

#### **Matter 4 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 4**

2) In the 1997 Local plan it was recognised that improvement to access of the Princess Estate, in particular a second entrance, in Princes Risborough was a priority to help stimulate employment in the north of the district and reduce the 2,200 working age population of the town that have to commute. In the next 20 years there was a fall in the industrial base of the district with most of them been in the north, with five major employers closing. In the Local Plan all that has been provided has been replacement of site lost due to the Local Plan, not reflecting the increased need for employment opportunities that WDC recognised 20 years ago have not been addressed in the Local plan, showing a lack of aspiration, failing to even address the issue of a second entrance.

5)As part of the Plan Princes Risborough will have lost at least two industrial site which the proposed new Industrial Estate in Longwick replacing them providing a minimal increase. However, two sites under construction were ex industrial sites which have been lost in the last decade and this has not been replaced, so in real terms there is a major loss of employment land. This means that only one area where industrial land is being created and it is close the main estates so concentrating them into a small area. To create this industrial estate will require improvement of connecting roads and is provided on land owned by the council.

5)I support the aims of the Council to support tourism and cherish the Chilterns unfortunately I see no concrete evidence of this in this plan. The north of the district is an area which can benefit with the natural attraction of the countryside within reach of London. However, the destruction of many walking trails, and world-renowned views into and out of the Chiltern ANOB will be severely damaged by the level of houses proposed in this part of the district, destroying a potential income generator in a neglected part of the district.

6)There is no support evidence or documentation on the requirement of GP to support the new population levels. The existing number of GP's for the existing population of Kimble, Longwick and Risborough is 8 the Local Plan will more than double the population of the area, so an increase of 5-8 Gps would be a reasonable expectation not the 2 proposed, a number of requests have been made to support this figure to the council without success. The GP requirement should recognise the fact that the 2011 census figures did not include approx. 250 residents of old people's homes in Princes Risborough, and their greater use of GP facilities,

6)Roughly about 4,000 homes are required to support a GP surgery, the Risborough area will provide just under 4000. The effect of the plan will make the Risborough area one the highest number of GPs to patients in the country (source Daily Telegraph FOI request 2016), and close to the WHO unsustainable level.

5)The 1997 Local plan envisaged that an increase of 700 homes would require the sewage works to be moved, with a plan of 3,500 new homes no new sewerage facilities are required. I note that in their representation that Thames Water have only looked at the effect of individual developments, varying between 100-500, not reflecting on the cumulative effect of 3,500-4000 new houses. They stated the expansion zone of 2000 would require major improvements. It can be assumed that for about twice that the amount of investment would be much higher. During the Park Mill enquiry for 500 houses Thames water requested a Grampian exception so raising doubts about deliverability, of the houses envisaged in the Risborough area.

5)The Odournet report carried out on the PR sewage treatments works in 2016, carried out in relation to the Park Mill enquiry for 500 houses, recommended in his expert view that the buffer zone should be increased. though he admitted that government regulations would allow it, based on this WDC reduced the buffer Zone. This means that about 10% of people will be affected, roughly about 20-30 residents of these houses.

8)With the demise of the High Street being illustrated with many recent high-profile retail failures, this year, the centres that are suffering most are regional centres like Wycombe. The Local plan should reflect this new world, when looking forward. Therefore, more support needs to be provided to the smaller local High streets in the smaller towns which can service their immediate community quickly and efficiently, which will help the council secure its future revenue, unfortunately this is not reflected in their plan, instead it has concentrated on developing one centre.

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.