

INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION OF THE LONGWICK-CUM-ILMER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

EXAMINER: Jill Kingaby BSc BSc (Econ) MSc MRTPI

LONGWICK-CUM-ILMER NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN EXAMINER'S QUESTIONS

From my initial reading of the Longwick-cum Ilmer Parish Neighbourhood Plan (NP) and the supporting evidence including the responses to the latest consultation exercise, I have a number of questions for the Parish Council and Wycombe District Council. It would be most helpful to receive comments in writing as early as possible, so that I can progress the examination in a timely fashion.

Firstly, please would you confirm that the submitted NP does not breach Human Rights, within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998. I have seen no evidence that it would do so, but I would appreciate confirmation by the Councils that the legal requirements have been met in this regard.

The following questions arise from my reading of the consultation responses:

1. Red Kite Development Consultancy (007) provided detailed information about the current and past usage of the Shoulder of Mutton Public House, including the claim that use as a public house ended in 1996, and all current uses are residential only. I am informed that the site is previously developed land where redevelopment should be generally acceptable, etc. Please would the Councils comment on this information, and advise whether Policy A6 (and Policy A4) should be amended in the light of fresh evidence?
2. Framptons (008) commented that Wycombe District Council has recently resolved to grant planning permission for residential development on a site at Rose Farm, which is the subject of NP Policies L4a and L4b. Framptons are critical of these policies' criteria regarding access, community facilities and landscape and boundaries. In view of progress on the recent planning application and the comments made, do the Councils think modifications should be made to Policies L4a and L4b?
3. Thames Water (009) drew attention to the potential cumulative effect of development on water supply and wastewater. It raised some specific concerns about proposed allocations L1, L2 and L4. Do the Councils think that the NP should be modified in light of these comments?
4. Bellwood Homes (010) referred to the appeal decision of 23rd August 2017 for development on land at Ivy Farm, Lower Icknield Way, and the Inspector's acceptance that Wycombe District Council could not demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. Bellwood Homes also noted that land adjoining the Policy L3 site, which it proposes for inclusion in the NP, was assessed as suitable for housing development in the Longwick Capacity Study. It would assist me to understand both the Parish Council's and Wycombe District Council's views on this information.
5. Rectory Homes (015) also drew attention to the recent appeal decision permitting 9 units at Ivy Farm. Should this be acknowledged in the NP, possibly with a new policy and/or amendments to Policies Maps? Rectory Homes also referred to the removal of the rural green gap, proposed in Policy A3, by the previous Examiner of the earlier NP. It would be helpful to know the Councils' views on the Examiner's recommendation and the retention of this proposed designation.

6. Savills (012) advised that the Princes Risborough Town Plan, referenced on Page 30 of the NP, will be included in the emerging Wycombe District Local Plan. Savills suggested that there were some inconsistencies between the NP and the emerging Local Plan, notably between draft Policies PR4 & PR5 and Policy A3 of the NP. What is Wycombe District Council's and the Parish Council's perception of this?
7. Gladman Developments Limited (013) criticised Policy A3 and the rural green gap concept. In addition, it stated that land at Boxer Road/ Barn Road subject to Policy L2 had been granted planning permission on appeal, and questioned the need for a policy in the NP. Has the policy been superseded by this appeal decision? Do the Councils think that Gladman is correct that criteria for design and landscape principles are overly onerous, and more flexibility is needed so as not to undermine the viability of development? Please advise whether or not the policy should be retained or modified in the light of these considerations.

A number of parties have referred to progress on the emerging Wycombe District Local Plan, and I shall monitor progress using the Council's website. However, if Wycombe District Council could confirm the latest position regarding progress on the Local Plan, that would be most helpful.