
From: Jacqui Farnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 25 March 2019 19:13
To: NewLocalPlan
Subject: Responses to Main Modifications to WDC Local Plan.docx
Attachments: Responses to Main Modifications to WDC Local Plan.docx; ATT00001.txt

Click https://www.mailcontrol.com/sr/2Of0D-M6sE3GX2PQPOMvUia7ubmZNLk3ErVH63GEG9fEsrtG_9Y83k7cjkG5uOC7NqC7KGg3g4ozGm2rSK1dVQ== to report this email as spam.

Responses to Main Modifications to WDC Local Plan

General

Firstly I would like to comment that none of the modifications within the Plan could be considered 'Main Modifications' – they are minor changes to wording, paraphrasing or wordsmithing. As such I would make an objection that the title of the document is misleading.

PMM2 Page 15

The wording here is in conflict with Policy DM30 which should also aim to enhance the AONB but fails to do so. In addition it is in conflict with numerous other proposals in the document which fail to enhance our historic environment

PMM3 Page 24

Again, lofty statements here are in conflict with the content of the Plan, specifically around travel, as the development at Princes Risborough will mean there is more traffic. Co-location of employment with housing is not something that is reflected in this Plan.

POLICY CP3 Page 35

The modifications are not reflected in the Plan. There is a failure throughout to maximise the use of brownfield sites and instead development is focussed on green field including some AONB and Green Belt. There is a total lack of consistency with regard to site selection with reasons for not building in Marlow being equally applicable to Princes Risborough. In addition, the reasons for not developing the brownfield site at Saunderton (ie visibility from AONB) are equally applicable to the Princes Risborough development, but disregarded.

POLICY PR3 Page 171

Sustainability of growth has not been considered. Per the NPPF the Plan should consider environmental, social and economic agendas – this Plan does not as is apparent from the volume of representations. The economic aspect in particular has been totally disregarded with the severe lack of employment opportunities in Princes Risborough being previously well documented from all sides

POLICY PR5 Page 188

The failure of the Plan to provide for an adequate strategic buffer between Longwick and Princes Risborough has not been addressed, despite strong representations at the Hearing.

Page 348-9

The modified wording fails to demonstrate that the Plan is compliant with NPPF and the CROW Act 2000 wrt Chilterns AONB

POLICY PR8

The relief road proposed in the Plan is vehemently opposed by the local community and other key stakeholders as was very apparent during the hearing and representations. It was one of the 4 key issues on the Inspector's agenda and had the largest number of objectors during the discussion. Despite this, voices were not heard, and nothing has been addressed. The viability of funding the road was a matter of significant discussion but is ignored. The failure of WDC to be entirely honest with respect to the HIF fund bid has also been disregarded.

It is noted that there is a modification which requires a safe crossing of the relief road for non motorised traffic on Picts Lane – but there is no detail on how this should be achieved, the associated costs or the impact on traffic flow. There is similarly no assessment of the impact of the new Blanchfords access on traffic flow. Given that improving traffic flow was one of the key objectives of the relief road, it should be imperative that these ‘main modifications’ be assessed and considered against the alternative route options.

POLICY PR11

The revised wording seems only to emphasise all the reasons why development should NOT take place on this site. It was very apparent during the on-site visit by the inspector that WDC had not determined the exact access route from the relief road – nor is there an obvious solution given the presence of ponds in that area of the chalk stream. The addition of the second access route requires its own safety assessment due to the limitations on width of this secondary access road, and the visibility concerns noted by the inspector. Will the householders be affected and if so, in what way? The proposed buffer areas are welcomed – but what does this look like, who will be responsible for their maintenance? All of these points need to be clear to fulfil the requirements of proper public consultation.

Sustainability Appraisal

It is very apparent that this has been retrofitted to fit the town plan, rather than being an unbiased assessment. As such it does not address any of the concerns raised during the hearings. It is clearly an amalgamation of previous iterations and has not addressed anything new. There are relevant factors that should have been taken into consideration with this appraisal including the Oxford-Cambridge link road and the impact that it has on the appropriate placement of housing within the new unitary council area; and the significant lack of demand for new properties in the vicinity of Princes Risborough including Haddenham, Stoke Mandeville and Chinnor which suggests the Government Housing Needs Assessment figures are seriously flawed.