial flood risk point of view. Through the steps set out in DSA Policy DM17, including the production of a Flood Risk Assessment and the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), increased flood risk from development on greenfield land should be mitigated.</p>
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	?/+	<p>This development would present opportunities to increase energy-efficiency through sustainable building practices, thus maximising the potential for renewable energy and promotion of sustainable management of waste. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM18 would help ensure that developments under all three options reduce carbon emissions through the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources and use a design which allows for adaptation to climate change.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of these implementation measures.</p>
6. Best use of land, including soil	--	<p>Development on the site would result in the significant loss of greenfield land – therefore there are likely to be significant negative impacts on this objective. The site is predominantly Grade 2 and 3A agricultural land. Development would therefore be likely to involve the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. Part of the site is also a former Landfill site (Heath End Farm), which would need further assessment in terms of suitability for development.</p>
7. Transport	?	<p>The site falls within Accessibility Zone 5, and parts of the site are within 400m of an hourly bus service (the number 36 between High Wycombe and Bourne End via Flackwell Heath and Marlow Hill) although northern parts of the site are not within 400m of any route.</p> <p>Combined with gradient differences between the site and the rest of High Wycombe town, this means</p>

	<p>that the site is relatively inaccessible.</p> <p>The transport study highlights that there will be a mix of transport impacts, the most significant on the M40 and the southern and eastern areas of High Wycombe, There is a significant increase in traffic volume on the M40 to the east of Junction 4, but correspondingly there are reductions in traffic for the eastbound offslip at Junction 4, and also for traffic using the dedicated slip road from the A404 (T) to the M40 (west).</p> <p>Land use developments in the southern quadrant and Gomm Valley directly benefit from the new junction. Significant reductions in traffic volumes are shown on the route from Heath End Road west of Spring Lane, on to Daws Hill Lane and through to Marlow Hill and Handy Cross, with around 200 vehicles removed in each direction.</p> <p>Increases in traffic on local roads are seen as a result of traffic travelling to and from the development site from the east affecting the A40 London Road, Kingsmead Road, Abbey Barn Lane and Spring Road.</p> <p>Further afield, areas including Flackwell Heath, Wooburn Town and Bourne End benefit in terms of access to the M40 for journeys associated with destinations to the west via Oxfordshire and the south via the Thames Valley. The resulting alternative north-south route in the eastern part of the town redistributes traffic volumes away from Marlow Hill and Daws Hill Lane.</p> <p>Public transport accessibility to the site is poor and would need to be improved and there may be scope</p>
--	--

		<p>for this by connecting to public transport improvements associated with Handy Cross Hub, RAF Daws Hill and Abbey Barn South.</p> <p>The extent of mitigation packages is subject to further testing and assessment</p>
Environmental objectives summary		Overall there is scope for this option to have significant negative environmental impacts, especially in terms of the impact on the AONB, and other locally important landscape and the loss of high grade agricultural land. The impact is subject to further detailed assessment especially in relation to the transport objectives, where impacts will depend on the mitigation package and landscape assessment.
8. Population – Housing	?/+	Potential to provide a limited number of homes, but dependant on location and suitability of former landfill site for development.
9. Accessibility	?/-	The proposed allocation is predominantly for business development and the residential element is most likely to be adjacent to Flackwell Heath, whose village centre has a small range of services and facilities.
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?/--	Development in this area could also have a negative impact as a result of eroding the gap between High Wycombe and Flackwell Heath as well as being visible from the Gomm Valley. However, this option would provide significant new employment development and job opportunities in a location close to the majority of the working population in the district which may provide social benefits. ,
11. Health	?	Precise effects uncertain at this stage.
Social Objectives Summary		Overall potential there may be some limited positive social impacts as a result of providing jobs and a potentially a limited number of new homes, but wider potential impacts about how development in this location would integrate with the communities it adjoins, and potentially leads to their coalescence.
12. A strong and sustainable	++	Allocation of this site would promote economic development and increase the competitiveness of the local economy, creating new business floorspace on a site of sufficient size to meet a range of different

economy		needs.
13. Levels of employment	++	The amount of land available means that a range of unit sizes could be provided as well as a mix of industrial/warehouse and office uses, in addition the development would contribute towards accommodating the projected increase in jobs forecast.
14. Education, skills and training	++	Potential to create links with Amersham and Wycombe College which is adjacent to the site, as well as increase the labour supply from additional housing.
15. Business and economic development	++	The development of a mix of new industrial and office allows would provide new premises for existing businesses, attract new business and support the diversification of the economy especially through the provision of warehousing
Economic Objectives Summary	Overall very positive impact on economic objectives	

CW2: Ashwells

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Housing	Ashwells could provide for approximately 85-110 dwellings. Under this option, the developable area of the site would be 4ha out of the 6.5ha total site area. This would avoid the very sensitive landscape area in the west of the site.

B	Housing and Business	Due to the size,nature and location of the site and developable area outlined above, business development is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. It is not considered to be a commercially attractive location for business. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.
----------	----------------------	---

Outcome of full appraisal

OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE		
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	?/0	There are no designations on the site although it adjoins a hedgerow designated as a biological notification site (BNS) at its southern end. There is scope to mitigate impacts here be providing a landscaped buffer at the southern boundary of the site where it adjoins this hedgerow. The precise nature of the impact would therefore depend upon the effectiveness of such mitigation.
2. Landscape and Countryside	?/-	The site has been assessed in the landscape assessment as part of the wider Gomm Valley site, incorporating Ashwells. The overall sensitivity of this wider site to development is moderate-high. The rolling topography and the expansive intervisibility of the valley with the wider landscape is an important characteristic, as is the setting that the undeveloped and wooded slopes play in providing a setting for High Wycombe in the valley floor. On Ashwells in particular, the sloping landform on the west of the site enables attractive views to and from Micklefield and King's Wood, whereas the eastern fields are more contained by topography and existing vegetation. Therefore, whilst there is the potential for negative impacts, there is also scope for mitigation including by avoiding the western field of the site as this is the area of greatest landscape sensitivity.
3. Heritage and Townscape	0	There are no conservation areas or listed buildings within the site, although the site includes the northern tip of the archaeological notification site (ANS), the vast majority of which falls within Gomm Valley. Here, evidence of stone age, iron and and Romano-British habitation has been found.

		There is therefore the potential for development there to have negative impacts. However mitigation is possible through avoiding development on the ANS and maintaining appropriate buffers where appropriate.
4. Water and Flooding	0	<p>Water resources: As this is not a previously-developed site, development there would increase water consumption on the site and the demand for waste water facilities. However, Thames Water does not anticipate any significant issues in terms of the water supply and the sewage network.</p> <p>Flooding: The site is in Flood Zone 1, so is low-risk from a fluvial flood risk point of view, although the site has the potential risk of other forms of flood risk such as surface-water run-off. Through the steps set out in DSA Policy DM17, including the production of a Flood Risk Assessment and the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), increased flood risk from development on greenfield land should be mitigated.</p>
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	?/+	<p>The option would present opportunities to increase energy-efficiency through sustainable building practices, thus maximising the potential for renewable energy and promotion of sustainable management of waste. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM18 would help ensure that development here reduces carbon emissions through the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources and use a design which allows for adaptation to climate change.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of these implementation measures.</p>
6. Best use of land, including soil	-	<p>Development on the site would encompass the loss of greenfield land – therefore negative effects on this objective are likely. However, it is presumed that development under this option would avoid the western segment of the site; therefore the loss of greenfield land would be limited.</p> <p>The site contains some Grade 3a agricultural land. Development here would therefore involve some loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>

7. Transport	?/--	<p>Ashwells is in Accessibility Zone 5. Most of the site is not within 400m of a regular bus service although the northern edge of the site does fall within 400m of the more than half-hourly number 31 service between Penn and Downley (via High Wycombe town centre). Even with the policy framework of DSA Policy DM2, it would be difficult to improve public transport in the long-term in this location.</p> <p>The option would have an adverse impact on the highway network. Improvement and mitigation measures would be needed, and also improvements to pedestrian/cycle routes to and within the site would need to be provided.</p> <p>A full transport assessment would be required to identify the likely impact of development and the extent of mitigating measures. Vehicular access off Ashwells would be needed, as well as secondary emergency access.</p> <p>Contributions towards improving local bus services would be needed to mitigate negative effects.</p>
Environmental objectives summary	There are likely to be negative effects on environmental objectives under this option, although avoiding development on the western fields would provide significant mitigation on landscape objectives. The potential significant negative effects on transport objectives would be difficult to mitigate fully.	
8. Population – Housing	+	This option would provide some affordable housing and contribute towards meeting overall housing requirements.
9. Accessibility to services and facilities	?/--	<p>The site is poorly located in relation to many facilities; none are within 500m (Tylers Green First School is just over 500m away; Tylers Green Middle School is close to the site).</p> <p>The site is approximately 4km away from the wide range of facilities and employment opportunities available in High Wycombe town centre and approximately 3km away from the small range of facilities and employment opportunities in Hazlemere district centre. Given the scale of the potential development it would be difficult to mitigate against this lack of accessibility.</p> <p>Development would have to integrate well into the urban area, and financial contributions towards some services could be sought, as part of the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)</p>

		framework.
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?/--	Development under this option would raise major concerns about community identity by closing the strategic gap between High Wycombe and Tylers Green. Loss of community identity could be mitigated by maintenance of a gap between High Wycombe and Tylers Green as part of any development proposals, although this is largely dependent upon development at Gomm Valley meeting this mitigation requirement. There would be opportunities to incorporate good connections to existing communities and facilities but the precise impact would depend on the scale and design of development.
11. Health	?/0	<p>Development would exacerbate open space deficiency Recreational facilities (pitches) are within 800m of the site but as these are school facilities (at Tylers Green Middle School) they are restricted access. Nearby semi-natural open space at King’s Wood offers unrestricted access. Sports club on Elm Road (at the edge of the 800m buffer) offers potential access (this is outside the District boundary).</p> <p>The site offers scope for provision of allotments and other open space, including amenity space, play/teen facilities and a landscaped buffer. Retention of footpaths through the site would be required.</p> <p>The site forms part of the District’s Green Infrastructure Network running north-west towards King’s Wood, and to the open countryside to the east. Any options would therefore be expected to deliver the enhancements specified in DSA Policy DM11.</p> <p>Financial contributions may be obtained towards improvement of these facilities and accessibility to them – as well as to any improvements to local health facilities - through the Council’s Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) framework.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of the mitigation measures.</p>

<i>Social Objectives Summary</i>	There could be significant negative effects on objectives 9 and 10 in the absence of any significant and effective mitigation measures, which may be difficult to deliver. The option would provide benefits in terms of contribution to housing and potentially open space facilities.	
<i>12. A strong and sustainable economy</i>	0	No employment opportunities are proposed under this option.
<i>13. Levels of employment</i>	0	No employment opportunities are proposed under this option.
<i>14. Education, skills and training</i>	+	Housing on the site would add to the labour supply.
<i>15. Business and economic development</i>	0	No direct effect as a result of this option.
<i>Economic Objectives Summary</i>	No direct effects other than contributions to the labour supply resulting from new housing.	

CW3: Slate Meadow

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Housing	Slate Meadow could provide for approximately 150-200 dwellings. Under this option, the developable area of the site would be 6.3ha out of the 10.3ha total site area. This would avoid the village green on the north of the site.
B	Housing and Business	Due to the size, nature and location of the site and developable area outlined above, business development is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. It is unlikely to be attractive for commercial business developers. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.
C	Housing (potentially with business) covering a larger site area within the site.	Due to the village green designation on the northern segment of the site, a larger developable area on the site is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.

Outcome of full appraisal

OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE		
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	?/0	There are no biodiversity designations on the site but the site supports two Priority Habitats – rivers and hedgerows. The River Wye flows along the southern boundary of the site and the River Wye Biodiversity Opportunity Area (BOA) spans 250m either side of it. The site forms part of a network of semi-natural habitats including hedgerows. There are also several areas of young woodland on the

		<p>site.</p> <p>The function of the site as a habitat link is an important one and any development option here would need to provide mitigation/ enhancement in the form of hedgerow reinstatement and retention of the tree-lined buffer at the north-west corner of the site.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would therefore depend upon the effectiveness of such mitigation measures.</p>
2. Landscape and Countryside	?/-	<p>The site is adjacent to a local landscape area and development here would impact on views into and out of the site from the valley sides, although the site itself is a small-scale landscape with a somewhat unkempt appearance. There is scope for mitigation in the form of avoiding large-scale or high-density development which would negatively impact on the intervisibility of the site and the valley sides, and retention of the tree-lined buffer in the north-west of the site. Development which spanned the entire frontage would alter the function of the site as a visual break between Bourne End and Wooburn.</p> <p>The precise impact of this option would depend on the scale and design of development.</p>
3. Heritage and Townscape	0	<p>There are no conservation areas or listed buildings within the site, and there are no recorded/observed historic features on the site.</p>
4. Water and Flooding	?/-	<p>Water resources: As this is not a previously-developed site, development there would increase water consumption on the site and the demand for waste water facilities. However, Thames Water does not anticipate any significant issues in terms of the water supply and the sewage network, subject to capacity testing and network upgrades.</p> <p>Flooding: A large portion of the site falls within Flood Zone 2, so is medium-risk from a fluvial flood risk point of view (and the river course is Flood Zone 3), and the site has the potential risk of other forms of flood risk such as surface-water run-off. Mitigation could be provided via measures such as Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) but a sequential test and exceptions test would be required under the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework and the steps set out in DSA Policy DM17, including the production of a Flood Risk Assessment.</p>
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	?/+	<p>The option would present opportunities to increase energy-efficiency through sustainable building practices, thus maximising the potential for renewable energy and promotion of sustainable management of waste. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM18 would help ensure that development here reduces carbon emissions through the use of decentralised and renewable or low</p>

		<p>carbon sources and use a design which allows for adaptation to climate change.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of these implementation measures.</p>
6. Best use of land, including soil	-	<p>Development on the site would encompass the loss of greenfield land – therefore negative effects on this objective are likely. However, it is presumed that development under this option would avoid the northern segment of the site designated as a village green; therefore the loss of greenfield land would be limited to some extent.</p> <p>Much of the site is Grade 2 agricultural land. Therefore development would mean the loss of some best and most versatile agricultural land.</p>
7. Transport	?	<p>Slate Meadow is in Accessibility Zone 4. The site is in a peripheral location for the District’s main town of High Wycombe, but it is currently served by frequent bus services running on the route between Bourne End and High Wycombe. These run directly adjacent to the site. There is also a railway service from Bourne End providing connections with the Great Western Main Line. A cycle route is also located adjacent to the site.</p> <p>The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM2 offers scope for further mitigation. For example, development could help secure further improvements to public transport in the area, including potentially a bus service through the site and a park-and-walk facility for the adjacent St Paul’s Primary School, and traffic management could ensure traffic issues associated with new development are managed in a way to mitigate their impact on the highway network.</p> <p>The option would have an adverse impact on the highway network. Improvement and mitigation measures would be needed, and also improvements to pedestrian/cycle routes to and within the site would need to be provided.</p> <p>A full transport assessment would be required to identify the likely impact of development and the extent of mitigating measures. Vehicular access off Stratford Drive and Willows Road and/or Frank Lunnon Close would be needed. Pedestrian/cycle access onto Stratford Drive and Willows Road/Frank Lunnon Close would be required, as well as pedestrian/cycle access onto the former</p>

		<p>Bourne End-High Wycombe railway line and the retention/improvement of footpaths through the site.</p> <p>Contributions towards improving local bus services would be needed to mitigate negative effects.</p>
Environmental objectives summary		There is the potential for some negative effect on environmental objectives but with scope for mitigation possible under several of the objectives.
8. Population – Housing	+	This option would provide some affordable housing and contribute towards meeting overall housing requirements.
9. Accessibility to services and facilities	?/-	<p>The site is close to a primary school and to local employment facilities. However it is between 800m and 1km from the moderate range of facilities and employment opportunities at Bourne End village centre and approximately 7km from the wide range of facilities and employment opportunities in High Wycombe town centre (and a similar distance from the wide range of facilities and employment opportunities at Maidenhead town centre).</p> <p>Development would have to integrate well into the urban area, and financial contributions towards some services could be sought, including to GP surgeries and schools, as part of the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) framework.</p>
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?/--	Development under this option raises concerns about community identity by closing the strategic gap between Bourne End and Wooburn, although some low density development already occupies the gap to the south east of the site. Loss of community identity could be mitigated by maintenance of a gap between the two settlements as part of any development proposals. There would be opportunities to incorporate good connections to existing communities and facilities but the precise impact would be depend on the scale and design of development.
11. Health	?/0	<p>Development would exacerbate open space deficiency although part of the site is designated as a village green and used for informal recreation, and this area could not be developed due to this designation.</p> <p>Recreational facilities (pitches) are close to the site but as these are school facilities they are restricted</p>

		<p>access. Nearby semi-natural open space at King's Wood offers unrestricted access.</p> <p>Sporting and leisure facilities at Wooburn Park are located at the edge of the 800m buffer from the site.</p> <p>Sites offers scope for amenity space (in the form of the village green), play/teen facilities and potentially space for pitch sport. Retention and improvement of footpaths through the site would be required.</p> <p>The site forms part of the District's Green Infrastructure Network running north-west towards King's Wood, and to the open countryside to the east. Any options would therefore be expected to deliver the enhancements specified in DSA Policy DM11.</p> <p>Financial contributions may be obtained towards improvement of these facilities and accessibility to them – as well as to any improvements to local health facilities - through the Council's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) framework.</p> <p>The precise nature of the impact would depend upon the effectiveness of the mitigation measures.</p>
Social Objectives Summary		There is the potential for significant negative effects on the place-making objective due to the risk of coalescence of Bourne End and Wooburn which could result from this option. The precise nature of the impact on this, and the other social objectives, would be dependent on the design of any scheme coming forward under this option as well as the effectiveness of the various mitigation measures which would be required.
12. A strong and sustainable economy	0	No employment opportunities are proposed under this option.
13. Levels of	0	No employment opportunities are proposed under this option.

employment		
14. Education, skills and training	+	Housing on the site would add to the labour supply.
15. Business and economic development	0	No direct effect as a result of this option.
Economic Objectives Summary		No direct effect other than the addition to the labour supply which would result from housing development on the site.

Marlow Sites

CW4: Westhorpe

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Area of agricultural land approximately 20 ha located adjacent to the Westhorpe junction of the A404 and the A4155 south of the A4155, on the eastern side of Marlow.	This option involves a new Business Park with potential to provide up to 10 ha of new employment land.

Outcome of full appraisal

	OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE	
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	+	No biodiversity designations specifically on-site, scope to increase biodiversity through landscaping on the site
2. Landscape and Countryside	?/0	Site is immediately south of the Chilterns AONB, the northern boundary being the A4155 is also the southern boundary of the AONB as such it is in a sensitive location. It is also within the Little Marlow Gravel Pits policy area and this option has potential to contribute towards delivery of a Country Park in this area
3. Heritage and	0	Immediately to the south of the site is Westhorpe House which is a grade 2 listed building

Townscape		
4. Water and Flooding	0	Small part of the site is in flood risk zone 2, adjacent to little marlow gravel pits
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	?/+	This development would present opportunities to increase energy-efficiency through sustainable building practices, thus maximising the potential for renewable energy and promotion of sustainable management of waste. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM18 would help ensure that developments under all three options reduce carbon emissions through the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources and use a design which allows for adaptation to climate change.
6. Best use of land, including soil	0	Development on the site would result in the significant loss of greenfield land, however, the site was previously used as a landfill site between 1978 and 1983, so the agricultural land quality is poor
7. Transport	?	The site falls within Accessibility Zone 5, public transport accessibility is unknown, potential impact on the Westhorpe junction and mitigation measures may be required to ensure safe egress and access to the site and junction. The road access to Westhorpe Farm crosses the site and the access to the farm would also be affected by a development in this location.
Environmental objectives summary	Overall this option has neutral impacts on the environmental objectives	
8. Population – Housing	0	No housing is proposed in this option
9. Accessibility	+	No housing is proposed in this option, but there would be scope to provide facilities on site for the working population including public space.

10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?/0	This option would provide significant new employment development and job opportunities in a location close to the majority of the working population in the district, the development would potentially be of high quality and designed to minimise landscape impact. This could offset the fact that development in this location could also have a negative impact as a result of being adjacent to the AONB and in the Green Belt
11. Health	?	
Social Objectives Summary	Overall this option has neutral impacts on the social objectives	
12. A strong and sustainable economy	++	Allocation of this site would promote economic development and increase the competitiveness of the local economy, creating new business floorspace in a location attractive to the commercial property market.
13. Levels of employment	++	The amount of land available means that a range of unit sizes could be provided as well as a mix of industrial/warehouse and office uses, in addition the development would contribute towards accommodating the projected increase in jobs forecast.
14. Education, skills and training	++	This option would create opportunities for skilled residents to work in the District
15. Business and economic development	++	The development of an office based business park would provide new premises for existing businesses, attract new business and support the change in the district economy through the provision of new quality and accessible office space
Economic Objectives Summary	Overall very positive impact on economic objectives	

Princes Risborough sites

PR2: Park Mill Farm

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Housing only.	Park Mill Farm could provide for approximately 375-500 homes on a developable area on the site of approximately 17.7ha out of the total site area of 26.5ha.
B	Housing and business	Park Mill Farm could provide a mix of housing and business development. However, the evidence base indicates that the site would not be suitable for business so this is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.
C	Development covering a larger developable area on the site than Option A above.	Due to the need for a buffer between the adjacent Princes Risborough Sewate Works and residential development on Park Mill Farm, this option is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.

Outcome of full appraisal

OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE		
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	?/0	Effects on biodiversity are unlikely to be significant as the majority of the site is actively cultivated arable land and there are no nature conservation designations on the site or nearby. Key ecological interests are the stream and associated trees in the northwest of the site, hedgerows and scrub. Key species include bats and badgers, for which mitigation measures may be required. All development proposals should be designed to maximise biodiversity as set out in DSA Policy DM11 – there is scope for enhancement through the provision of wildlife corridors across the site and along the access spur. Boundary vegetation should be retained and an appropriate buffer to the watercourse provided.
2. Landscape and Countryside	?/0	The overall landscape sensitivity of the site is moderate – low so development here would be unlikely to have a major significant effect. However, the impact of design and development density on views from the Chiltern escarpment should be considered, and the precise nature of the impact will depend on the effectiveness of such issues to provide mitigation. This mitigation should include retention of views from the site to the escarpment and town features such as the church spire. Appropriate buffers will be required around the sewage works and builders yard. Mitigation opportunities include the definition of a strong outer landscape boundary to contain development and confirm separation from Longwick. The site offers potential for new managed green space.
3. Heritage and Townscape	0	There are no conservation areas on the site, though development may affect the setting of Alscot conservation area. As a potential greenfield extension to the existing built up area of Princes Risborough, development will need to integrate well with the rest of the town, respecting the existing townscape.
4. Water and Flooding	?/-	Water resources: As this is not a previously-developed site, development here would increase water consumption and the demand for waste water facilities. The water supply network in the area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development, and an upgrade of the

		<p>waste water system would be required.</p> <p>Flooding: A small area in the far south east corner of the site could be vulnerable to flooding. Through the steps set out in DSA Policy DM17, including the production of a Flood Risk Assessment and the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), increased flood risk from new development should be mitigated.</p>
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	?/+	<p>The option would present opportunities to increase energy efficiency through sustainable building practices, maximising the potential for renewable energy and promotion of the sustainable management of waste. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM18 will help ensure that carbon emissions are reduced through the use of decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources. Similarly, site and building design should allow for adaptation to climate change. The precise nature of the impact would depend on the effectiveness of these implementation measures.</p>
6. Best use of land, including soil	--	<p>As a predominantly greenfield site, over 50% of the site is grade 2 agricultural land, with a further 16% grade 3A agricultural land. This therefore represents a loss of productive land for farming. A very small part of the site is previously-developed land, but this option would represent a significant loss of greenfield land.</p>
7. Transport	?/--	<p>The site presents difficulties in terms of accessibility because of the barrier effect of the Aylesbury railway line, which inhibits the integration of the site with the rest of Princes Risborough. Safe, grade-separated, routes for pedestrians and cyclists will need to be provided across the railway line.</p> <p>Access to bus services is poor as the site is remote from existing frequent services. Opportunities for mitigation include a contribution to enhanced / re-routed services linking the development to the town and railway station. A small part of the site is within 800m walking distance of the railway station. Traffic from the development will increase pressure on the town road network. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM2 offers some scope for mitigation under this objective. However the level of development on this site would not be likely to enable the delivery of the major road infrastructure needed to provide fuller mitigation of the potential negative effects identified.</p> <p>The relatively unattractiveness of Princes Risborough for new business means most new residents</p>

		<p>would have to commute out of the town to find work, adding pressure to the local and inter-urban road network.</p> <p>Opportunities for people to work locally (and hence travel more sustainably) are limited as the economy study shows that the north of the district is less attractive to business.</p>
Environmental objectives summary		Overall, a number of the environmental objectives are capable of being addressed through mitigation and enhancement measures. There is, however, no replacement for agricultural land, and while the site could deliver some transport improvements, there are limited opportunities to reduce the need for travel by car and mitigate the effects of the increased volume of traffic generated by development.
8. Population – Housing	++	The site could provide for approximately 380-500 homes, contributing significantly to the overall housing requirements of the District and providing a range of types and tenure, including affordable housing.
9. Accessibility to services and facilities	?/--	While the site could provide some on-site facilities (public and green space, community hall and shops), difficulties referred to above in Transport relating to the severance aspects of the railway line and the provision of public transport may limit accessibility to wider services such as schools, doctor's surgeries and leisure facilities, with most of these being more than 500m from most parts of the site.
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?/-	<p>This objective depends largely on the quality of the design of the development, and the mix of building types and tenures. There is a risk that the development would be remote from, and poorly related to, the existing community. Key aspects here are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhance / preserve the identity of Princes Risborough • create meaningful physical links across the railway to the existing built-up area • avoid coalescence with Longwick village.
11. Health	?	Access to healthcare and leisure services may be limited. Opportunities to walk and cycle safely will depend on the development delivering meaningful links to the town, however, close access to the

		countryside and Rights of Way offers opportunities for healthy recreation, together with any open or green space provided within the development. Increased traffic from development may have an adverse impact on air quality at certain junctions in the town, while train movements on the railway lines on the boundary of the site may produce unwanted noise effects in new development. An appropriate buffer area should be provided around the sewage works to minimise odour effects on the development.
Social Objectives Summary		The site provides clear potential to assist in the delivery of homes and some supporting social infrastructure to go towards creating a sustainable community. There are however significant concerns about the ability to address issues of wider access and integration into Princes Risborough – robust solutions would be required.
12. A strong and sustainable economy	0	The current option does not include employment uses, but neither would it result in the loss of any existing employment use. Some employment would be generated in association with the construction of the development. A local centre will promote vitality within the development, while direct and safe links to the town centre will help increase footfall there.
13. Levels of employment	0	Development on this site is not likely to have any appreciable long-term effects on levels of employment. Future occupants of the site may have to travel further to reach likely places of work.
14. Education, skills and training	++	Development on this site is not likely to have any appreciable long-term effects on education, skills and training, though the development will be expected to contribute to local schools provision. The significant amounts of housing capable of being delivered under this option would entail a significant addition to the labour supply.
15. Business and economic development	0	This site is not currently identified as an appropriate location for business growth so not expected to contribute significantly to business and economic development
Economic Objectives		Overall, the site does not have significant economic effects, other than the significant addition to the labour supply which would result from the new housing quanta envisaged under this option. The lack of local

Summary	employment may lead to increased commuting from the housing development.
----------------	--

PR3a: North of Longwick Road

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Housing only	North of Longwick Road could provide for approximately 280-370 homes on a developable area on the site of approximately 13.1ha out of the total site area of 18.5ha.
B	Housing and business	North of Longwick Road could provide a mix of housing and business development. However, the evidence base indicates that there is unlikely to be scope for significant additional business development in Princes Risborough in addition to existing areas and commitments so this is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.
C	Development covering a larger developable area on the site than Option A above.	Due to the need to provide a buffer between the adjacent Alscot Conservation Area and development on North of Longwick Road, as well as the greater landscape sensitivity of the west of the site, this option is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.

Outcome of full appraisal

OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE		
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Summary
1. Biodiversity and Geodiversity	?/-	The site is of low – moderate ecological interest so effects on biodiversity are unlikely to be significant. There are no nature conservation designations on the site but a Biological Notification Site (BNS) lies a short distance to the northwest of the site. Key ecological interests are the stream, scrub, trees and hedgerows. All development proposals should be designed to maximise biodiversity as set out in DSA Policy DM11 – there is scope for enhancement through the provision of wildlife corridors across the site. Boundary vegetation should be retained and appropriate buffers to the watercourse, tree belt and BNS in the northwest provided.
2. Landscape and Countryside	?/-	<p>The overall sensitivity of the site is moderate so development here would be likely to have some effect. Some of the key characteristics and qualities of the landscape are vulnerable to change from development, especially towards the west of the site. The impact of design and development density on views from the Chiltern escarpment should be considered, and the precise nature of the impact will depend on the ability of such issues to provide effective mitigation. This mitigation should include retention of views from the site to the escarpment and town features such as the church spire. The structural vegetation of trees and hedgerows along the stream and field boundaries should be conserved and enhanced.</p> <p>The site offers potential for new managed green space.</p>
3. Heritage and Townscape	?/0	<p>The site is close to the Alscot conservation area and is likely to affect the setting so an appropriate gap should be provided between the hamlet and any potential development.</p> <p>As a potential greenfield extension to the existing built up area of Princes Risborough, development will need to integrate well with the rest of the town, respecting the existing townscape.</p>

4. Water and Flooding	-	<p>Water resources: As this is not a previously-developed site, development here would increase water consumption and the demand for waste water facilities. The water supply network in the area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development, and an upgrade of the waste water system would be required.</p> <p>Flooding: Through the steps set out in DSA Policy DM17, including the production of a Flood Risk Assessment and the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), increased flood risk from new development should be mitigated.</p>
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	?/+	<p>The option would present opportunities to increase energy efficiency through sustainable building practices, maximising the potential for renewable energy and promotion of the sustainable management of waste. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM18 will help ensure that carbon emissions are reduced through the use of decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources. Similarly, site and building design should allow for adaptation to climate change. The precise nature of the impact would depend on the effectiveness of these implementation measures.</p>
6. Best use of land, including soil	--	<p>This greenfield site is mostly grade 2 or 3A agricultural land with no previously developed land. This therefore represents a loss of productive land for farming, as well as the loss of greenfield land.</p>
7. Transport	?/--	<p>The site presents difficulties in terms of accessibility because of the barrier effect of the Aylesbury railway line, which inhibits the integration of the site with the rest of Princes Risborough. Safe, grade-separated, routes for pedestrians and cyclists will need to be provided across the railway line.</p> <p>Access to bus services is poor as the site is remote from existing frequent services. Opportunities for mitigation include a contribution to enhanced / re-routed services linking the development to the town and railway stations. The site is within walking distance of Monks Risborough railway station, which has lower frequency services compared to the main station. Traffic from the development will increase pressure on the town road network. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM2 offers some scope for mitigation under this objective. However the level of development on this site would not be likely to enable the delivery of the major road infrastructure needed to provide fuller mitigation of the</p>

		<p>potential negative effects identified.</p> <p>The relatively unattractiveness of Princes Risborough for new business means most new residents would have to commute out of the town to find work, adding pressure to the local and inter-urban road network.</p> <p>Opportunities for people to work locally (and hence travel more sustainably) are limited as the economy study shows that the north of the district is less attractive to business.</p>
Environmental objectives summary		Overall, the site can go some way to meeting environmental objectives through mitigation and enhancement measures. There is, however, no replacement for agricultural land, and while the site could deliver some transport improvements, there are limited opportunities to reduce the need for travel by car and mitigate the potential significant effects of the increased volume of traffic generated by development.
8. Population – Housing	+	The site could provide for approximately 280-370 homes, contributing to the overall housing requirements of the District and providing a range of types and tenure, including affordable housing.
9. Accessibility to services and facilities	?/-	While the site could provide some on-site facilities (formal sports provision and informal open space), difficulties referred to above in Transport relating to the severance aspects of the railway line and the provision of public transport may limit accessibility to wider services such as schools, doctor's surgeries and leisure facilities, with most of these being more than 500m from the site.
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?/-	<p>This objective depends largely on the quality of the design of the development, and the mix of building types and tenures. There is a risk that the development would be remote from, and poorly related to, the existing community. Key aspects here are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhance / preserve the identity of Princes Risborough • create meaningful physical links across the railway to the existing built-up area. • avoid coalescence with Longwick village.

11. Health	?	Access to healthcare and leisure services may be limited. Opportunities to walk and cycle safely will depend on the development delivering meaningful links to the town, however, close access to the countryside and Rights of Way offers opportunities for healthy recreation, together with any open or green space provided within the development. Increased traffic from development may have an adverse impact on air quality at certain junctions in the town, while train movements on the railway line on the boundary of the site may produce unwanted noise effects in new development.
Social Objectives Summary	The site provides clear potential to assist in the delivery of homes and some supporting social infrastructure to go towards creating a sustainable community. There are however significant concerns about the ability to address issues of wider access and integration into Princes Risborough should be sought – robust solutions would be required..	
12. A strong and sustainable economy	0	The current option does not include employment uses, but neither would it result in the loss of any existing employment use. Some employment would be generated in association with the construction of the development. Direct and safe links to the town centre will help increase footfall there.
13. Levels of employment	0	Development on this site is not likely to have any appreciable long-term effects on levels of employment. Future occupants of the site may have to travel further to reach likely places of work.
14. Education, skills and training	+	Development on this site is not likely to have any appreciable long-term effects on education, skills and training, though the development will be expected to contribute to local schools provision and the additional housing envisaged under this option would add to the labour supply.
15. Business and economic development	0	This site is not currently identified as an appropriate location for business growth so not expected to have any direct effect to business and economic development
Economic Objectives	Whilst adding to the labour supply, the option would not be likely to have significant economic effects. The lack	

Summary	of local employment may lead to increased commuting from the housing development.
----------------	---

PR3b: Mill Lane

Summary of potential options and reasons for selections for full appraisal

Option	Description/Source	Commentary including reason for selecting (for full appraisal) or rejecting option
A	Housing only	Mill Lane could provide for approximately 135-180 homes
B	Housing and business	Mill Lane could provide for a mix of housing and business. However the evidence base suggests there is unlikely to be scope for significant additional business development in Princes Risborough in addition to existing areas and commitments, and together with the location of the site, means this option is not considered to be a reasonable alternative. Therefore no detailed appraisal of this option has been carried out.

Outcome of full appraisal

OPTIONS CONSULTATION STAGE		
Sustainability Objective	Option A	Summary
1. Biodiversity and	?/0	Assessment of ecological issues on this site rates them as low, so there is unlikely to be a significant effect from development. Key ecological interests are hedgerows, trees and scrub in the context of

Geodiversity		intensively-farmed arable fields. All development proposals should be designed to maximise biodiversity as set out in DSA Policy DM11 – there is scope for enhancement through the provision of wildlife corridors across the site. Boundary vegetation should be retained.
2. Landscape and Countryside	?/0	The overall sensitivity of the site is moderate – low so development here would be unlikely to have a major significant effect. However, the impact of design and development density on views from the Chiltern escarpment should be considered, and the precise nature of the impact will depend on the ability of such issues to provide effective mitigation. This mitigation should include retention of views from the site to the escarpment. The site offers potential for new managed green space.
3. Heritage and Townscape	0	The site does not contain any historic features or buildings. As a potential greenfield extension to the existing built up area of Princes Risborough, development will need to integrate well with the rest of the town, respecting the existing townscape.
4. Water and Flooding	?/-	Water resources: As this is not a previously-developed site, development here would increase water consumption and the demand for waste water facilities. The water supply network in the area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from this development, and an upgrade of the waste water system would be required. Flooding: A small area in the far south east corner of the site could be vulnerable to flooding. Through the steps set out in DSA Policy DM17, including the production of a Flood Risk Assessment and the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), increased flood risk from new development should be mitigated.
5. Energy efficiency, climate change and waste	?/+	The option would present opportunities to increase energy efficiency through sustainable building practices, maximising the potential for renewable energy and promotion of the sustainable management of waste. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM18 will help ensure that carbon emissions are reduced through the use of decentralised and renewable or low-carbon sources. Similarly, site and building design should allow for adaptation to climate change. The precise nature of the impact would depend on the effectiveness of these implementation measures.
6. Best use of land, including	-	The site is Grade 3B agricultural land so the option would not entail any loss of best and most versatily agricultural land. However, no part of the site is previously-developed, so the option would represent

soil		the loss of some greenfield land.
7. Transport	?/--	<p>The site presents difficulties in terms of accessibility because of the barrier effect of the Aylesbury railway line, which inhibits the integration of the site with the rest of Princes Risborough. Safe, grade-separated, routes for pedestrians and cyclists will need to be provided across the railway line.</p> <p>Access to bus services is poor as the site is remote from existing frequent services. Opportunities for mitigation include a contribution to enhanced / re-routed services linking the development to the town and railway stations. The site is within walking distance of Monks Risborough railway station, which has lower frequency services compared to the main station. Traffic from the development will increase pressure on the town road network. The effective implementation of DSA Policy DM2 offers some scope for mitigation under this objective. However the level of development on this site would not be likely to enable the delivery of the major road infrastructure needed to provide fuller mitigation of the potential negative effects identified.</p> <p>The relatively unattractiveness of Princes Risborough for new business means most new residents would have to commute out of the town to find work, adding pressure to the local and inter-urban road network.</p> <p>Opportunities for people to work locally (and hence travel more sustainably) are limited as the economy study shows that the north of the district is less attractive to business.</p>
Environmental objectives summary		Overall, most environmental objectives are capable of being met through mitigation and enhancement measures. There is, however, no replacement for agricultural land, and while the site could deliver some transport improvements, there are limited opportunities to reduce the need for travel by car and mitigate the potentially significant effects of the increased volume of traffic generated by development.
8. Population –	+	The site could provide for approximately 130-180 homes, contributing to the overall housing

Housing		requirements of the District and providing a range of types and tenure, including affordable housing.
9. Accessibility to services and facilities	?/-	While the site could provide some limited on-site facilities (public and green space), difficulties referred to above in Transport relating to the severance aspects of the railway line and the provision of public transport may limit accessibility to wider services such as schools, doctor's surgeries and leisure facilities, with most of these being more than 500m from the site. The site is some distance from the main facilities in Princes Risborough town centre.
10. Place-making – Creating Sustainable Communities	?/-	This objective depends largely on the quality of the design of the development, and the mix of building types and tenures. There is a risk that the development would be remote from, and poorly related to, the existing community. Key aspects here are to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhance / preserve the identity of Princes Risborough • create meaningful physical links across the railway to the existing built-up area • avoid coalescence with Longwick village.
11. Health	?	Access to healthcare and leisure services may be limited. Opportunities to walk and cycle safely will depend on the development delivering meaningful links to the town, however, close access to the countryside and Rights of Way offers opportunities for healthy recreation, together with any open or green space provided within the development. Increased traffic from development may have an adverse impact on air quality at certain junctions in the town, while train movements on the railway line on the boundary of the site may produce unwanted noise effects in new development.
Social Objectives Summary		The site provides clear potential to assist in the delivery of homes and some limited supporting social infrastructure. There are however significant concerns about the ability to address issues of wider access and integration into Princes Risborough- – robust solutions would be required..
12. A strong and sustainable	0	The current option does not include employment uses, but neither would it result in the loss of any existing employment use. Some employment would be generated in association with the construction

economy		of the development. Direct and safe links to the town centre will increase footfall there.
13. Levels of employment	0	Development on this site is not likely to have any appreciable long-term effects on levels of employment. Future occupants of the site may have to travel further to reach likely places of work.
14. Education, skills and training	+	Development on this site is not likely to have any appreciable long-term effects on education, skills and training, though the development will be expected to contribute to local schools provision. Housing on the site would contribute to the labour supply.
15. Business and economic development	0	This site is not currently identified as an appropriate location for business growth so not expected to contribute significantly to business and economic development
Economic Objectives Summary	Although housing on the site would contribute to the labour supply, this site is not likely to have significant economic effects. The lack of local employment may lead to increased commuting from the housing development.	

6. Next steps

6.1 This report along with feedback on this report and wider feedback from the New Local Plan options consultation will inform the future draft New Local Plan. In turn the SA will evolve to appraise the emerging plan as a whole as well as the likely effects of individual options be they strategic or site based.