
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 27 March 2019 12:54
To: NewLocalPlan
Subject: Comments on Wycombe local plan:

Dear Sir,

We wish to comment on the modifications to the Wycombe local plan specifically related to the area in Lane End known as the Golden Guff, RUR1(AP9.1), and do not feel that the form on your website allows us to comment in a way we are used to. Consequently, we trust you will indulge us and pass on our comments to the appropriate authority.

We note the reduction in the number of houses proposed on the site of the Golden Guff but feel this reduction in no way addresses the issues which prompted general vehement opposition to this development as previously stated. We also hope that this reduction is not a cynical attempt to favourably influence planning consent. We will list our concerns as bullet points although some of the points will be quite expansive to illustrate our concerns.

1. There are more suitable places to build houses, other than green field sites within areas of outstanding natural beauty.
2. The Golden Guff is within an area of outstanding natural beauty and provides a unique habitat for plants and animals because it is a boggy upland mire at some 700 feet above sea level. It is also of potential scientific interest because of the flora and fauna present.
3. Building houses on the Golden Guff will exacerbate the wet spongy ground and flooding could become a real problem. AP2.5 states that settlements should not be proposed in areas where development should be restricted such as AONB, Green belt and areas at risk of flooding.
4. A further point of major concern is the potential water run-off from any development on the elevated Golden Guff to the surrounding areas. It has been drained in the past but still remains waterlogged after modest rainfall. The developers talk vaguely of water management systems to control and manage any run off but a few holding tanks will not suffice to control this. From personal experience, when our neighbour (Sunrise) constructed a small Conservatory, our lawn at Flint Cottage became boggy after modest rain. A soakaway dug to take the water from the conservatory roof was ineffective and even digging it deeper did not improve the situation. After consultation with the Building regulations department, at Wycombe District Council, it was recommended that we dig another soakaway in our own garden to ameliorate the problem. It seems most unfair that we had to take remedial action to resolve an issue created by a neighbour. We live downhill from the Golden Guff, so we are most concerned that any development there will increase water flow and drainage towards our property. We bought land to the rear of our cottage approximately 12 years ago and it was prone to flooding within hours of moderate rainfall (see picture below of land to the rear of Flint Cottage after rainfall in 2006).



We employed a civil engineering firm and spent a considerable sum of money having the land drained properly because the substrata of the area is very varied. Therefore we would be mortified and angry if this work was undone by any housing development on the Golden Guff. The Golden Guff is a high point in the area and water drains from there in all directions, so any development would exacerbate this! This would potentially affect many properties in Lane End. Indeed, several properties already suffer from water runoff from the Golden Guff

5. Many years ago when the Golden Guff was drained, pipes were laid into the adjacent wood because the Guff and the wood were both owned by the same landowner. This is no longer the case so does this create a legal dilemma?
6. Any housing development on the Golden Guff will increase traffic flow onto the Finings road at peak times. The access point from this development will increase the potential for road traffic accidents because of visibility and traffic volume issues at peak times.
7. The elevated land of the Golden Guff would make the housing development there much more obvious and prominent than the recent Shanley development. As such it will destroy the rural limit of Lane End which has been protected for so long.
8. PMM45 states that development of the site is required to preserve the setting of Lane End conservation area and the listed White Gable Cottage. These already have a rural setting which allows them to be seen in their natural glory. PMM45 also suggests development is required to maintain access to the water tower but access to this utility is already present. We are also concerned that several mature trees are likely to be removed in the plan to develop access to the proposed housing development.
9. The development of the northern portion of the Golden Guff would mean that the remaining land could not be used for pasture because there would be no convenient access. Historically this land has been used to accommodate the bull that services the

local pedigree dairy herd because it is the only field which does not have a footpath through it. If the remaining pasture cannot be used, it increases the probability of further development in the future.

10. As a general point, we have lived in Lane End for the past 46 years and are well aware of the variable substrata of the area, composed of mixed clay and sand seams, including several underground springs. This variability has resulted in several sink holes and considerable subsidence in the area. For example, Lammas Way was constructed in the seventies, yet subsidence has only recently become apparent in some of the properties.
11. Finally, there are several Lane End residents who do not have access to computers and are unused to challenging local authority decisions but who do object to the proposed development on the Golden Guff. Their views should not be ignored simply because they feel powerless.

Yours sincerely,
Jan & Tony Savage



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