

# Comments on the Great and Little Kimble Neighbourhood Plan

1.] Detailed analysis of data re the parish from census data, other official sources and surveys undertaken – e.g. settlement patterns, housing stock, employment, travel to work method and distance, historic data, location of sustainability features, house prices, the nature of dwelling ownership, age profiles land use etc would identify three main characteristics of the parish, namely

a.] Very high house prices [more than twice the national average] and little provision for young people within the parish in view of the lack of social, low cost, or rented properties. Hence the under-representation of the 20-35 age group in the parish age profile.

b.] The concentration of sustainability features [e.g. bus route, railway station, school, places of worship, village hall] in a narrow corridor along the A4010. Ignoring the ludicrous RUR6 which implies that a [very good] pub used regularly by less than 10% of the parish population is more significant than all of these put together, the parish is in the lowest categories for both Geographical and Social Amenity deprivation. Poor services and inadequate roads

c.] A very dispersed settlement pattern with many historic features [e.g. 13 listed buildings, 17 ancient monuments, and 24 Archaeological notification areas] Although once again RUR6 tries to pretend that there are in fact two nucleated “Midsummer Murders” villages.

**The proposed plan neither acknowledges any of these characteristics, nor attempts to deal with any issues arising from them.**

2.] **The standard of work in the Visual Impact assessment was poor**, the selection and grading arbitrary and error strewn. E.g. on SRDO 198 the site was described as one paddock when it contained **six** distinct areas – a school outdoor classroom, an area of community land, an organic hay meadow, a garden extension and a house and outbuildings, and a conservation woodland. In all categories the plot was listed as “low to medium” [impact] yet the overall category was “low” - mathematically impossible.

**3.] The road development in the Greater Risborough Development Plan must have a huge impact** on all sites except 17a yet the Planning Authority seems to want to advance the housing developments to help pay for this. The map of the road pattern shows a feature which was removed in 1961 – so the base map must date from before then – hardly an encouragement to public confidence in the Planning Authority or to suggest that the right hand knows what the left hand is doing.

**4.] The Planning Authority dictatorially indicated opposition to sites far better** than any of the nominated sites apart from 17a [and maybe 1] Notably the brown field sites at Holly Tree Farm [where an entirely low cost development was offered] Rifle Range Farm [close to the permitted development at the Bernard Arms] and the Askett Garden Centre [development already allowed] are all superior – the latter two being on the bus route, and easily accessible to the station, Village Hall and school. Members of the Committee say that they must obey these diktats – which begs the question why bother – just let the Planning Authority impose its arbitrary choices and not waste time and money on a pretended consultation.

5.] The Planning Authority unusually chose to include the whole parish rather than the villages and then effectively chose the villages within that. Hardly surprising that despite a huge effort from some of us [e.g. knocking on 90 doors and talking to 53 householders] the response has been so weak with no response from anyone in Cadsden, Chiltern, or Kimblewick and 4 responses from the whole of Marsh [Marsh Green, Marsh Crossing, Marsh Hill, Brickfields]. Also undermining the process by allowing Site 10 to go ahead with a premature declaration that it would be part of the Local Plan, suggests that this whole process is just window dressing.

**Don't be surprised if the plan is voted down or gets a derisory turnout**