

Matter 6 Written Statement – Ian Parkinson (725)

I would like to add some further responses to Wycombe District Council's 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 6

1) One of the aims of the Green Belt is to encourage the efficient use of Urban land, I note that there are many urban sites that do not meet the recommended target of 30 houses per hectare. This is a minimum target and would be expected to be higher in Urban areas, and as nowhere has been justified in the Plan. This inefficient use has been raised by many developers of these sites. Of WDC's list of Brownfield urban sites in Wycombe that only just over a fifth have been included in the Local plan, again contrary to the aims of the Green Belt.

2) The Council plan has proposed removing the Poppy road site from the Green Belt, but no explanation of how this site differs from between and dozen and two dozen similar sites not removed elsewhere, examples can be provided if required. By removing the site, the Council has set its definition of exceptional circumstances and they need to be applied consistently across the district.

2) Green Belt protection should not prevent the economic and social development of a settlement, and also not override other regulations. This is obviously a judgement call, but by not providing affordable housing in relation to the existing housing and infrastructure, due to Green Belt restrictions this is a fundamental failure of the Plan, in that providing for too few houses to be built is preventing social and economic development of many settlements.

3) WDC has the lowest use of the Green Belt to help meet its housing targets. Councils with a similar issue with about half their areas covered by the GB have used it to find between a quarter and fifth of their needs for Wycombe it is about a tenth. The Council is passing on an unmet need of 2,275 despite that council having to build a similar number of houses in their green belt despite only having about 5% of their land restricted.

3) The number of houses allocated for sites released from the Green Belt Local Plan has remained largely unaltered since it was first muted in 2013. This is despite the government indicating that it is in favour of development of the right sites since then and survived a Buckinghamshire wide review by Arup's of the Green Belt across the County and Wycombe's own review of the individual sites.

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