

**From:** formpost@contensis.co.uk  
**Sent:** 17 February 2020 20:40  
**To:** Neighbourhood Planning  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comment form submitted: Great and Little Kimble-cum-Marsh NP

## Contensis Email Notification



### Project - Website

<https://cms-wycombedc.cloud.contensis.com/>

### A new form post has been received.



**Posted on:** 17/02/2020 20:39:22

**Posted from:**

<https://www.wycombe.gov.uk/pages/About-the-council/Have-your-say/Consultation-forms/Comment-form-Great-and-Little-Kimble-cum-Marsh-Neighbourhood-Plan.aspx>

### Form Post

**Name:** Rick Eveleigh

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

**Which of the following do you consider yourself (please choose only one)::**

Local resident

**Stay updated:**

I wish to be notified of the decision to adopt the neighbourhood plan

**Future consultations:**

I wish to be notified of future local plan consultations

**Which part(s) of the Great and Little Kimble-cum-Marsh neighbourhood plan do your comments relate to?:**

Resident engagement; AECOM assessment; Working Group impartiality; Site 10 inclusion

**Which part of the basic conditions do your comments relate to? (Please tick all that apply.):**

The achievement of sustainable development

The plan claims 'this document benefits from the input of residents' and the consultation document claims it wishes 'to involve as many of the community as possible throughout all consultation stages of the Plan development'. 1.6 states 'the PC must also demonstrate to an independent examiner that the PC has successfully engaged with the local community in preparing the Plan'. I don't believe it has 'successfully engaged' with the local community as evidenced by the volume and feeling of responses to the draft which constitute much of the 600+ page document provided. I would like to highlight this by showing the example of the inclusion of Site 10, 'The Laurels'. Note the principles in this specific example may well be evidenced regarding to other sites, but this is the site I have most knowledge of. In the Community Survey Site 10 with a score of -22 ranked

**Comments:**

even below Site 7, Birdbrook, which has been rejected due to valid pedestrian safety concerns. The reasons stated for the Community Survey result to be discounted ('no need to use the survey', para 3.14) are insulting to those of us who took the time to complete it and prove that undue weighting has been given to AECOM's flawed assessment of Site 10 (see below). Not content with this the document also states in para 4.3 'These site preferences helped inform the final choice of site allocations in the Plan' which it clearly didn't, as the document itself states! Even in the feedback from the 5 chosen sites (Consultation Appendix p368) it is still bottom of the 5. The inclusion of Site 10 in the plan is particularly suspicious for several reasons. Its separate planning application should have been rejected as it is far too big in the context of the hamlet of Clanking, which has only 25 dwellings. The NP says windfall sites will be '4 units or less on small sites'. The application for site 10 says it is 'small' but has 14 units. At the WDC Planning Cte meeting the Planning Officers referred to its inclusion in the draft NP, but the NP specifically ignored residents' opinion regarding this site. The Planning Officers should also only consider the site in the context of other applications \*outside\* of the NP, all of which are no more than 5 units. The objective scoring of site 10 and site 17b is equal in the document, and referring to my serious reservations regarding AECOM's assessment below, not even valid, so the residents' view should have been the 'casting vote'. Instead it appears the sites were conveniently shared between the owners of sites 10 and 17, both of whom were members of the NPWG. The makeup of the NPWG needs scrutiny. The applicants for Site 10 were both officers on the NPWG. They only resigned from the Group in February 2019 after I attended its September 2018 meeting and expressed the view that too many of its members had a vested interest. Also at the time (Sept 2018) the register of interests mentioned in some of the minutes had not been published, and minutes of several meetings had also not been published. The group had a reputation for being a cartel of landowners ensuring their developments would be included in the plan, or potential developments next to other members' properties were not included. Adding to this I also have fundamental concerns about the integrity of AECOM's positive assessment of Site 10. AECOM's para 5.46 states 'Notably Site 10 [The Laurels] will "provide a new footpath along its frontage with Marsh Road."' It goes on to allege that 'this will improve accessibility for residents throughout the Parish, encouraging the use of sustainable transport and reducing reliance on the car for shorter journeys. Site 10 in particular will provide pedestrian access to the school, public transport services and the Swan public house.' These statements are extremely questionable for the following reasons and should be disregarded as positive comments for Site 10: 1. The footpath only serves the proposed development. It will not benefit any other residents of the parish. The main problem on Marsh Road is the pinch point immediately after the proposed development north on Marsh Road where the road narrows to such a degree there is not enough width for two cars to pass. There is no pedestrian provision there and none proposed. Indeed (ironically) the only way this situation could be improved would be for The Laurels itself to be demolished allowing for the road to be widened. 2. Residents of Site 10 walking to the school or The Swan will pass Sites 1 and 15; and from Site 1 there is already a footpath. So Site 10 does not 'in particular' offer anything significant. 3. Access to public transport currently requires walking under the narrow and dangerous Grove Lane bridge. Until the Grove Lane realignment is completed, which does not yet have a proposed date, it is not possible to state that pedestrian access to public transport is offered by any development other than Sites 17a and 17b. This is actually called out elsewhere in the AECOM report in the Transportation section for both Site 7 and indeed Site 10!: 'access by foot, for both bus and train, is restricted by the lack of footway under the railway bridge'. The Birdbrook development (site 7) has been rightly excluded with a Red Flag from AECOM due to safety concerns for pedestrians accessing public transport. As cars exiting Site 10 are just as likely to turn left along Marsh Road as right, they will immediately encounter the narrow part of Marsh Road that is called out by AECOM under Site 7. It should also be called out under Site 10, giving it a red flag for Transportation as well. This would give Site 10 two adverse effects ranking it alongside Birdbrook. Site 17a has been chosen over Site 17b despite having more adverse effects than 17b and 10. As the correction of AECOM's Transportation assessment would remove the perceived advantage of Site 10 over Site 17b, Site 17b (with its 2nd place, +98 Community Survey score) should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan and Site 10 excluded. As the plans for Site 17b are for 35 homes but Site

10 is 14 homes, Sites 17a & 17b could be reduced in size (e.g. to 30 and 24 dwellings) to allow the village feel to be further retained, leaving only Site 14 as a large development. Site 17b also appears, from the drawings submitted, to have a wider variety of housing than Site 10: the lack of clarity throughout the Plan regarding affordable housing is also a concern. The latest version of the report drops in two sections that look like they address the Marsh Road narrowness concern but are not thought through or valid: 2.6 'The PC considers appropriate improvements would include widening Marsh Road where it is currently too narrow for two-way vehicular traffic.' This is not mentioned anywhere else in any document (even at 6.5 where the CIL is discussed) and there are no details. Widening of this part of the road is impossible without knocking down property (ironically, The Laurels itself) and/or encroaching into already very small front gardens. This statement should be discounted and removed. 6.5 'Traffic calming Marsh Lane [sic, should be Marsh Road] from Grove lane junction to the speed limit' -- traffic calming is not needed here. This is a tiny section of the road where The Laurels' planning application already is required to provide a new footpath. Traffic calming is required on Marsh Road through Clanking, ie. at each end of the current 30mph speed limit. The road is very narrow with no footpaths and the traffic survey included with The Laurels' planning application showed a significant level of speeding traffic. A 20mph speed limit should be introduced with entry and exit single lane restrictions like those added at Bishopstone recently. Speed bumps are not acceptable due to the noise they add, particularly from farm trailers which regularly use the road. Please note: although I live on Marsh Road I am not associated with or a member of the 'Marsh Road Action Group'.

I confirm I have read and understood the Wycombe District Council privacy policy found at [www.wycombe.gov.uk/privacy](http://www.wycombe.gov.uk/privacy)

**Your privacy:**

#### Properties

**Form Reference:** FRM78559  
**Posted by:** Public User ([publicuser@contensis.co.uk](mailto:publicuser@contensis.co.uk))  
**IP Address:** 10.65.17.8  
**Posted on:** 17/02/2020 20:39:22  
<https://www.wycombe.gov.uk/pages/About-the-council/Have-your-say/Consultation-forms/Comment-form-Great-and-Little-Kimble-cum-Marsh-Neighbourhood-Plan.aspx>  
**Posted from:**  
**Marked as Read:** No ([Mark this post as read](#))  
**Form template:** /SiteElements/forms/Consultation-forms/Consultation-Great-and-Little-Kimble-neighbourhood-plan.frm

This automated email has been sent from Contensis Content Management System. Any statements made, or intentions expressed in this communication may not necessarily reflect the view of Contensis. The information contained in this e-mail is confidential. It is intended only for the addressee. If you are not the addressee you must not disclose, copy or distribute this or take any action in reliance upon it. If you receive this e-mail in error, please notify your system administrator.

WARNING: Please ensure that you have adequate virus protection in place before you open or detach any documents attached to this e-mail.

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.