

Matter 3 Written Statement – Ian Parkinson (725)

I would like to add some further responses to Wycombe District councils Local Plan. But may I explain my interest firstly I am a concerned resident of Princes Risborough and was also a member of the Princes Risborough Steering group for most of its existence. I have found many of the issues raised in the minority report resonated with my experiences so had no hesitation with adding my name to it. With a background of 30 years of experience managing finance departments around the world, I took my time responsibilities on the Steering group seriously and researched planning issues and legislations, and as expected it discovered it is a complex field and not as black and white as it was often painted by WDC. My view on the plan is closer to those of RARA, than WDC, and I have assisted them in producing their responses, but I have different views that from them on some issues, which I would like to put forward at your enquiry bringing a different perspective to some of the matter, which I have already applied for earlier this month.

Matter 3

3)It should be noted that an OAN assessment of 13,200 for a council in the South East of England and London, is very low, therefore relying on an unmet need of about a sixth of this figure shows a lack of robustness in the councils review of its ability to meet these needs.

3) I note that the 5% relief buffer has not been included in this figure. The objective of this is to have a reserve if issues mean that the identified sites are unable to deliver, therefore it should be based on the intended housing builds and needs to be included, of 10,925 not ignored.

3)Since this process has started in 2013 the figures behind the plan has remained constant but for two parts. This has been despite the fact that detailed reviews have been carried out, the housing requirements changing, it even survived the appointment of new head of planning. The only figures that have changed has been the unmet need and the number of houses proposed to be built in the Risborough area, the figures for the rest of the district have been subject to reductions or minor changes over five years, despite changes and a better understanding of the issues faced.

4) Five-year housing supply will need to be based on a figure that will include a buffer reserve so if it is different from the Local plan number it will be impossible for it to be ever met. Secondly since WDC has failed to deliver this for five years the reserve number could be increased to 20% from 5%, making the discrepancy even greater

5) Contrary to the governments recommended aim of 30 house per hectare, of the sites identified in the Wycombe urban conurbation, there are about a dozen sites with a nett density lower than that which could accommodate just under another 200 homes.

5) The developers of the reserve sites have stated in their representation that they feel the density stated is too low, supporting the view made by G Hearn made in their 2016 report. As they are within the urban area of Wycombe, efficient use of these sites is encouraged by both Green Belt legislation and the NPPF, more greatly emphasised in the new NPPF. In a district with a major unmet need WDC's view appears indefensible

5)When looking at the break down of figures that make up the Local Plan, it would be useful if WDC could reconcile the figures. The Houses built up to March 2016 was about 100 more than the submission to the office of statistic at the time, the windfall was stated as 33 for the next 15 years

but a figure of 559 was used. The figure up to 2018 March, in September about half the target still had to be built, was this ambitious target achieved, or is the Local now behind schedule

7)The Viability report commissioned by the Bucks councils, stated that the target of producing so many houses in PR was unrealistic and 800 had to be moved to after 2033. This still relies on an optimistic start date of 2022, which requires a number of events to be achieved within that timetable to be met understandably the report's author is concerned, so further slippage should be expected, a better positioned relief road would have remove many of these issues. The deliverability of a major part of the plan is questionable, a point supported in the submissions made by two developers, not surprisingly, but they do have good project management experience

14) To be able to answer this point we need to know how many affordable homes have been allowed the sites already built or in the course of construction as part of the Plan. So how many have to be found in the proposed sites. Secondly on the proposed sites I do not see a set figure just a proposed target, how does this compare to the ratio of actual sites, and if different how will the ratio be improved, assuming that a majority of the need is going to be allocated to sites awaiting permission.

14)WDCs policy of jobs in the south houses in the north which this plan espouses, has detrimental effects on many aspects such as congestion and air pollution, and on affordable homes owners. Assuming that affordable homes distribution is similar to the homes distribution. By failing to provide the right home in the right places it will have a greater effect on people where money is tight. Housing them away from the jobs so incurring extra travel costs, but also reduce the hours parents can work as they have to make the journey to collect their children from school, but also take them away from the support network of grandparents that many working parents need.

Can I take this time in thanking your staff in the assistance they have provided in this process and in particular Ian Kemp in his patients in answering my many questions.lok8lllo

Yours respectfully

Ian Parkinson.