

---

**From:** David Garratt [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 25 March 2019 23:31  
**To:** NewLocalPlan  
**Subject:** Comments on PMMs.

Dear Sir/Madam,

Once again I write to you regarding the proposed town plan for Princes Risborough and the associated “relief” road. It would appear that the views of the majority of the local population count for nothing. The local authority has not addressed the specific and detailed objections from many involved stakeholders about the proposed extreme degree of additional housing in the town plan and is evidently intent on ignoring the clearly expressed concerns of thousands of local inhabitants regarding the ironically-described “relief road”.

I have three particular comments on the “Proposed Main Modifications” as outlined which all lie at the heart of the issue. There are many other sub-set points which are of concern, but these are the core issues which, in my opinion, demonstrate that the whole plan is fundamentally unsound.

**1. LEVEL OF PROPOSED NEW DWELLINGS. PMM 27/28.**

The proposed increase in dwelling numbers of some 70% is not sustainable from economic and social standpoints. The local topography will mean a divided town left poorer by the destruction of its valuable rural character. Local employment is scarce which will lead to the area being nothing more than a dormitory town. Current new developments, such as Pictsmede, are experiencing slow pickup of purchase given the prevailing political and economic uncertainty. 2016 ONS figures reflect a significant fall in demand for housing, so why is the proposal still using erroneous and out-dated information? The proposed level of additional homes to those currently being built will simply mean an over-supply of buildings lying empty with all the attendant cost of upkeep and vandalism.

**2. OVER-ARCHING ISSUES. PMM 1 and 6.**

This plan is a sideshow when one considers some of the strategic issues it has to face, but has not considered. There is a complete administrative sea-change with the impending abolition of WDC and the creation of a single Unitary Authority which will take a much wider view of the challenges than the narrow one currently being pursued. The external impacts of HS2 and CR2 will affect the deliverability of major road and bridge construction and a skew in Berks/Bucks house prices respectively. Inevitably, the eventual cost will spiral with consequent damage to the public purse.

**3. TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE. PMM 33.**

As it stands, this “relief” road will merely cause traffic chaos at the station end of Picts Lane. Even if the Blanchfords site is utilised as part of the plan, then there is simply not enough room to plan a phased development without causing a dangerous and congested scenario in real time. Concerns have been raised and vociferously aired by local inhabitants, current developers and Highways England, but here has been no coherently appropriate response to them. The “Culverton Plan” rides roughshod over AONB location, relies upon a single land purchase, has no transparency about its funding and will merely move any perceived traffic issues elsewhere along the A4010.

The road is not necessary in the first place, its “need” being founded on the mistaken perception of increased traffic in the town. The issue is not one of traffic volume, but of flow, which could be readily addressed by re-configuring pedestrian crossings with (comparatively) loose change.

The mood of the local inhabitants is increasingly one of frustration at the perceived lack of understanding and response of the local authority. More concerning is the growing belief that the local plan as it stands will cause significant chaos and spiralling cost. The “consultancy process” has been no more than lip-service to a poorly-represented community.

Yours faithfully.

David Garratt.