



**Intelligent Plans**  
and examinations

# **Report on Longwick-cum-Ilmer Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2033**

**An Examination undertaken for Wycombe District Council with the support of the Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council on the August 2017 submission version of the Plan.**

Independent Examiner: Jill Kingaby BSc(Econ) MSc MRTPI

Date of Report: 14 December 2017

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

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

## Contents

	Page
<b>Main Findings - Executive Summary</b>	3
<b>1. Introduction and Background</b>	3
• Longwick-cum-Ilmer Neighbourhood Plan 2017–2033	3
• The Independent Examiner	4
• The Scope of the Examination	4
• The Basic Conditions	5
<b>2. Approach to the Examination</b>	6
• Planning Policy Context	6
• Submitted Documents	7
• Site Visit	7
• Written Representations with or without Public Hearing	7
• Modifications	7
<b>3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights</b>	8
• Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area	8
• Plan Period	8
• Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation	8
• Development and Use of Land	9
• Excluded Development	10
• Human Rights	10
<b>4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions</b>	10
• EU Obligations	10
• Main Issues	10
• Issue 1 - New Housing Development	11
• Issue 2 - Protecting the distinctive rural character of the Parish with its outlying hamlets, countryside and proximity to the Chilterns AONB	17
• Issue 3 - The local economy and community facilities	20
• Issue 4 - Infrastructure including transport and utility services for water, drainage and broadband	22
<b>5. Conclusions</b>	24
• Summary	24
• The Referendum and its Area	24
• Overview	24
<b>Appendix: Modifications</b>	25

## **Main Findings** - Executive Summary

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

I have also concluded that:

- The Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – the Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council;
- The Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – the Parish of Longwick-cum-Ilmer, illustrated in Plan 1, Page 6 of the submitted Neighbourhood Plan;
- The Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect – 2017-33; and
- The policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

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

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

## **1. Introduction and Background**

### *Longwick-cum-Ilmer Neighbourhood Plan 2017- 2033*

- 1.1 Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish is located in the north of Wycombe District, to the north-west of Princes Risborough, and outside the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Parish's population was 1,347 at the time of the 2011 Census. Longwick village is the largest settlement in the Parish. It is linear in form, and extends along the A4129, the old turnpike road between Princes Risborough and Thame. The Parish also includes much rural land and a number of small hamlets, notably Owlswick, Meadle and Little Meadle, Ilmer and part of Horsenden. As Plan 2 in Appendix A of the Neighbourhood Plan indicates, these smaller settlements contain conservation areas reflecting their heritage, significant character and appearance. The B4009 road linking Chinnor to Aylesbury runs close to the south-eastern boundary of the Parish. Longwick is approximately 2 miles from Princes Risborough railway station from where there are services to Birmingham, Aylesbury and London Marylebone. The railway line extends along an embankment close to the south-western edge of Longwick.

- 1.2 The Longwick-cum-Ilmer Neighbourhood Plan (the Plan/LNP) has been prepared by the Neighbourhood Steering Group and its consultants TDRC Ltd, on behalf of the Parish Council. Following the collection of evidence and public consultation for the Longwick Village Capacity Study in 2014, agreement on the need to produce a Neighbourhood Plan was reached at a public meeting convened by the Parish Council in January 2015. An earlier version of the LNP was subject to examination in 2015, and the Examiner recommended that it should proceed to referendum, subject to modifications, in February 2016. However, in view of significant planning applications and appeal decisions around this time, Wycombe District Council recommended that the Neighbourhood Plan should be withdrawn. The Parish Council agreed. My report addresses the revised LNP, submitted for examination in August 2017.

### *The Independent Examiner*

- 1.3 As the Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the LNP by Wycombe District Council, with the agreement of the Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council.
- 1.4 I am a chartered town planner and former Government Planning Inspector, with prior experience examining neighbourhood plans. I am an independent examiner, and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

### *The Scope of the Examination*

- 1.5 As the independent examiner I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
- (a) that the LNP is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
  - (b) that modifications are made and that the modified Neighbourhood Plan is submitted to a referendum; or
  - (c) that the LNP does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 1.6 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)('the 1990 Act'). The examiner must consider:
- Whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions;
  - Whether the Plan complies with provisions under s.38A and s.38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ('the 2004 Act'). These are:

- it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body, for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;
  - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
  - it specifies the period during which it has effect;
  - it does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development';
  - it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area;
  - whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the Plan proceed to referendum; and
- Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended)('the 2012 Regulations').

1.7 I have considered only matters that fall within paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

#### *The Basic Conditions*

1.8 The 'Basic Conditions' are set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, a neighbourhood plan must:

- Have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
- Be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
- Be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations; and
- Meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.

1.9 Regulation 32 of the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the neighbourhood plan should not be likely to have a significant effect on a European Site (as defined in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017) or

a European Offshore Marine Site (as defined in the Offshore Marine Conservation (Natural Habitats etc.) Regulations 2007), either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

## **2. Approach to the Examination**

### *Planning Policy Context*

- 2.1 The Development Plan for this part of Wycombe District Council, excluding policies for minerals and waste development, comprises the Core Strategy adopted in 2008, the Delivery and Site Allocations Plan adopted in 2013, and saved policies from the Wycombe District Local Plan 2004.
- 2.2 The planning policy for England is set out principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented. Reflecting the legislation, Paragraph 184 of the NPPF states that neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. The ambition of the neighbourhood plan should be aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area. Wycombe District Council produced a draft Local Plan – Regulation 19 Version, in October 2017, for consultation ending November 2017. It is scheduled for adoption in 2018 and, like the submitted LNP, provides for the time period 2017-33. I take account of this emerging Local Plan document in my examination, having regard for PPG Reference ID 41-009-20160211, which amongst other things, provides “Although a draft neighbourhood plan or Order is not tested against the policies in an emerging Local Plan the reasoning and evidence informing the Local Plan process is likely to be relevant to the consideration of the basic conditions against which a neighbourhood plan is tested”.
- 2.3 It continues, “For example, up-to-date housing needs evidence is relevant to the question of whether a housing supply policy in a neighbourhood plan or Order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development”. Regarding general conformity with strategic local policy, although the emerging Local Plan is not part of the statutory development plan, there is evidence from the 2014 SHLAA and SHMA and recent appeal decisions<sup>1</sup> that the Core Strategy 2008 is out-of-date in its provision for new housing.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeal decision for land at Ivy Farm, Lower Icknield Way, Longwick, dated 3 August 2017.

### *Submitted Documents*

- 2.4 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents relevant to the examination<sup>2</sup>, including those submitted which comprise:
- the draft LNP 2017-2033, August 2017;
  - Plan1 on Page 6 of the LNP which identifies the area to which the proposed Plan relates;
  - the Consultation Statement, February 2017;
  - the Basic Conditions Statement, August 2017;
  - all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation;
  - the Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion prepared by Wycombe District Council – updated May 2017; and
  - responses from Wycombe District Council and Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council to examiner’s questions, 13<sup>th</sup> November 2017.<sup>3</sup>

### *Site Visit*

- 2.5 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 1 November 2017 to familiarise myself with it, and visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the Plan and evidential documents.

### *Written Representations with or without Public Hearing*

- 2.6 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. The Regulation 16 consultation responses clearly articulated a number of objections to the Plan, and presented arguments for and against the Plan’s suitability to proceed to a referendum. With my procedural letter to Wycombe District Council and the Parish Council, I attached questions which arose from my initial reading of the LNP, from the written background evidence and from consultation responses. The Councils’ replies dated 13 November provided useful additional information, and led me to the decision that hearing sessions would be unnecessary for this examination of the LNP.

### *Modifications*

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

---

<sup>2</sup> View at: <https://www.wycombe.gov.uk/pages/Planning-and-building-control/Neighbourhood-planning/Longwick-cum-Ilmer-neighbourhood-plan.aspx>

<sup>3</sup> View at: <https://www.wycombe.gov.uk/pages/Planning-and-building-control/Neighbourhood-planning/Longwick-cum-Ilmer-neighbourhood-plan.aspx>

### **3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights**

#### *Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area*

- 3.1 The LNP has been prepared and submitted for examination by Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council which is a qualifying body, for an area that was designated by Wycombe District Council on 2 March 2015.
- 3.2 It is the only neighbourhood plan for Longwick-cum-Ilmer, and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area.

#### *Plan Period*

- 3.3 The Plan specifies clearly the period to which it is to take effect, which is from 2017 to 2033.

#### *Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation*

- 3.4 The application for a neighbourhood area to coincide with the area of the Parish was made by Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council in December 2014 and was followed by consultation between 7 January 2015 and 20 February 2015. On behalf of the Princes Risborough Consortium, it was pointed out that the neighbourhood area overlaps with the Strategic Area of Search for Princes Risborough because Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish extends to the east of the B4009. The Consortium contended that it was essential to consider matters associated with overlapping boundaries early in plan preparation to secure joined up planning policy. Notwithstanding this comment, Wycombe District Council formally designated the Neighbourhood Area in March 2015.
- 3.5 Agreed aims for the consultation process for the LNP were set out as reported in paragraph 1.2 of the Consultation Statement, February 2017, and began with aiming to involve as many people in the community as possible throughout all consultation stages of the Plan's development. I support all the "agreed aims" and consider them to be important principles for inclusive and effective consultation with local people and stakeholders over the course of plan preparation and evolution. Collection of baseline evidence and public consultation for the Longwick Village Capacity Study took place in Autumn 2014, prior to agreement to prepare a neighbourhood plan by the Parish Council at a public meeting in January 2015. A Steering Group was formed in February 2015 to oversee the Neighbourhood Plan's development.
- 3.6 Following from the Longwick Capacity Study, undertaken by Wycombe District Council and consultants Tibbalds, which had been consulted on in October 2014, the Steering Group drafted a vision and objectives for the proposed Neighbourhood Plan. It put forward to the Parish Council potential development sites and site selection criteria, and engaged with

residents of the Parish's hamlets (who were outside Longwick village but within the Parish). Meetings with some key stakeholders were held, and a page on the Council's website was set up to enable interested persons to monitor planning progress in the first half of 2015. Consultation on a draft Neighbourhood Plan with residents, businesses and other stakeholders took place in June and July 2015, which informed a submission Neighbourhood Plan and sustainability appraisal. These documents were consulted on in Autumn 2015, and the Plan was submitted for examination.

- 3.7 The examiner recommended in February 2016 that the Neighbourhood Plan for Longwick-cum-Ilmer should proceed to referendum, subject to a number of modifications. However, the Parish Council decided to withdraw that Neighbourhood Plan and prepare a revised one. The Parish Council then had to take into account a successful planning appeal and new planning applications for largescale development in Longwick, as well as publication of the draft Wycombe Local Plan in June 2016, with raised expectations for housing development in the Parish. In November 2016, the Parish Council convened a public meeting to update local people and explain the new Plan's revised strategy to meet the District Council's emerging Local Plan housing target for new homes in Longwick. Prior to this meeting, some 600 leaflets were distributed to all households in the parish. Notices were placed in local newsletters, on noticeboards, in the Princes Risborough library, in local shops and in the Red Lion public house. The meeting was attended by more than 130 people and an overwhelming number supported the proposal to revise and resubmit the Plan.
- 3.8 The LNP submission version August 2017 was subject to public consultation between 25 August 2017 and 9 October 2017. Nineteen responses were received. I consider that the consultation and engagement process throughout the plan period has enabled all who live and work in the Parish to comment on and engage with production of the LNP. The consultation process is described in detail in the Consultation Statement, February 2017, and I am satisfied that it has complied with the publicity and submission requirements in Part 5 of the 2012 Regulations and has had regard for the advice in the PPG pertaining to plan preparation and engagement

#### *Development and Use of Land*

- 3.9 The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with s.38A(2) of the 2004 Act. Chapter 7 of the LNP includes proposals to meet its Vision which are not part of the statutory land use policy provisions. It is made clear that they are aspirations to be pursued by the Parish Council and others, and are separate from land use planning.

### *Excluded Development*

3.10 I am satisfied that the LNP complies with s.38B(1)(b) of the 2004 Act in respect of 'excluded development', as defined in s.61K of the 1990 Act.

### *Human Rights*

3.11 The Basic Conditions Statement (section 6, Page 15) confirms that the Plan does not breach Human Rights (within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998), and from my independent assessment I see no reason to disagree.

## **4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions**

### *EU Obligations*

4.1 The LNP was screened for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) by Wycombe District Council, which found that it was necessary to undertake SEA (Updated document May 2017). A Sustainability Appraisal Report incorporating SEA: Longwick-cum-Ilmer Neighbourhood Plan June 2017, was prepared by Wycombe District Council and revised by TDRC Ltd for the Parish Council. This found that policies for the growth of Longwick village with land allocated for development and open space would have some positive and neutral effects on sustainability objectives eg. on "Population – Housing" with the delivery of new housing, and on "Business and Economic Development" supporting growth of the rural economy. The appraisal also identified potential negative effects of some of the growth options, including potentially harmful effects on the setting of the Chiltern AONB, and on objectives for Transport and Water and Flooding. Several spatial strategies for the growth of Longwick village were appraised, and Option 5 was considered to be the most sustainable. This forms the basis for the LNP, including its site allocations and policy criteria.

4.2 As there are no European sites of importance for nature conservation within or close to the LNP area, Natural England confirmed that Habitats Regulation Assessment was not required and from my independent assessment, overall, I am satisfied that the EU Obligations for habitat protection and environmental impact assessment have been met.

### *Main Issues*

4.3 Having regard for the submitted LNP, the consultation responses, other written evidence and the site visit, and in the light of the requirements for

the Plan to meet the Basic Conditions, I consider that there are four main issues for this examination. These are:

- Whether the submitted LNP will deliver an appropriate level of new housing development focused on Longwick village and will provide a wide choice of high quality homes;
- Whether the submitted LNP will adequately protect the distinctive rural character of the Parish with its outlying hamlets, countryside and proximity to the Chilterns AONB;
- Whether the submitted LNP is adequately supportive of the local economy and community facilities, having regard for the planned level of new housing development; and
- Whether the submitted LNP supports the achievement of a safer and more sustainable transport system for the Parish, as well as improved utility services notably for water, drainage and broadband services.

### *Issue 1 – New Housing Development*

- 4.4 The Wycombe Core Strategy adopted in 2008 set out a requirement of just over 400 new homes per annum to be provided in the District. Although the Sustainability Report June 2017 accompanying the LNP reported that around 400-450 dwellings are currently being achieved annually, this is not sufficient to meet more recent assessments of housing need for the District. The Draft Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), January 2014, and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), interim report February 2014, calculated objectively assessed housing need at around 11,000-12,000 units for Wycombe District over the next 20 years, ie. around 500-700 dwellings on average annually.
- 4.5 The emerging Wycombe District Local Plan October 2017 states in its Pre-Introduction that about 13,200 new homes will be required to meet the District's needs by 2033. Because some 71% of land in Wycombe District lies within the AONB and 48% within the Metropolitan Green Belt, there are constraints to the identification of suitable future housing sites. Applying the duty-to-co-operate, Aylesbury Vale District Council has agreed to accommodate a portion of Wycombe District's need, but the latter will still have to increase its target for new dwellings from 400 to 550 units on average annually. The emerging Local Plan envisages that most new development will take place in the towns of High Wycombe, Princes Risborough and Bourne End. About 15% of new housing will be delivered in rural areas "to help foster their economic and social wellbeing". Longwick and Kimble villages are expected to accommodate about a third of the 15% and, more precisely 300 new homes should be provided in Longwick. The emerging Local Plan remarks that most of the likely sites in Longwick already have planning permission, but it is not allocating sites because the LNP will do that.

- 4.6 The 2015 version of the Longwick-cum-Ilmer Neighbourhood Plan envisaged the provision of 129 new homes over the lifetime of the Plan, but the current LNP plans for a significant uplift in that number to 300, as explained on its Page 29. I consider that the LNP has had regard for paragraph 47 of the NPPF, helping “to boost significantly the supply of housing” in the locality. I have considered the argument that the Parish Council should have delayed producing the Neighbourhood Plan until Government confirms its approach to the methodology for calculating the five year housing land supply. However, Government has not advised that planning and development for new housing should be paused whilst the assessment methodology is reviewed, and the details of a new approach finalised<sup>4</sup>.
- 4.7 As previously noted, although the emerging Local Plan is not part of the statutory development plan, there is evidence from the 2014 SHLAA and SHMA and recent appeal decisions<sup>5</sup> that the Core Strategy 2008 is out-of-date in its provision for new housing. The LNP aligns with the emerging Wycombe Local Plan which represents more up-to-date evidence of housing need, and the current situation on planning decisions for new housing development. I support the LNP’s approach, which is adequately explained in sections 4.5 to 4.7 on Pages 17-18 of the submitted Plan.
- 4.8 Policy A1 of the LNP defines a settlement boundary for Longwick village “for sustainable development”. I comment further on the detail of this policy and the precise position of the proposed boundary in the following paragraphs under Issue 2 as well as Issue 1. Although Policy A1 states that the settlement boundary for Longwick is shown on “Proposals” Maps 1 and 2, “settlement boundary” is not featured in the key for either map. In order to provide clarification<sup>6</sup> for readers and users of the LNP and in order to contribute to sustainable development, the reference to “Policy” Maps 1 and 2 in Policy A1 should be corrected and the Maps should include a reference to the settlement boundary. **PM2 and PM3** would secure this, and should be made.
- 4.9 Policy A1 will support sites allocated for development in accordance with Policies A2, A5 and L1-6. The justification to Policy A2 explains that the allocations are under-pinned by evidence from the Tibbalds Longwick Village Capacity Study February 2015 and the Sustainability Appraisal,

---

<sup>4</sup> The Government has consulted on a new methodology for determining objectively assessed housing need set out in the DCLG publication, “Planning for the right homes in the right places”. The consultation closed on 9 November 2017. View at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-right-homes-in-the-right-places-consultation-proposals>

<sup>5</sup> See footnote 1.

<sup>6</sup> The NP should be drafted with sufficient clarity that a decision maker can apply it consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. See PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

reported on in June 2017. It is clear that alternative sites to those allocated have been considered, along with the potential constraints to the achievement of sustainable development in the locality. This is good planning practice and in accordance with the Basic Conditions. I have had regard for an alternative view supporting new development away from the busy Thame Road, possibly drawing the hamlets of Owlswick and the Meadles more closely to Longwick. However, I consider that this would lead to greater incursion into the countryside in conflict with national planning policy.

- 4.10 Policy L1 relates to the site allocation on the eastern side of Thame Road leading around to Bar Lane. Wycombe District Council drew my attention to the detailed planning permission for 43 homes, 17/06562/REM, granted on 31 October 2017. The District Council advised that the permission was informed by the submission version of the LNP and its Policy L1. Having read the permission statement, the planning conditions and studied the amended site layout plan, I consider that Policy L1 satisfactorily reflects the planning permission. As both Wycombe District Council and Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council pointed out, planning permissions may lapse, and it is important that the LNP, with a time period of some 16 years, sets out the key principles for site development in the event that a fresh proposal is put forward for the site. In my opinion, Policy L1 meets this important planning objective and should help promote sustainable development in Longwick.
- 4.11 The key principles for access, open space, drainage, landscape and boundaries, and design layout of the allocation take into account the particular characteristics of this site. They include maintaining the green gap adjacent to Thame Road, recognising its proximity to homes on Wheelwright Road and to the pet hotel on Bar Lane, thus embodying aims which have had regard for national planning policy in the NPPF. The development of 43 homes, in a mix of 2,3 & 4 bedroom houses, on this site would align with proposals for new housing in the emerging Local Plan.
- 4.12 The site allocation of land at Boxer Road/Barn Road is the subject of Policy L2. Detailed planning permission was granted for the provision of 160 new homes on the site in October 2017 (17/06691/REM), with a range of dwellings from 1 bedroom apartments to 5 and 6 bedroom houses. I agree with the District Council and Parish Council that the LNP should set out the criteria for site development, to be applied in the event that the current permission lapses. The grant of permission was informed by the requirements of the submission version of the LNP, suggesting that Policy L2 is not overly prescriptive or acting to delay the delivery of sustainable development. Policy L2 has had regard for section 7 of the NPPF, Requiring good design. It takes account of the site's sensitive location at the centre of the village close to existing residential areas, to the school's

facilities and village playing field, and does not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes which would stifle innovation, in my opinion.

- 4.13 However, on behalf of Bellway Homes, it was pointed out that criterion 5. 'Provide an all-weather permeable loose surfaced footpath ....' had failed the terms of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulation 122, as necessary contributions to mitigate the impact of development had been secured through a Section 106 (s.106) agreement at the outline planning permission stage. Having regard for paragraph 173 of the NPPF which is clear that sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and deliverability, I consider that the LNP should qualify its "requirements" for new development in Policy L2 and for the other allocated sites. Paragraphs 203-206 of the NPPF set out the requirements for planning conditions and obligations which could also be usefully referenced in Policies L1-L6, and in the justification for Policy A2. Modifications **PM8 – PM13** should be made having regard for national planning policy. With the relevant modification, Policy L2 should make a significant contribution towards the provision of new housing, promoting the achievement of sustainable development in line with strategic policy in the emerging Wycombe Local Plan.
- 4.14 Land on Thame Road east of Chestnut Way junction, Policy L3, is allocated for the provision of some 18 homes. As the Sustainability Appraisal report, Plan C, Page 24 illustrates, site L3 formed part of a larger site extending along Thame Road towards Longwick Road roundabout, when site options were assessed as part of the Longwick Village Capacity Study. Bellwood Homes, a local housebuilder, put forward a proposed extension to the settlement boundary to include land adjoining site L3 for future housing development. It pointed out that planning permission had been granted on appeal for housing development at Ivy Farm, Lower Icknield Way, Longwick, in August 2017 (App Ref: 15/07209/OUT), even though the site had been assessed in the Capacity Study as unsuitable for urban design reasons. The Inspector had concluded that, as Wycombe District Council was unable to demonstrate a 5 year housing supply, and Longwick was a sustainable location for new housing provision, the development should be permitted.
- 4.15 As I saw at the site visit, land east of Briants and Laurel Farm and north of Thame Road is distinctly rural, important to the setting of the village, and visible to all who approach Longwick from the roundabout along Thame Road. Policy L3 appropriately in my view, addresses matters of access, landscape and boundary treatment, and design layout to respect the site's edge of village location. This should ensure that new development would relate well to the existing built-up area of Longwick, and not have a seriously adverse impact on the surrounding countryside. I have considered whether the site should be extended to the east, but

have concluded that it should not. The Capacity Study's assessment of the larger site L was that "*Developing the western portion of this location could support the village and its existing character.....*" (my emphasis). I agree with Wycombe District Council's observation, in its letter to me of 13 November 2017, that limiting the allocation to that included in Policy L3 is consistent with the preferred linear growth strategy set out in the Sustainability Appraisal, and reduces the impact on long views of the village from the Chilterns AONB.

4.16 Also in the letter of 13 November 2017, the Council acknowledges that its current housing land supply amounts to 4.95 years. However, against the requirement set out in the emerging Local Plan, the Council calculated that, at that point in time, it would amount to 6.2 years. The Council also advised that it has submitted a claim for judicial review of the Inspector's decision on the Ivy Farm development. Given that 300 new homes are planned for Longwick on alternative sites, I see no need for the LNP to amend Policy L3 or extend the settlement boundary along Thame Road. I do not recommend that the LNP is modified to take account of future housing development at Ivy Farm. Even if the proposed development does go ahead, it is relatively small scale and an additional 9 dwellings would not undermine the Vision, objectives or policies for Longwick. However, the text on Page 12 should be amended to represent the current position, as recommended in **PM1**.

4.17 Policies L4a & L4b relate to the site allocations of land at Rose Farm frontage and south, which are expected to provide 68 new dwellings in total with a mix of units to reflect the needs of the village. The site at L4b was granted outline planning permission on 3 November 2017 (16/06673/OUT), and I agree with the Parish Council that the LNP could acknowledge the current situation on pages 12 and 29. **PM4** as well as **PM1** should be made to inform readers and users of the Plan, and promote sustainable development. However, especially as reserved matters have yet to be determined, I consider it important that the LNP sets out the key principles for the sites' future development. I have had regard for the comment that the plans for Policies L4a & L4b on Pages 46 & 47 may omit some protected trees. However, the plans are "*for illustrative purposes*" and areas of Tree Preservation Orders are labelled as indicative. In these circumstances, I consider that it is unnecessary to modify the plans, which should ensure that development respects the privacy and amenity of neighbours.

4.18 Framptons on behalf of J Walker and Sons (Farm) Ltd misquoted criterion 2 of Policies L4a & 4b. Nevertheless, their objection that the policy should not prevent vehicular access to land beyond the site was clear. Framptons argued that a potential future planning situation could require access to adjoining parcels of land. However, as the Parish Council stated in its letter of 13<sup>th</sup> November 2017, developing land to the west could lead to a

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

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

significant change in the village's form and rural setting. Visual sensitivity from the Chilterns AONB was tested in the LNP's Community-led Visual Impact Assessment and is a major concern. I note that the site options within the growth strategy, illustrated in the Longwick Capacity Study, do not include land south or west of the Rose Farm sites. Criterion 2 is appropriate, in my opinion, in restricting vehicular access to the west of allocation L4b. I also consider that criteria 10 and 11 to strengthen the settlement boundary have regard for the NPPF, section 11, Conserving and enhancing the natural environment, and they need not be modified.

- 4.19 However, I support the proposed change to criterion 4 of Policies L4a & 4b as it would be for the highway authority rather than the planning system to decide the case for and position of any new pedestrian crossing. Criterion 6 seeks a community IT cafe, facility or hub for small businesses and residents. The policy justification describes this as an important part of sustaining village life, enabling the Parish's home-workers and small businesses to have a central work and networking space. Having visited Longwick and recognising the need for future residential growth to be supported by new, modern facilities and services, I support criterion 6. The Parish Council indicated that the facility could be funded partly from CIL, and section 7 of the LNP, Implementation, accepts that "*other conversion opportunities are welcome*" as an alternative to new provision on site L4a. **PM11** would secure amendment to criterion 4 and ensure that Policies L4a & 4b meet the Basic Conditions.
- 4.20 Policies L5, Site Allocation of land adjacent to Red House Farm, and L6, Site Allocation of land adjacent to Anderdons Farm, are expected to provide a modest addition of 11 new dwellings over the plan period. In view of the potential constraints including drainage and flood risk, proximity to listed buildings, and position at the northern edge of the village, I strongly support the policies' criteria as they should contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and meet the Basic Conditions for neighbourhood planning.
- 4.21 I have considered whether additional sites for new housing, such as the one proposed at Vine Cottage, should be included in the LNP, but conclude that it should not. I am satisfied that the Plan's allocations should deliver sufficient housing on a variety of sites to meet the target of 300 homes in the emerging Local Plan. On general conformity with the strategic policies in the adopted Core Strategy, the LNP seeks a greater number of new houses for the Parish than was then predicted. However, the LNP focuses new housing provision in the settlement of Longwick and this is in general conformity with Policy CS7 – Rural settlements and the rural area. Providing the above-mentioned modifications are made, I conclude that the LNP should deliver an appropriate level of new housing development focused on Longwick village and should provide a wide choice of high

quality homes, in accordance with the Basic Conditions for neighbourhood planning.

*Issue 2 –Protecting the distinctive rural character of the Parish with its outlying hamlets, countryside and proximity to the Chilterns AONB*

- 4.22 The Vision for Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish in 2033 is set out on Page 19 of the LNP, and starts with: *"continue to be a village and a collection of hamlets with a cherished history, each of which has retained its own unique independent and distinctive character, scale and atmosphere"*. The Vision seeks to embody the wishes and aspirations of the community, as expressed at public meetings and more formal consultations. The objectives: 6 - Work with Local Character, Scale and Rural Context, and 7 - Maintain Rural Character, follow from this aspect of the Vision. Policy A3: Retaining Longwick Village's Distinct Rural Identity addresses a significant challenge for the LNP, in view of the plans for future growth of Princes Risborough to its north-west and towards Longwick.
- 4.23 The Pre-Introduction to the emerging Wycombe District Local Plan – Regulation 19 version, October 2017, explains that over 2,600 new homes are planned for Princes Risborough with about 2,000 by 2033. New employment sites are also planned, with one on land north of Lower Icknield Way near Longwick. Policy CP2 of the emerging Local Plan and Figure 4 describe the broad location for growth north-west of Princes Risborough. This provides the context for Policy A3: Retaining Longwick Village's Distinct Rural Identity in the LNP. The policy seeks to maintain the current rural green gap between Princes Risborough and Longwick, as shown on Policy Map 2.
- 4.24 I am aware that the examiner of the previously submitted neighbourhood plan for Longwick-cum-Ilmer considered there to be no evidence to demonstrate that the identified green gap would achieve the aims of Policy A3. He also indicated that development in this gap might not be unsustainable. The Longwick Village Capacity Study, however, includes an assessment of the area in its section 3.2, Topography, landscape and views, and states *"It is important that the development of Longwick does not extend southwards to coalesce with Princes Risborough"*. The emerging Wycombe District Local Plan identifies a Main Expansion Area for Princes Risborough extending to Lower Icknield Way, as shown on the Concept Plan, Figure 26. Policies PR4, PR5 and PR6 and the supporting text (eg. paragraph 5.3.33) refer to a green gap between new development and Longwick.
- 4.25 Discrepancies were observed between the LNP and emerging Local Plan, regarding the boundaries for the rural green gap on Policy Map 1 of the LNP and the 'Lower Icknield green buffer' in the Local Plan's Concept Plan. Policy PR5 of the emerging Local Plan aims to set a settlement boundary

and strategic buffer for Princes Risborough, partly to secure physical separation from Longwick. Within the strategic buffer, open space uses and essential infrastructure, or small scale development only will be permitted by Policy PR5, to protect the rural character of the land between the settlements. Due to the different sizes of the maps in question in the two draft Plans, it is difficult to discern differences. However, the District Council advised that the difference occurs in the area of two properties south/west of Mill Lane and south of Lower Icknield Way. I consider it essential that the maps in question adopt the same boundaries for the rural green gap, to give certainty to users of the LNP and alignment with the emerging Local Plan. Policy Maps 1 and 2 in the LNP should be modified to accord with the draft Local Plan. In addition, the justification for Policy A3 should be modified so that it is clearly consistent with the draft Local Plan Policy PR5, which allows for some limited development. **PM3** and **PM5** should secure these modifications and aid the achievement of sustainable development.

- 4.26 Policy A4 identifies two areas for designation as local green space within the Parish. The NPPF, paragraph 77, cautions that local green space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. I have considered the suitability of the proposed spaces in Policy A4 against the criteria in the NPPF, and have had regard for the Government's PPG (Reference ID:37-005-20140306 to 37-022-20140306). As I saw at my site visit, Longwick playing field is centrally located in the village, in close proximity to existing residential areas along Thame Road, Chestnut Way, Walnut Tree Lane and Boxer Road. It is close to Longwick School, the Scouts' Group building, village hall with pre-school, as well as the site allocation in Policy L2 off Boxer Road/Barn Road. The playing field is well-maintained with play area equipment in the northern corner and I accept that it is demonstrably special to the local community. It is local in character and not an overly extensive tract of land, and I am satisfied that its designation has had regard for national policy in the NPPF. It is in general conformity with Policy CS19 of the Core Strategy which seeks the reinforcement of locally distinct place qualities, as well as Policies DM12- Green Spaces and DM16 – Open Space in New Development, in the Delivery and Site Allocations DPD, 2013. Policy Maps 1 & 2 should show Longwick playing field as local green space, subject to Policy A4, and **PM3** would achieve this.
- 4.27 Owlswick village green occupies a more rural location and serves a very small local community<sup>7</sup>. The green is well-kept and visually very attractive, having historic importance within Owlswick Conservation Area. The village green is not an extensive tract of land. The NPPF statement that local green space designation is not appropriate for most green

---

<sup>7</sup> Page 8 of the LNP states that there are now 25 residential properties in Owlswick and its immediate area.

areas, and the PPG advice that land already protected by conservation area designation may not gain any additional benefit from local green space status, arguably count against this designation. On the other hand, the consultation response from Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of the site owner and correspondence from the Councils, 13 November 2017, indicate that the owner does not oppose the proposed designation or its promotion for use for community events in conjunction with St Peter's Chapel. I consider that the proposed designation would not undermine the LNP's aim to provide sufficient land in suitable locations for development (as sought in the PPG), and could positively promote more community use of the space thereby promoting healthy communities in line with the NPPF, paragraphs 69 - 76.

- 4.28 Red Kite Development Consultancy proposed alterations to the supporting text to Policy A4 to clarify that privately-owned space could only be used for community events if the owner were willing for them to happen. The Councils agreed to these proposed changes, set out in **PM6**, which should be made for clarity and to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. I conclude that Owlswick village green should be designated as local green space, as in Policy A4, having had regard for national policy.
- 4.29 The Vision for the Parish set out in paragraph 5.1 of the LNP begins by stating that Longwick-cum-Ilmer will: "*continue to be a village and a collection of hamlets with a cherished history, each of which has retained its own unique and distinctive character, scale and atmosphere*". I consider that the LNP which plans for all significant new development to take place within the village of Longwick is wholly consistent with that Vision and should enable the predominantly rural character of the wider area to be protected. The approach should contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, and have regard for national planning policy in paragraph 55 of the NPPF. It is in general conformity with adopted Policies CS1, CS2 and CS7 of the Core Strategy, and is in line with Policy CP3 of the emerging Local Plan.
- 4.30 The Parish is well-endowed with trees and hedges, within the village of Longwick as well as in the more rural surrounding area. The site allocation policies all include criteria for landscape and boundary treatment. I consider these to be important for securing a strong settlement boundary and maintaining the rural character of the Parish. Longwick is relatively flat but is visible from the higher ground of the Chilterns AONB to the east. Having regard for the NPPF, paragraph 115, the LNP should pay particular attention to conserving its natural environment and enhancing the landscape. I am satisfied that the Plan achieves this.

- 4.31 Historic England is broadly supportive of the submitted LNP but, with reference to paragraph 58 of the NPPF, was critical that the LNP does not contain any policies relating to the design or quality of new development. However, I note that the Vision for the Parish in paragraph 5.1 includes *“will be a parish which protects, conserves and enhances the quality of the historic environment of designated and undesignated heritage assets and their settings”*. All the site allocation policies L1-L6 address “design layout” and “landscape and boundaries”. All are some distance from the Parish’s Conservation Areas (see map in Appendix A). Policies L4a & L4b, L5 and L6 include references in policy and justification text to the requirement to respect specific listed buildings or groups of historic local farmsteads/older buildings. I am satisfied that criterion 16 in Policies L4a & L4b would provide adequate protection for the historic farmstead at Rose Cottage. As already observed, most of the allocations have received planning permission, and I have seen no evidence that harm to heritage assets would be a serious constraint on their delivery.
- 4.32 I am also aware that Policies CP11 and DM31 in the emerging Local Plan concern development affecting the historic environment. The latter includes considerable information on heritage protection, referring to designated and non-designated heritage assets, their settings and other characteristics, which would apply in decision-making and need not be repeated in the LNP. Historic England suggested that references should be made to non-designated heritage assets including archaeological remains. It would welcome reference to the Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Characterisation and the Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Record. Paragraph 6.105 of the emerging Local Plan refers to the Wycombe Local Heritage List and County Historic Environment Record. I see no need for the LNP to repeat the policy in the emerging Local Plan, but shall recommend that these documents from Wycombe District Council as well as the Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Characterisation and Historic Environment Record are referenced in the LNP. **PM2** to amend the text on Page 24 would achieve this, and achieve consistency with national planning policy.
- 4.33 I consider that the LNP, with the proposed modifications, will respond to local character and history appropriately, having regard for paragraph 58 of the NPPF. Also, as long as the above modifications are made, I conclude that the submitted LNP will adequately protect the distinctive rural character of the Parish with its outlying hamlets, countryside and proximity to the Chilterns AONB.

*Issue 3 -The local economy and community facilities*

- 4.34 Policy A5 of the LNP aims to encourage small scale business space development, providing it respects local character, is sensitively located and does not harm residential amenity. As the supporting text indicates,

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT  
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

new housing development in Longwick will need to be balanced with an increase in opportunities for local employment. There will also be a need for the expansion of community facilities to serve the growing population, and sites L4a & 4b are expected to accommodate a new hub with IT cafe for small businesses and community facilities. I consider that Policy A5 has regard for section 1 of the NPPF – Building a strong, competitive economy, and should help the achievement of sustainable development in the Parish. It is in general conformity with Policy CS7 of the adopted Core Strategy, and in line with Policies CP2, CP3 and CP5 of the emerging Local Plan which refer to permitting limited new employment land in villages, and facilitating rural enterprise and diversification.

- 4.35 Policy A6 states that the Shoulder of Mutton Public House in Owlswick will remain as a community facility unless it can be demonstrated to be unviable for future use as a public house. Ownership of the Shoulder of Mutton and surrounding land has recently changed, and the current owner advised that the public house has been closed for some 21 years. Major investment would be required to restore the building and re-open the public house, it is suggested. During 2017, the site has been actively marketed nationally and locally, and it is contended that any further marketing (to demonstrate non-viability of a public house use) would be unnecessary. Re-use for employment purposes could generate unacceptable levels of traffic within the rural area and harm the quiet character of the conservation area. The owner proposed an alternative wording for the policy, based on future use of the site for residential purposes.
- 4.36 Wycombe District Council commented that it has not issued a certificate of lawfulness for a change of use to residential, and one has not been sought. Therefore, the existing use of the site as a public house has not changed. The Parish Council advised that there had been another potential buyer of the site this year who was interested in maintaining the public house/restaurant with assisted living residential use alongside. The District Council pointed out that, within the emerging Local Plan, Policy DM29: Retention of community facilities; DM44 1(j): Development in the countryside outside of the Green Belt; and DM45: Conversion of existing buildings, support the LNP's Policy A6. Even if the site is "previously developed land", the Parish Council pointed out that Owlswick has no public transport services and is "in a very isolated location". My attention was drawn to paragraph 55 of the NPPF which addresses the promotion of sustainable development in rural areas. Isolated new homes in the countryside should be avoided unless there are special circumstances such as, among other things, development which would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting.
- 4.37 I consider that the LNP should be cautious over the future use of the site, and aim to maintain its use as a community facility/public house and

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

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

restaurant if feasible and viable. The approach in Policy A6 requiring a marketing exercise before a change of use would be permitted is aligned with the approach in the draft Local Plan and has regard for the NPPF. In order to promote sustainable development in this rural area and within a designated Conservation Area, I am satisfied that the thrust of Policy A6 should be retained. However, given the site's isolated location, I consider that any significant employment use there could conflict with the promotion of sustainable development and be damaging to the countryside. The detailed criteria in Policy A6 should be simplified to align with the draft Local Plan policies and contribute to sustainable development, as in **PM7**. As long as this modification is made, I conclude that the submitted LNP is adequately supportive of the local economy and community facilities, having regard for the planned level of new housing development.

*Issue 4 –Infrastructure including transport and utility services for water, drainage and broadband*

- 4.38 Page 19 of the LNP sets out the Vision for the Parish which includes having safe and easy access for pedestrians and cyclists to and through Longwick village, with good connectivity to the hamlets and key locations, such as schools. It also aims for good bus services to Princes Risborough town centre and the railway station; as well as infrastructure and services appropriate to the needs of current and future residents. The Plan's objectives begin with better transport and connectivity, and safer highways for all users. They also seek mitigation of flood risks and better utilities, with particular reference to sewerage, water supply and broadband services.
- 4.39 Policy A2: New housing allocations in Longwick village requires developers to make financial contributions towards sustainable transport in the form of high quality, safe and dedicated pedestrian and cycle routes to Princes Risborough town centre and station, as well as a high quality bus service in accordance with Policy DM2 of the Wycombe Delivery and Site Allocations Plan. As discussed under Issue 1, Policy A2 should have regard for the NPPF, paragraphs 173 and 203-206, concerning viability and deliverability, and the appropriate use of planning obligations. The policy should be modified to make clear that viability and the tests for planning obligations would be applied when financial contributions are sought. **PM4** should be made accordingly. Policy A3 should secure new infrastructure for transport in the area which respects the area's rural character and amenity. The potential traffic impact of any new business development will also need to be assessed through Policy A5, and I support this.
- 4.40 Policy A1: Development at Longwick Village alerts developers to the need to address flood risk and consider water supply and sewage disposal. The

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Regency Offices, 37 Gay Street, Bath BA1 2NT

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

supporting text refers to the need for early engagement with Thames Water. Local people commented that the village of Longwick has many water courses and flooding has been a local problem which needs robust attention, not just an aspirational policy. However, as the Parish Council observed, the District Council will deal with any site-specific requirements for and cumulative effects from development through planning conditions. Policies L1 - L6 relating to site allocations address "drainage" requirements in broad terms for each site. I am satisfied that the LNP deals satisfactorily with matters relating to flood risk, water supply and sewerage and is aligned with emerging Local Plan Policy CP7: Delivery infrastructure to support growth. Modification to policy on this matter is not needed.

- 4.41 Policy A1 requires any street lighting to provide safety for road users as well as protection for dark skies in the rural area. I consider this to be reasonable in view of the LNP aims to accommodate a significant number of new homes and associated development, whilst retaining the Parish's distinct rural identity. This aspect of the policy meets the Basic Conditions.
- 4.42 Chapter 7 of the LNP, Implementation, sets out a number of community aspirations which are not within the scope of neighbourhood planning but would bring wider benefits to the area and help to meet the Plan's Vision and objectives. Section 7.3 explains that the Parish Council will look for funding from planning obligations, CIL and other stakeholders for a significant number of projects. The table includes, 1P Improvements to broadband services in outlying areas and 1L Community IT cafe, facility or hub. I consider that the promotion of such services should assist growth of the local economy.
- 4.43 I note the criticism of item 1E on Page 52 with the proposed multi-use games' area (MUGA), which is not part of the existing outline planning permission for the L2 site. I consider that Chapter 7 usefully sets out main priorities and sources of funding, and describes a pro-active role for the Parish Council to meet the community's aspirations through a number of mechanisms. The distinction between what the LNP can achieve and other Parish Council action should be clarified by amending the heading on Page 2 which states that "Essential improvements" will be "required" from new development. In addition, the wording of section 7.3 should be modified to remove the reference to MUGA from 1E. **PM14** should be made having regard for paragraph 173 of the NPPF. Then, Chapter 7 should contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and have regard for paragraphs 183-185 of the NPPF.
- 4.44 As long as all the above proposed modifications are made, I conclude that the submitted LNP supports the achievement of a safer and more

sustainable transport system for the Parish, as well as improved utility services notably for water, drainage and broadband services.

## **5. Conclusions**

### *Summary*

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

### *The Referendum and its Area*

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

### *Overview*

- b. I recognise the hard work that the Parish Council and Steering Group have carried out over a number of years to produce the submission LNP. I am also aware of the difficult decisions that had to be made in 2016 leading up to the Parish Council's decision to rewrite the Plan which had already been through examination, undertake a fresh consultation exercise and submit a revised Plan. In view of progress being made on the emerging Local Plan by Wycombe District Council, I consider that the Parish Council's action was correct and should result in a more robust Neighbourhood Plan for future development of the Parish. I commend them for taking this difficult route.

*Jill Kingaby*

Examiner

## Appendix: Modifications

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no./ other reference	Modification
PM1	Pages 12, 13	<p><b>3.7 Recent Development, Applications and Site Promotions</b></p> <p>Last paragraph on Page 12:</p> <p>In the period between the Neighbourhood Plan's withdrawal ...<del>two</del><b>three</b> large housing planning applications ..... and WDC is minded to approve the third subject to agreement on planning obligations. These housing sites ... to the village. An application for nine homes at Ivy Farm..... was refused, but this decision has since been appealed <b>allowed on appeal. As WDC has submitted a claim for Judicial Review of the Inspector's decision, there remains uncertainty over the site's development. It is not allocated for development in this Plan.</b></p>
PM2	Page 24	<p><b>Policy A1: Development at Longwick Village</b></p> <p>The settlement boundary is shown on <del>Proposals</del><b>Policy</b> Maps 1 and 2.</p> <p>JUSTIFICATION:</p> <p>(penultimate paragraph)</p> <p>The design and layout of new housing .....basis for their study. <b>Regard should be had for the history of the area and the relationship of new development to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Characterisation, Buckinghamshire Historic Environment Record, and Wycombe Local Heritage List provide useful reference information.</b></p>
PM3	Pages 26,	<b>Policy Maps 1 and 2</b>

	27	<p>Add <b>Longwick Settlement Boundary</b> to the keys to both maps.</p> <p>Adjust the boundary for the rural green gap (Policy A3) on both maps, so that it is the same as the boundary for the Lower Icknield Green Buffer, in Figure 26- Concept Plan in the emerging Wycombe District Local Plan.</p> <p>Add Local Green Space (Policy A4) to both maps, at Longwick Playing Field to align with Figure 3: Policy 2 layout plan.</p>
PM4	Pages 28, 29	<p><b>Policy A2: New Housing Allocations</b></p> <p>The following sites ....</p> <p>On these sites, development is required, <b>subject to viability and meeting the tests for planning obligations and conditions</b>, to make financial contributions ...</p> <p>JUSTIFICATION:</p> <p>(second paragraph Page 29)</p> <p>The first group of sites are the large housing planning applications .....<del>and another which WDC is 'minded to approve'.</del></p> <p>....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land at Rose Farm (south) – 65 homes <b>approved by</b> WDC <del>'minded to approve'.</del></li> </ul> <p>(final paragraph)</p> <p>It is recognised ...funding available from BCC, <b>and the need to meet the tests for planning conditions and obligations.</b></p>
PM5	Page 30	<p><b>Policy A3</b></p> <p>JUSTIFICATION:</p> <p>Second paragraph:</p> <p>The Parish boundary ....It is therefore important that <del>no</del> <b>any</b> further development <del>occurs</del> on the south side of ..... junction</p>

		<p>eastwards <b><i>is limited.</i></b></p> <p>Delete third paragraph and substitute:</p> <p><b><i>The Draft Wycombe District Local Plan expects a green buffer to be retained south of Lower Icknield Way to function as a separation between the Main Expansion Area proposed for Princes Risborough and the village of Longwick. Draft Policy PR5 states that open space uses and essential infrastructure to support the expansion of Princes Risborough will be permitted outside the settlement boundary within the strategic buffer. Other development there is required to be of small scale to protect the rural character of the land.</i></b></p> <p>Final paragraph:</p> <p>The potential future growth ...character and amenity of this rural area <del>is</del><b>are</b> minimised, as it is within the `rural ....</p>
PM6	Page 31	<p><b>Policy A4: Local Green Space Designations</b></p> <p>JUSTIFICATION:</p> <p>(Third paragraph)</p> <p>Owlswick playing field is privately owned ....NPPF policy above. <del>As a</del><b>While currently</b> a privately-owned public space ....the village green <del>also</del> has huge potential .....Chapel opposite. <del>Nevertheless,</del>  <b>€The green is vital .....</b></p>
PM7	Page 33	<p><b>Policy A6: Shoulder of Mutton Public House</b></p> <p>Delete the existing policy and substitute:</p> <p><b>The retention of the Shoulder of Mutton in Owlswick as a community facility will be supported. Residential development of the site, including conversion of the public house, will be supported providing that:</b></p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Marketing for at least a 6 month period has demonstrated that use as a public house would not be viable;</b></li> <li>• <b>Proposed development would be no greater than the footprint of the existing buildings, and ridge heights would not be higher than those of the public house;</b></li> <li>• <b>Proposed development would respect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and its setting; and</b></li> <li>• <b>Where possible, public access to the adjacent village green would be increased.</b></li> </ul>
PM8	Page 35	<p><b>Policy L1: Site Allocation on the eastern side of Thame Road, leading around to Bar Lane</b></p> <p>The development of Site L1 (2.46ha) is required, <b><i>subject to viability and meeting the tests for planning obligations and conditions</i></b>, to: .....</p>
PM9	Page 38	<p><b>Policy L2: Site Allocation of land at Boxer Road/Barn Road</b></p> <p>The development of Site L2 (6.73ha) is required, <b><i>subject to viability and meeting the tests for planning obligations and conditions</i></b>, to: .....</p>
PM10	Page 41	<p><b>Policy L3: Site Allocation on Land on Thame Road east of Chestnut Way junction</b></p> <p>The development of Site L3 (1ha) is required, <b><i>subject to viability and meeting the tests for planning obligations and conditions</i></b>, to: .....</p>
PM11	Page 43	<p><b>Policies L4a and L4b: Site Allocation of land at Rose Farm frontage and South</b></p> <p>The development of Site L4a (0.5ha) and Site L4b (3ha) is required, <b><i>subject to</i></b></p>

		<p><b>viability and meeting the tests for planning obligations and conditions</b>, to:</p> <p>.....</p> <p>ACCESS</p> <p>4. Create pedestrian and cycle access point <del>on</del> <b>from</b> Thame Road, <b>well</b> and positioned <del>to align with</del> for a potential new pedestrian road crossing over Thame Road.</p>
PM12	Page 48	<p><b>Policy L5: Site Allocation of land adjacent to Red House Farm</b></p> <p>The development of Site L5 (0.55ha) is required, <b>subject to viability and meeting the tests for planning obligations and conditions</b>, to: .....</p>
PM13	Page 49	<p><b>Policy L6: Site Allocation of land adjacent to Anderdon's Farm</b></p> <p>The development of Site L6 (0.26ha) is required, <b>subject to viability and meeting the tests for planning obligations and conditions</b>, to: .....</p>
PM14	Pages 51, 52	<p><b>7 Implementation</b></p> <p>7.3 Infrastructure Projects</p> <p>1. <del>Essential</del> <b>Improvements required sought</b> with new development</p> <p>.....</p> <p>E. New open space in Site L2 off Boxer Road, a <del>multi-games use area (MUGA)</del>, and open space in L2 around the proposed drainage .....</p>