

WYCOMBE DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

SCHEDULE OF MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

Important Notes:

- The purpose of the examination is to determine whether the Wycombe District Local Plan is sound in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. To be sound the Plan must be: **Positively prepared; Justified; Effective;** and **consistent with national policy.**
- Participants should only respond to the questions which directly relate to their previously-submitted written representations on the plan. Please clearly indicate in your statement(s) the question(s) you are answering.
- Further statements should be proportionate in length to the number of questions being answered and should not, in total, exceed 3,000 words per Matter.
- I am examining the plan as submitted by the Council. Therefore, I will not, at this stage, be considering the merits for development of sites not included in the plan.
- The questions concerning soundness are primarily focussed on the plan's policies. Insofar as they relate to the plan's soundness, Chapters 1 – 3 of the plan, which relate to the Introduction and Context, Wycombe District – The Big Challenge and Our Vision and Strategic Objectives, and other supporting text will be considered as part of the discussion of the relevant policies.
- **If you have questions in respect of this document or any aspect of the Examination then please contact the Programme Officer, Mr Ian Kemp, on 01527 861 711 (Landline) or 0772 300 9166 (Mobile) or by email at idkemp@icloud.com.**

STAGE 1 – MATTERS ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

Matter 1 – Legal Compliance and the Duty to Cooperate

1. What are the relevant strategic matters in relation to the duty to cooperate?
2. In preparing the plan did the Council engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis with neighbouring authorities and other relevant organisations on relevant strategic matters, in respect of the Duty to Cooperate? What were the outcome of these discussions?
3. How has that cooperation been undertaken and have any formal agreements or Memorandum of Understandings been produced?
4. What outcomes have resulted from the cooperation with adjoining authorities in relation to: Housing; Gypsy and Travellers; Employment; and Infrastructure?

5. Has the plan been prepared in accordance with the adopted Local Development Scheme (WDLP 12)?
6. Has consultation on the plan been carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (WDLP 11) and the requirements of the 2004 Act (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations?
7. Is the Sustainability Appraisal (WDLP 2) adequate in terms of its assessment of the likely effects of the Plan's policies and allocations and its consideration of reasonable alternatives and have the requirements for Strategic Environmental assessment been met?
8. Is the Habitats Regulations Assessment (WDLP 3) robust and does the plan include the measures (including a suitable review mechanism) identified in this document as necessary to ensure compliance with the Habitats Regulations?
9. In light of the '*People over Wind, Peter Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta*' judgement is the Council content that the Habitat Regulations Assessment is legally compliant?
10. Does the Plan include policies designed to ensure that the development and use of land in Wycombe contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change?
11. How does the Plan address the issue of air quality?
12. Does the Plan comply with all other relevant legal requirements, including those in the 2004 Act (as amended) and the 2012 Regulations?
13. Does the Plan provide robust mechanisms for the Monitoring and Implementation of the Plan's Strategy?
14. Will the Plan be supported by Supplementary Planning Documents?

Participants

Wycombe District Council
Berkeley Strategic (966)
Gladman (845)
Home Builders Federation (911)
Igloo Planning for JSN Property (948)
Keep Bourne End Green (1347)
Keith Jamson (780)
Nexus Planning for Inland Homes (924)
PM Designs (1092)
Richard Clayton (587)
Risborough Area Residents Association (600)
Rob Barden (849)
RPS for Halsbury Homes (918)
Strutt & Parker for IM Land (1129)
Susan Jamson (789)

Turley for IM Land (1165)
Turley for Segro (1244)
Wake Up Risborough (707)
West Waddy ADP for Bourne End Residents Association (1011)
West Waddy ADP for Hawks Hill Widmoor Residents Group (1012)
Wilks Head & Eve for MPAC (917)
Will Streule (883)

Matter 2 - The Plan's Strategy

1. Is the Vision sufficiently aspirational and locally specific to form the basis for planning in Wycombe over the Plan period?
2. Are the Plan's objectives appropriate, positively prepared and justified and are they capable of delivering the vision for Wycombe District set out in the Plan?
3. Is the Plan's Spatial Strategy (Policy CP2) consistent with the requirement of the NPPF to promote sustainable development
4. Does the Plan reflect the strategies and proposals of infrastructure providers?
5. Has the Plan's Spatial Strategy been positively prepared, is it justified and will it be an effective mechanism for delivering growth over the Plan period?
 - a) Does the Plan's Spatial Strategy represent an effective approach to delivering sustainable development (Policy CP1) over the Plan period?
 - b) What are the key components of the Plan's Spatial Strategy and how do they interact?
 - c) Does the Plan's Spatial Strategy effectively link transportation, employment and housing growth?
6. Has the Settlement Strategy (Policy CP3) been positively prepared, justified and will it be effective in delivering sustainable growth?
 - a) How has the settlement hierarchy been defined and what level of growth is proposed for each tier?
7. How many Neighbourhood Plans are there in the Wycombe, where are they and what is their status?
8. Is the Spatial Strategy sufficiently flexible and can it respond effectively to changing circumstances?

Participants

Wycombe District Council
Andrew Smith for Narvo Asset Management (1005)
Barton Willmore for Gallagher Estates (953)
Barton Willmore for University of Reading (1014)

Berkeley Strategic (966)
Chiltern Society (786)
Chilterns Conservation Board (618)
Gladman (845)
High Wycombe Society (857)
Home Builders Federation (911)
Igloo Planning for JSN Property (948)
Keep Bourne End Green (1347)
MSC Planning Ltd (392)
Nexus Planning for Inland Homes (924)
North Bucks Parishes (1230)
PM Designs (1092)
Progress Planning for Les Mason (959)
Richard Clayton (587)
Risborough Area Residents Association (600)
RPS for Halsbury Homes (918)
Star Planning for Richborough Estates (954)
Strutt & Parker for IM Land (1129)
Turley for IM Land (1165)
Turley for Segro (1244)
Wake Up Risborough (707)
West Waddy ADP for Bourne End Residents Association (1011)
West Waddy ADP for Hawks Hill Widmoor Residents Group (1012)
Will Streule (883)
Wooburn & Bourne End PC / Neighbourhood Plan Group (551)

Matter 3 - Housing Provision, Supply, Affordability and Gypsy and Traveller accommodation.

Issue: Is the objectively-assessed need for housing soundly based, supported by robust and credible evidence and is it consistent with national policy? And will it be met during the Plan period?

Objectively-Assessed Need for Housing

1. Have the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessments (HEDNA 2, HEDNA3, and HEDNA 5) been positively prepared and are their conclusions in respect of housing soundly based and justified?
2. Is the objectively-assessed need for housing (OAN) of 13,200 additional dwellings over the plan period (660 dwellings per annum) based on robust and up-to-date evidence?
3. In order to meet the OAN for housing Policy CP4 (Delivering Homes) indicates that land will be allocated for 10,925 dwellings (550 per annum) to be constructed in Wycombe over the Plan period. How and where will the remaining 2,275 dwellings be delivered?
4. Will there be a 5 year supply of housing for the duration of the Plan period, how has this been calculated and is the delivery profile realistic?

Housing Supply

5. Is the make-up of the housing supply justified and supported by robust evidence?
6. Are the allocations supported by a robust and comprehensive site assessment methodology, free from significant development constraints and demonstrated to be economically viable?
7. Will the Plan be an effective mechanism for delivering the housing requirements contained in Policy CP4?
 - a) Are the site allocations available and deliverable within the anticipated timescales?
 - b) Should the Plan include a policy for the phased release of land for housing?
8. Will Policy DM22 (Housing Mix) be an effective mechanism for delivering an appropriate mix of housing types, sizes and tenures?
9. Will Policy DM21 (Location of New housing) and Policy DM27 (Housing for Rural workers) provide an appropriate framework for managing the location of new housing development?

Other Housing Policies

10. Will Policy DM23 (other residential uses) provide an effective mechanism for assessing proposals for hotels and houses in multiple occupation?
11. Do Policies DM36 (Extensions and alterations to existing dwellings), DM37 (Internal space standards) and DM41 (Optional technical standards for building regulation approval) provide an appropriate mechanism for the design of new, extended and altered dwellings.
12. How will the need for specialist housing contained in Policy CP4 be met?

Affordable Housing

13. Have the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessments (HEDNA 2, HEDNA3, and HEDNA 5) been positively prepared and are their conclusions in respect of affordable housing soundly based and justified?
14. Are the affordable housing requirements identified in Policy DM24 (Affordable Housing) deliverable and justified by robust viability evidence? And how will the affordable housing need of 3,100 dwellings be met?
15. Does Policy DM25 (Rural Exceptions Affordable Housing) provide a clear and consistent framework for securing affordable housing on rural exception sites?

Gypsies and Travellers

16. Is the Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople Accommodation Assessment (GT1) soundly based and are its conclusions justified?
- a) How and where will the requirement for 7 pitches for Travellers and 3 plots for Travelling Showpeople be met?
17. Does Policy DM26 (Criteria for Traveller sites) provide a clear and consistent framework for assessing proposals for additional Gypsy and Travellers sites?

Participants

Wycombe District Council

- Alder King for Aviva (1233)**
- Barton Willmore for Gallagher Estates (953)**
- Barton Willmore for University of Reading (1014)**
- BB Architecture & Planning for IVG (1255)**
- Berkeley Strategic (966)**
- Bidwells for Careys New Homes (860)**
- Environment Agency (971)**
- GL Hearn for WG Binder (944)**
- Gladman (845)**
- Home Builders Federation (911)**
- Igloo Planning for JSN Property (948)**
- Keep Bourne End Green (1265)**
- Lichfields for St Conga (875)**
- MSC Planning Ltd (392)**
- Nexus Planning for Inland Homes (924)**
- Paul Dickinson & Associates for Mr & Mrs Capp (824)**
- PM Designs (1092)**
- Progress Planning for Les Mason (959)**
- Richard Clayton (587)**
- Risborough Area Residents Association (600)**
- RPS for Halsbury Homes (918)**
- Savills for Bloor Homes (950)**
- Strutt & Parker for IM Land (1129)**
- Turley for IM Land (1165)**
- Wilks Head & Eve for MPAC (917)**
- Wolf Bond for Persimmon & Taylor Wimpey (1268)**
- WS Architecture & Planning for Charles Pitcher (869)**

Matter 4 - Employment, Retail and Town Centres

Issue: Is the objectively-assessed need for employment soundly based, supported by robust and credible evidence and is it consistent with national policy? And will it be met during the Plan period?

Employment

1. Have the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessments (HEDNA 2, HEDNA3, and HEDNA 5) been positively prepared and are their conclusions in respect of economic development soundly based and justified?
2. Are the requirements of Policy CP5 (Delivering Land for Business) realistic, justified and deliverable?
3. Are the allocations supported by a robust and comprehensive site assessment methodology, free from significant development constraints and demonstrated to be economically viable?
4. Will the Plan be an effective mechanism for delivering the employment land requirements contained in Policy CP5?
 - a) Are the site allocations available and deliverable within the anticipated timescales?
5. Will Policy DM28 (Employment areas) provide an effective mechanism for managing new development in strategic and local employment area?

Community Facilities

6. Is Policy DM29 (Community Facilities) soundly based and will it provide an effective mechanism for retaining existing and securing future community facilities?

Town Centres

7. Is Policy CP6 (Securing vibrant and high quality town centres) soundly based and will it provide an effective mechanism for new development in town centres?
8. How has the retail hierarchy been defined?
9. What are the requirements for future comparison and convenience goods both in qualitative and quantitative terms, how have they been defined and how will these requirements be met?

Participants

Wycombe District Council
Bidwells for Careys New Homes (860)
Boyer Planning for Berkeley Homes (1251)
Environment Agency (971)

MSC Planning Ltd (392)
Planning Works for Highshore Commercial Ltd (978)
PM Designs (1092)
Rapleys for Comland (932)
Rapleys for LaSalle Investment Management (934)
Turley for Segro (1244)

Matter 5 - Natural, Built and Historic Environment

Issue: Does the Plan provide a framework for the management of the Natural, Built and Historic Environment that is soundly based, justified and consistent with the requirements of national policy?

1. Have the following policies been positively prepared and are they justified, effective and consistent with national policy?
 - a) Policy CP9 (Sense of Place);
 - b) Policy CP10 (Green infrastructure and the natural environment);
 - c) Policy CP11 (Historic environment);
 - d) Policy CP12 (Climate change);
 - e) Policy DM30 (The Chilterns Area of Outstanding natural Beauty);
 - f) Policy DM31 (Development affecting the historic environment);
 - g) Policy DM32 (Landscape character and settlement patterns);
 - h) Policy DM33 (Managing carbon emissions);
 - i) Policy DM34 (Delivering green infrastructure and biodiversity in development)
 - j) Policy DM35 (Placemaking and design quality);
 - k) Policy DM37 (Small scale non-residential development);
 - l) Policy DM38 (Water quality and supply);
 - m) Policy DM39 (Managing flood risk and sustainable drainage systems);
and
 - n) Policy DM20 (Matters to be determined in accordance with the NPPF).

Participants

Wycombe District Council
Barton Willmore for University of Reading (1014)
Buckinghamshire County Council (1232)
Bucks & MK Natural Environment Partnership (831)
Chiltern Society (786)
Chilterns Conservation Board (618)
Colin Courtney (740) / Wake Up Risborough (707)
Environment Agency (971)
High Wycombe Society (857)
MSC Planning Ltd (392)
Nexus Planning for Inland Homes (924)
Nick Gomersall (253)
North Bucks Parishes (1230)
PM Designs (1092)
Turley for IM Land (1165)
Turley for Segro (1244)

Vincent Moynihan (1157) West Waddy ADP for Bourne Hill Residents Association (1011)
West Waddy ADP for Hawks Hill Widmoor Residents Group (1012)
Wilks Head & Eve for MPAC (917)

Matter 6 - Green Belt session

Issue: Do the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the proposed revision of the Green Belt boundaries and can the need for housing and employment development be accommodated without releasing land from the Green Belt?

1. Are the Green Belt Assessments (GB1 and GB2) soundly based, justified and consistent with national policy?
 - a) Can the need for housing and employment development be accommodated on deliverable sites within settlement without releasing land from the Green Belt?
 - b) Has the capacity of areas within settlement to accommodate growth been robustly assessed and what were the conclusions?
 - c) How were the removal sites identified and assessed?
 - d) Was an assessment undertaken of the contribution of each of the removal sites to the Green Belt purposes and what were the conclusions?
2. Is the approach to amending Green Belt boundaries to release sites for development soundly based and is it consistent with the conclusions of the review in respect of their contribution to Green Belt purposes?
3. Do the exceptional circumstances exist to justify the proposed revision of the Green Belt boundaries?
4. What are the exceptional circumstances, as required by the NPPF paragraphs 79 – 86, that justify the Plan's proposed revision of the boundaries of the Green Belt?
5. Do Policies DM43 (Replacement or extensions of dwellings in the Green Belt), DM42 (Managing Development in the Green Belt) and DM45 (Conversion of existing buildings in the Green Belt and other rural areas) provide an appropriate mechanism for the managing the replacement, extension and conversion of buildings in the Green Belt?

Participants

Wycombe District Council
Barton Willmore for Gallagher Estates (953)
Berkeley Strategic (966)
Chiltern Society (786)
Colin Courtney (740) / Wake Up Risborough (707)
GL Hearn for WG Binder (944)
Home Builders Federation (911)
Hughenden Parish Council (264)
Ian Parkison (725)

Igloo Planning for JSN Property (948)
Keep Bourne End Green (1265)
Keith Jamson (780)
Lichfields for St Conga (875)
MSC Planning Ltd (392)
Naphill and Walters Ash Residents Association (293)
Nexus Planning for Inland Homes (924)
North Bucks Parishes (1230)
PM Designs (1092)
Progress Planning for Les Mason (959)
Risborough Area Residents Association (600)
RPS for Halsbury Homes (918)
Star Planning for Richborough Estates (954)
Strutt & Parker for IM Land (1129)
Susan Jamson (789)
Turley for IM Land (1165)
Turley for Segro (1244)**West Waddy ADP for Bourne End Residents Association (1011)**
West Waddy ADP for Hawks Hill Widmoor Residents Group (1012)
Wilks Head & Eve for MPAC (917)

Matter 7: Development Framework - High Wycombe

1. Are the following allocations soundly based and is there evidence that the development of the sites is viable and deliverable?
 - a) HW4 - Abbey Barn North;
 - b) HW5 - Abbey Barn South and Wycombe Summit
 - c) HW6 - Gomm Valley and Ashwells;
 - d) HW7 - Terriers Farm and Terriers House;
 - e) HW8 - Land off Amersham Road including Tralee Farm, Hazlemere;
 - f) HW9 - Part of Greens Farm, Glynswood, Green Hill, High Wycombe;
 - g) HW10 - Horns Lane, Booker, High Wycombe;
 - h) HW11 - Clay Lane, Booker, High Wycombe;
 - i) HW12 - Leigh Street, Desborough area, High Wycombe;
 - j) HW13 - Former Bassetsbury Allotments, Bassetsbury Lane;
 - k) HW14 - Highbury Works/Hazelmere Coach Wks, Chestnut Lane, Hazelmere;
 - l) HW15 - Land to the rear off Hughenden Road, High Wycombe;
 - m) HW16 - Wycombe Air Park;
 - n) HW17 - L/A High Heavens household Recycling Centre, off Clay Lane;
 - o) HW18 - Cressex Business Park, High Wycombe;
 - p) HW19 - Office outlet Site, Queen Alexandra Road, High Wycombe;
 - and
 - q) HW21 - Land at Queensway, Hazlemere

Participants

Wycombe District Council
Alder King for Aviva (1233)
Boyer Planning for Berkeley Homes (1251)

Buckinghamshire County Council (1232)
Chepping Wycombe Parish Council (859)
Chiltern Society (786)
Chilterns Conservation Board (618)
Environment Agency (971)
High Wycombe Society (857)
Holmer Green Village Society (1091)
Keith Jamson (780)
Mark Holmes (908)
Paul Dickinson & Associates for Mr & Mrs Capp (824)
Pegasus Group for Bovis Homes (983)
Penn & Tylers Green Residents Society (620)
PIMMS Action Group (26)
Planning Works for Highshore Commercial Ltd (978)
Save Wycombe Hospital (811)
Susan Jamson (789)
Tony Mason (1191)
Turley for IM Land (1165)
Turley for Segro (1244)
Widmer End Residents Association (2170/649)
Wilks Head & Eve for MPAC (917)
Wolf Bond for Persimmon Homes & Redrow Homes (1252)

Matter 8: Development Framework – Princes Risborough

1. Are the following policies soundly based, justified and will they provide an effective mechanism for delivering and managing the comprehensive development of Princes Risborough?
 - a) PR3 (Princes Risborough Area of Comprehensive development including Relief Road);
 - b) PR4 (Main Expansion Area and Development Framework);
 - c) PR5 (Settlement Boundary and Strategic Buffer);
 - d) PR6 (Main Expansion Area Development Principles);
 - e) PR7 (Development Requirements)
 - f) PR12 (Town Centre Traffic and Public Realm Enhancements) and
 - g) PR17 (Princes Risborough Delivery of Infrastructure)

2. Is Policy PR8 (Provision and Safeguarding of Transport Infrastructure) justified and will it provide an effective mechanism for securing new and improved transport infrastructure?

3. Will Policy PR15 (Molins Sports Ground) provide an effective mechanism for bringing Molins Sports Ground back into beneficial use as a sports pitch?

4. Are the following allocations soundly based and is there evidence that the development of the sites is viable and deliverable?
 - a) PR9 – Princes Estate Expansion;
 - b) PR10 – Land North of Lower Icknield Way;

- c) PR11 – Land to the Rear of Poppy Way;
- d) PR13 – Town Centre Site: Land Fronting New Road (Back Lane);
- e) PR14 – Town Centre Site: land South of Horns Lane;
- f) PR16 – Land at Princes Risborough Station; and

Participants

Wycombe District Council

Anthony Wilkinson (552)

Barton Willmore for Gallagher Estates (953)

Chiltern Society (786)

Chilterns Conservation Board (618)

Chris McCombie (711)

Colin Courtney (740)

Environment Agency (971)

Gary Odell (624)

Gladman (845)

Ian Parkinson (725)

Jacqui Farnell (586)

Jim Eyre (564)

Joanna Wilkinson (686)

Lesley Lunnon (828)

Mandy Dormer (814)

Pegasus Group for Endurance Estates (920)

Princes Risborough Town Council (937)

Richard Clayton (587)

Risborough Area Residents Association (600)

Rob Barden (849)

RPS for Halsbury Homes (918)

Sanjiv Bhatia (341)

Savills for Bloor Homes (950)

Tony Davies (1182)

Wake Up Risborough (707)

Wilks Head & Eve for MPAC (917)

Will Streule (883)

Wolf Bond for Persimmon & Taylor Wimpey (1268)

Matter 9: Development Framework – Rural Areas

1. Are the following allocations soundly-based and is there evidence that the development of the sites is viable and deliverable?
 - a) RUR1 – Land South of Finings Road, Land End;
 - b) RUR2 – Land Between Chalky and Marlow Road, Lane End;
 - c) RUR3 – Land at Sidney House, Lane End;
 - d) RUR4 – Little Marlow Lakes Country Park;
 - e) RUR5 – Longwick-Cum-Ilmer Parish;
 - f) RUR6 – Great and Little Kimble-Cum-Marsh Parish;
 - g) RUR7 – Land off Clappins Lane, Naphill;
 - h) RUR8 – Land South of Mill Road, Stokenchurch;

- i) RUR9 – Land at Wood farm, Stokenchurch;
- j) RUR10 – Land rear of Stokenchurch Business Park, Ibstone Road, Stokenchurch;
- k) RUR11 – Heavens Above, 16 High Heavens, Marlow Bottom; and
- l) RUR12 - Uplands Conference Centre, Four Ashes.

Participants

Wycombe District Council
Arrow Planning for Bellwood Homes (559)
Chiltern Society (786)
Chilterns Conservation Board (618)
Colin Meakes (1108)
Environment Agency (971)
Igloo Planning for JSN Developments (948)
Jerry Gray (820)
Land & Partners Ltd for Various Clients (801)
Martin Watkins (906)
Naphill & Walters Ash Residents Association (293)
Peter Murray (1033)
Risborough Area Residents Association (600)
Turley for IM Land (1165)
Turley for Segro (1244)
Will Streule (883)

Matter 10 - Development Framework – Marlow, Bourne End & Wooburn

1. Are the following allocations soundly based and is there evidence that the development of the sites is viable and deliverable?
 - a) MR6 – Seymour Court Road, Marlow;
 - b) MR7 – Globe Park, Marlow;
 - c) BE1 - Slate Meadow, Bourne End & Wooburn;
 - d) BE2 – Hollands Farm, Bourne End & Wooburn; and
 - e) BE3 – Health facilities in Bourne End & Wooburn.

Participants

Wycombe District Council
Chilterns Conservation Board (618)
Environment Agency (971)
Keep Bourne End Green (1347)
Planning Works for Mr L Noe (979)
Progress Planning for Les Mason (959)
Savills for Catesby Estates (1168)
Star Planning for Richborough Estates (954)
Turley for IM Land (1165)
Turley for Segro (1244)
West Waddy ADP for Bourne End Residents Association (1011)
West Waddy ADP for Hawks Hill Widmoor Residents Group (1012)
Will Streule (883)

Matter 11 – Monitoring

1. Does the Plan provide an appropriate framework for monitoring policies and proposals?
2. Does the Plan provide clear and effective guidance on implementation, monitoring targets and triggers for review?

Participants

Wycombe District Council