

# Wycombe District Council

## Draft Local Plan Proposed Site Allocations Policies

### Summary of responses to consultation – June-August 2016

#### Table of contents

Site Policy: HW4 – Abbey Barn North .....	3
Site Policy: HW5 – Abbey Barn South and Wycombe Summit .....	6
Site Policy: HW6 – Gomm Valley and Ashwells .....	9
Site Policy: HW7 – Terriers Farm and Terriers House .....	17
Site Policy: HW8 – Land off Amersham Road including Tralee Farm, Hazlemere .....	22
Site Policy: HW9 – Land to the rear of Hughenden Road, High Wycombe .....	34
Site Policy: HW10 – Glynswood, Green Hill, High Wycombe .....	36
Site Policy: HW11 – Horns Lane, Booker, High Wycombe .....	39
Site Policy: HW12 – Land off Penn Road, Hazlemere .....	44
Site Policy: HW13 – Leigh Street, Desborough Area, High Wycombe .....	53
Site Policy: HW14 – Former Bassetsbury Allotments, Bassetsbury Lane .....	55
Site Policy: HW15 – Wycombe Airpark, High Wycombe .....	57
Site Policy: HW16 – Land Adjoining High Heavens Household Recycling Centre, Off Clay Lane .....	63
Site Policy: HW17 – Cressex Business Park, High Wycombe .....	65
Site Policy: HW18 – High Wycombe Town Centre – Former Local Development Order Area .....	66
Site Policy: HW19 – Land at Queensway, Hazlemere .....	67
Site Policy: MR6 – Seymour Court Road, Marlow .....	69
Site Policy: MR7 – Land North of Oak Tree Road, Marlow .....	72
Site Policy: MR8 – Globe Park, Marlow .....	100
Site Policy: BE1 – Slate Meadow, Bourne End and Wooburn .....	103
Site Policy: BE2 – Hollands Farm, Bourne End and Wooburn .....	113
Site Policy: BE3 – Land off Northern Heights, Bourne End and Wooburn .....	125
Site Policy: RUR1 – Land South of Finings Road, Lane End .....	133
Site Policy: RUR2 – Land between Chalky Field and Marlow Road, Lane End .....	136
Site Policy: RUR3 – Land off Ellis Way, Lane End .....	140
Site Policy: RUR4 – Land Adjoining Sidney House, Lane End .....	143
Site Policy: RUR5 – Land off Simmons Way, Lane End .....	144
Site Policy: RUR6 – Little Marlow Lakes Country Park .....	145

Site Policy: RUR7 – Land at Thame Road/Off Bar Lane, Longwick.....	147
Site Policy: RUR8 – Land at Rose Farm, Longwick.....	150
Site Policy: RUR9 – Land off Thame Road, South of Chestnut Way Junction, Longwick ..	154
Site Policy: RUR10 – Land at RAF Walters Ash.....	156
Site Policy: RUR11 – Land off Clappins Lane, Naphill.....	158
Site Policy: RUR12 – Land south of Mill Road, Stokenchurch.....	162
Site Policy: RUR13 – Land to the rear of Stokenchurch Business Park.....	166
Site Policy: RUR14 – Uplands Conference Centre.....	168

## Site Policy: HW4 – Abbey Barn North

Respondents:	Rail Future Thames Valley (DNLP 1164) A & C Lewis (DNLP 0981) Woodland Trust (DNLP 2777) Wycombe Wildlife Group (DNLP 2608) O Witney (DNLP 0075) G Wiseman (DNLP 2706) Aylesbury Clinical Commissioning Group (DNLP 2712) South Bucks District Council (DNLP 2698) Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714) J Robinson (DNLP 2971) Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682) R Farmer (DNLP 1960) Historic England (DNLP 1798) S Young (DNLP 2199) Armstrong Rigg Planning (Abbey Barn Holdings SA) (DNLP 2444) Persimmon Homes (DNLP 2433) R Coombs (DNLP 0118) A Paine (DNLP 0092) Environment Agency (DNLP 2857)						
Number of Representations:	19	Objection:	2	Support:	4	Comment:	13

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

##### Delivering Homes

- Site is one of WDC's reserve sites, and is therefore supported for residential development.

##### Green Spaces

- Support for delivering green infrastructure in development.

#### Objecting:

##### Infrastructure

- Local primary schools oversubscribed, school expansions and improvements essential for growth.
- Site access on a steep hill and on difficult terrain.

##### Highways

- Road network unable to support growth, especially when combined with the Abbey Barn South development.
- Significant traffic issues during peak rush hour.

## Flooding

- Surface flooding at east end of Deangarden Rise already an issue, new development would increase this by increasing surface runoff

## Density

- Low housing density used by WDC at HW4 (5.5 to 8.2 dwellings per hectare) is preventing WDC from meeting its housing need.

## **Commenting:**

### Infrastructure

- Installation of a bridge over the railway seen as essential.
- Funding should be made available for the refurbishment of Lynton House to enable the NHS to maintain a GP presence in the east of Wycombe.
- Ensuring that WDC works with neighbouring authorities to ensure that developments on the fringes of High Wycombe infrastructure requirements do not impact adversely upon neighbouring authorities under the Duty to Cooperate.
- Currently water mains which supply the area are close to capacity. Developer will be required to produce an impact study of the existing infrastructure and assess the need to upgrade water supplies with water provider.
- Any bridge over the Back Stream should be designed to be clear spanning. Unclear exactly where this would be located.

### Highways

- Ensuring that sufficient development is put in place to ameliorate the A40 in light of the impact HW4 will have on the principal arterial road in the area.
- Formation of a new junction at Kingsmead Road to ensure suitable access is achieved.

### Green Spaces

- Ensuring there is no loss or deterioration of the woodland margin of Deangarden Wood by maintaining a 15 meter buffer between the development and the woodland.
- Mitigate the loss of any young woodland by ensuring that net tree cover is increased.
- Ensuring that adequate ecological assessments are carried out in line with the requirements of the NPPF.
- Developer is committed to the retention of calcareous grassland, a priority habitat as defined under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act.

### Conservation

- The Buckinghamshire Historic Towns Project should also form part of the evidence. High Wycombe is an important historical environment with 136 listing entries on the National Heritage list for England.
- The Historic Environment Record and the Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment should be consulted for non-designated assets, and the

Councils Conservation and Archaeological advisors should be consulted for their comments.

- No designated heritage assets on this site.

#### Other

- Site can sustainably supply more homes than the Local Plan has allocated for it.

## Site Policy: HW5 – Abbey Barn South and Wycombe Summit

Respondents:	A Paine (DNLP 0092) J Treadwell (DNLP 0665) RPS CgMs (Hambledon Land Ltd) (DNLP 0686) B Hunt (DNLP 1079) K Edwards (DNLP 1193) Little Marlow Parish Council (DNLP 1318) A Selman (DNLP 1784) Historic England (DNLP 1798) S Young (DNLP 2199) Wycombe Wildlife Group (DNLP 2608) Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682) Chiltern & South Bucks District Council (DNLP 2698) G Wiseman (DNLP 2706) Chiltern & Aylesbury Vale Clinical Commissioning Groups (DNLP 2712) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714) Woodland Trust (DNLP 2777) Kemp & Kemp LLP (Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd) (DNLP 2785) Flackwell Heath Residents Association (DNLP 2830) J Robinson (DNLP 2971)						
Number of Representations:	19	Objection:	2	Support:	1	Comment:	16

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

##### Ecology/Biodiversity

- Removal of the ski slope infrastructure is supported.
- Recreation of the chalk meadows/grassland & open mosaic scrub habitat is supported.
- Connectivity of Deangarden and Keephill Woods is supported.
- Retention of the landscape features is supported.
- The approach of preserving the site's Green Infrastructure by restricting development to the arable fields is supported.
- The redevelopment of the Summit site will give the opportunity to improve the management of Deangarden Wood and the formalisation of public access.

##### Design/Tenure

- Mixed use housing, including affordable housing is supported.
- Distinct architectural character of pockets of development is welcomed.
- 2 - 2 1/2 storeys should generally be the maximum height.
- Character areas to give a sense of place.

## Transport

- Realignment of the public rights of way is supported.
- The integrity of The Ride being maintained by the proposed entrance to the new employment area being through the Pine Trees business development is supported.
- The lowering of the speed limits on both Heath End Road and Abbey Barn Lane is welcomed.
- Buckinghamshire new parking standards of October 2015 being strictly adhered to or bettered is supported.
- Parking on individual plots is welcomed.

## Flooding/Management

- Incorporation of the SuDs strategy into the Green Infrastructure network, including attenuation ponds in The Dell is supported.

## **Objecting:**

### Ecology/Biodiversity

- Against building on land next to Ski Summit due to existing biodiversity on site.

## **Commenting:**

### Infrastructure

- Urgent need to improve local infrastructure (roads, schools, GPs, water system) to handle existing traffic and populace ahead of proposed additions from development.
- Suggested that water provider consider moving up timetable on business plan upgrade for Little Marlow Sewage Treatment Works including earlier public consultation.
- Water provider should move up build to match timetable of reserve sites' development.
- Developers should work with water provider on an impact study of the existing infrastructure for the brownfield sites and smaller infill development in order to determine the magnitude of spare capacity and a suitable connection point.
- Practice plans have been submitted to NHS England to develop a new build surgery to house both Hawthornden and Pound House practices (together with their branch surgeries) in a modern, state of the art building with sufficient capacity to absorb expected population growth from Abbey Barn South as well as development plans in Bourne End.
- Council support sought in identifying new build options for these practices and also funding to ensure that any proposed development is viable.

## Transport

- Daws Hill Lane & Heath End Road must be made adequate for heavy goods.
- Abbey Barn Lane/Heath End Road junction should use a three-arm roundabout rather than four.
- Winchbottom Lane – traffic calming measures OR upgrade to two lanes.

- Impact of motorway traffic noise due to already-high noise levels; provide for noise reduction in new developments.

#### Conservation

- Policy should protect the group of Grade II listed buildings at Abbey Barn Farm to the west by ensuring that development does not encroach intrusively into it.
- The Historic Environment Record and the Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment should be consulted for non-designated assets, and the Councils Conservation and Archaeological advisors should be consulted for their comments.

#### Ecology/Biodiversity

- Deangarden Wood and Keep Hill Wood must be buffered at least 50m from any development.
- Development should only be permitted if measures are included to ensure no negative impact on them from changes in hydrology, air quality, light or noise pollution, recreation or any other reason.
- A long-term management plan, with management funded for the lifetime of the development must be provided for the ancient woodland so as to ensure that the development is not detrimental to it.
- The area labelled as informal green space must include considerable areas of semi-natural habitat, both as part of an overall package to allow the development to achieve a net gain in biodiversity, and also to provide a natural space for recreation to provide an alternative recreation location to the ancient woodland.
- If the ancient woodland is the only green space with high quality wildlife habitat then it is likely to suffer high levels of recreational impact.
- If the ski slope is to be landscaped it should be done so by creating species-rich chalk grassland with a long-term management plan for its maintenance.
- Plans for new tree planting: the use of a range of native trees will mitigate the potential impacts of tree disease.
- A management company should be established to preserve the future appearance of the site and service charges paid by all tenures.



## Site Policy: HW6 – Gomm Valley and Ashwells

Respondents:	Savills (Taylor Wimpy Ltd) (DNLP 2691) A & C Lewis (DNLP 0981) Wycombe Wildlife Group (2608) K Warne (DNLP 0765) D Angus (DNLP 0880) D Angus (DNLP 0879) R & I Mcallister (DNLP 0758) R White (DNLP 0045) J Curry (DNLP 0877) N Barber (DNLP 0870) R Fryer (DNLP 1169) K Hallatt (DNLP 0820) A & A Thibault (DNLP 1328) G Wiseman (DNLP 2706) I Warby (DNLP 1238) J & I Kenny (DNLP 1182) S Robinson (DNLP 2406) A Barber (DNLP 0869) G Watkins (DNLP 2737) M Gillham (DNLP 2584) T Maslen (DNLP 1883) J Cannon (DNLP 0056) D Reeve (DNLP 0052) L Parsons (DNLP 1997) G & H Perfitt (DNLP 0380) D McMahon (DNLP 0621) G & J Gilmartin (DNLP 0433) B Bull (DNLP 2524) D Shaw (DNLP 1110) I Mance (DNLP 1466) I Mance (DNLP 0571) E Short (DNLP 2633) P Credand (DNLP 1316) G Markham (DNLP 1043) Historic England (DNLP 1798) K Cooke (DNLP 2217) S Halms (DNLP 1787) P Jones (DNLP 0104) A Butcher (DNLP 0096) D Berry (DNLP 1871) R Nolan (DNLP 0083) J Robinson (DNLP 2971) A Cooke (DNLP 2269) Ashwells Forum (DNLP 3094) High Wycombe Society Planning Group (DNLP 2877) A Blackborough (DNLP 1783) S Young (DNLP 2199) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (DNLP 2714) R Farmer (DNLP 1960) I & M Barber (DNLP 1456) P Cowley (DNLP 0548) Alder King (AXA Reim) (DNLP 2669)
--------------	--

	M Newitt (2988) P Miller (DNLP 0288) H Murray (DNLP 2523) G Smith (DNLP2241) I West (DNLP 2947) M Goodhall (DNLP 2667) Penn and Tylers Green Residents Society (DNLP 0696) Penn Parish Council (DNLP 2660) P Miller (DNLP 0288) Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390) J Cockroft (DNLP 1759) S Cooke (DNLP 2271) T & G Barlow (DNLP 1700) Pimms Action Group (DNLP 2680) A Coombes (DNLP 0578) South Bucks District Council (DNLP 2698) Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682) Natural England (DNLP 2654) W Tinker (DNLP 0234) R King (DNLP 0383)						
Number of Representations:	73	Objection:	29	Support:	3	Comment:	41

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

##### General

- The development reacts positively to High Wycombe's constrained topography by making best use of the Valley as an asset to the landscape.

##### Employment

- Support for the allocation of the site for B1 employment use, subject to suitable access being achieved.
- The need for new offices stock, especially high quality offices, was noted due to low vacancy rates and the success of the neighbouring business park.
- The location is considered to be attractive to potential occupants.

##### Conservation

- The inclusion of a requirement that the road network must avoid a detrimental impact on local wildlife is welcomed.
- The undeveloped land allows for wildlife enhancements to existing nature conservation sites with potential for community involvements and 'hands on' nature conservation areas and will also provide community land area.

## Housing Allocations

- Support for the allocation, number and range of homes as it will deliver much needed homes and affordable housing.

## Transport

- The location to the north of the A40 will provide links to the town centre, train station and M40.
- The transport improvements as part of delivering the site will improve London Road's congestion and other congestion hotspots and improve public transport.
- The site seeks to promote the provision of non-car modes of travel.

## **Objecting:.**

### General

- Will not provide employment but instead a dormitory for commuters to London and Birmingham.

### Green Belt/AONB

- Countryside should be preserved at all costs and should be classified as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Green Belt. Brownfield land should therefore be used instead.
- Allocation is a contradiction of the Council's promise to preserve the landscape in this area.
- The proposal and associated infrastructure will alter the character, distinctiveness, beauty and quiet nature of the, rural and picturesque village.
- Development will destroy another area of Tylers Green and could lead to Tylers Green losing its identity as distinct villages become merged into one and roads become widened and they become part of High Wycombe, creating urban sprawl.

### Infrastructure

- Strain on infrastructure such as GPs, Hospitals and Schools.
- No detailed information on the provision of additional schools.
- Existing telecoms and electrical infrastructure are prone to outages & are inadequate.
- There is no A&E except Stoke Mandeville.
- Lack of adequate community facilities.
- Objection to associated proposals to alter infrastructure, including making Penn School into a sixth form, which will further increase traffic.

### Highways

- Increased strain on road networks in Hazlemere and east Wycombe, many of which already suffer from congestion and long tailbacks and peak times.
- Additional cars will mean rush hour gridlocks will become more common with associated air quality deterioration and emergency service provision, and escalating social and economic costs.
- Plan fails to provide credible details on how these traffic issues will be addressed.

- Highways authority can't maintain roads to an acceptable standard and so can't cope with additional usage.
- Traffic issues at Cock Lane at peak times which are made worse by the single file bridge and short green lights at the A40 junction, causing traffic to back up and become gridlocked and so current roads cannot cope with more cars.
- Access is poor and will cause congestion - it would make more sense for access to be directly off London Road through the business park, and the new housing should only be accessed from the A40 with no additional through road through Hazelmere and Penn.
- The proposed new spine road exacerbate existing problems and would provide an attractive bypass, resulting in increased traffic and congestion up to Tylers Green and Penn and increase rat run traffic to Amersham, Chesham.
- Cock Lane and Hammersley Lane should remain residential and local village link roads and not a major bypass for Wycombe, as the roads are already congested at peak times and carry too much traffic for the size of the roads.
- If both Gomm Valley and Ashwells development and the Land off Penn Road (HW12) development go up the roads will become gridlocked.
- Proposal to connect Parcel 1 to Hammersley Lane and the signalisation of Hammersley Lane railway will increase peak period congestion on Hammersley Lane caused by the existing signals at its junction with London Road.

#### Community

- Council should listen to local opinion rather than comply with political pressure.
- The proposal will make irreversible changes to the vibrant village community once it is absorbed by High Wycombe.

#### Affordable housing

- The majority of the houses are unlikely to be affordable and cheaper housing which is required. This could be provided more urgently by exhausting brownfield sites.

#### **Commenting:**

##### General

- Tylers Green already has to contend with the housing development at the vacant Penn School.
- Any decision to develop parcel 9 should only be made in conjunction with proposals for parcels 10 & 11 when the council brings these forward.
- The criteria with 1b) is too prescriptive and should be described within the development brief.
- As the last valley, a more sensitive response to the landscape than other urbanised valleys is expected.

##### Extent of Proposal

- Amendments need to be made to the extent of the site.
- Houses in the development should be kept to a minimum and should be ringed with trees to obscure their view.

## Employment

- The sites importance in delivering office accommodation needs greater consideration.
- The use of this site for employment was questioned due to access constraints and employments parts of the site mustn't be linked to the homes.

## Highways

- Improvement to road infrastructure to resolve congestion issues must be made before development takes place.
- Amendments need to be made so the new spine road is called 'spine road' and not 'link road' as that implies a through road, and to the design of the spine road so it will be deliberately designed to discourage its use as an attractive through route to New Road in Tylers Green and onwards to High Wycombe centre
- The traffic forecasts for this development are underestimated due to lack of alternative transport modes and so improvements to road networks must reflect this.
- Schemes to prevent traffic congestion and gridlock in High Wycombe and Flackwell Heath during the planning period won't be very effective.
- Concern that no attempt will be made to address the issues of increases in traffic from the housing developments in Hazlemere.
- Cock Lane should be retained as a single track road and shouldn't be widened at its north end, as the present single track road deters its use by through traffic.
- The new spine road should have traffic calming measures like speed bumps and width restrictions to discourage its use as a through fare to and from A40/M40.
- The spine road will also reduce separation between Penn and Tylers Green – splitting the development with no through road with the majority exiting via Pimms Grove and Peregrine Business Park and a smaller development toward Tylers Green would be more sensible.
- In order to discourage traffic from using Penn as a 'rat run', Cock Lane should be closed in favour of the new spine road which will be more suitable for traffic.
- Access from Parcel 1 should be via a connection from the spine road with egress via Gomm Road to London Road.
- High Wycombe's physical geological character make road additions and modification difficult – the plan will need to address this.
- Plan doesn't address the issue of a new motorway junction (3A) which would reduce traffic, details on this should be included and assessed before any development or planning decisions.
- The proposed spine road isn't just for public transport and the link allows for pedestrians and cycle routes and would connect Robinson road residential development with the proposed primary school on site and to the A40 London Road.
- The transport improvements as part of the development would define a logical movement hierarchy and legible street structure for pedestrians and cyclists
- Increased housing will have a negative impact on traffic congestion leading to Hazlemere crossroads becoming gridlocked.
- Cock Lane won't be able to cope with traffic from additional residents and the access for development on parcel 11 is likely to become a through road for all developments across parcels 9, 10 and 11 causing disturbance.

## Sense of space

- There is currently a lack of separation between Tylers Green and High Wycombe, and the undeveloped break of 170m separating them is less than expected, inappropriate, inadequate, and should be a much larger.
- Undeveloped space needs to be increased to at least 300m in order to preserve the village's character and identity and prevent urban sprawl.
- The size and spread of parcel 8 is too big and won't provide sufficient separation between the Gomm Valley development and Ashwells development.
- Concern of damage to landscape character and destruction of the physical barrier between High Wycombe and Tylers Green due to proposals to increase housing units and extend the development the entire length of the Gomm Valley following the removal of the requirement for outdoor sports on the site
- Tylers Green and Penn must stay separate.
- Development will create one large housing estate spreading from Cressex to Downley to Hazlemere to Loudwater.

## Evidence base

- Three of the most crucial criteria are assessed at the worst score of 'very negative' but only two criteria get very positive.
- Evidence in the Sustainability Appraisal argues against the proposal and supports concerns about loss of green space, increased traffic with the widening of Cock Lane and separation of communities.
- The evidence base to inform this allocation would benefit from a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.

## Impact on current residents

- Concern over noise pollution from the proposed new houses.
- Noise pollution from reversing vehicle beepers during the development will cause disturbance to local residents, which could be resolved using an acoustic muffler.
- It was questioned if they'll be compensation for drops in local property value.
- Concern for where they'll be natural screening through trees to the Hammersley lane residents to block the development and reduce noise.
- Development of land in parcel 11 adjacent to the houses in Greenridge will result in significant overshadowing and will overlook properties in Greenridge and Ashwells.

## Conservation

- It was noted in the Sustainability Appraisal that archaeological features would be affected if development was maximised, causing a very negative effect on heritage and townscape, however with other options that affect is reduced to negative which lends support to the approach of policy HW6 and to the request of an extension to the landscape buffer and the site's northern edge.
- The northern area of the proposal is opposite the Grade II listed Katherine Knapped Residential Home which should be protected through the extension of the landscape buffer as part of the strategy for conservation, enjoyment and enhancement of the historic environment required by the NPPF.

- The Historic Environment Record and the Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment should be consulted for non-designated assets, and the Councils Conservation and Archaeological advisors should be consulted for their comments.
- Concern that the plans offer very little to protect the intrinsic character or environmental quality of Tylers Green.
- Issues of visual and psychological loss of landscape.
- Given the scale of the undeveloped land, habitat creation shouldn't be expected to be maximised as this will lead to visibility issues but must provide a net gain in biodiversity and plan effectively for the undeveloped.
- Concern over development on one of the last dry chalk valleys.
- Policy fails to recognise this site is in the setting of the Chilterns AONB, and thus development must be sympathetic as it will affect the view in and out of the AONB and this should be identified in the place making part of the policy.
- The development contradicts CP8 as Gomm Valley is part of the existing Green infrastructure network. It is a wildlife corridor and 'green finger' linking the AONB throughout Wycombe.

#### Parking

- The development needs to ensure adequate off street car parking to minimise on street car parking.

#### Infrastructure

- Inadequate capacity of the sewage treatment works in Little Marlow to handle additional housing and so developments must include a detailed review of the water waste handling capacity during expected heavy rainfall periods.
- The development should provide a doctors surgery to the south of the site.
- Lack of street lighting in Tylers Green is key to the village feel and separation from High Wycombe so any development shouldn't have street lighting.
- Reference is made to the Reserve Site Infrastructure Delivery Plan and this criterion confuses the issue by articulating elements of the plan which will need careful scrutiny to ensure they meet necessary CIL tests.
- Local infrastructure will be affected by such a large development including schools, doctors, and parking.
- The water supply required for this development is significant additional demand and the mains that feed the area are running close to capacity and so it's likely the developer will be required to work with the water supplier on an impact study existing infrastructure to determine the magnitude of the spare capacity and a suitable connection point.

#### Green Belt and Land Protection

- Acceptance of the development by locals would increase if the green land separating Tylers Green and Penn would remain green in perpetuity, through greater protection such as 'Village Green' status.

## Density

- Concern over the low housing densities in relation to neighbouring authorities.
- Density needs to be lowered, in line with existing properties.
- Housing density for the proposed development in the Gomm Valley should be no greater than for Ashwells at Tylers Green.
- Greenridge residents considered themselves disproportionately affected by the plan and it was questioned whether the development should go ahead given its small contribution overall and greater consideration of residents, cooperation and innovative solutions would be needed if the proposal goes ahead.



## Site Policy: HW7 – Terriers Farm and Terriers House

Respondents:	<p>High Wycombe Society Planning Group (DNLP 2887)          Wycombe Wildlife Group (DNLP 2608)          GL Hearn Limited (Janson Property) (DNLP 1290)          A &amp; C Lewis (DNLP 0981)          A Seels (DNLP 0861)          M &amp; K White (DNLP 1015)          A &amp; V Windsor (DNLP 0127)          A &amp; A Thibault (DNLP 1328)          C &amp; W Willmott (DNLP 0964)          M Price-Stephens (DNLP 0510)          D Angus (DNLP 0880)          D Gamble (DNLP 1127)          S. Kent (DNLP 1154)          Widmer End Residents Association (DNLP 1572)          P O'Brien (DNLP 1982)          H &amp; A McCarthy (DNLP 1256)          D Savostiyarov (DNLP 0185)          Woolf Bond Planning (Persimmon Homes and Redrow Homes) (DNLP 2443)          J. Wemyss (DNLP 0595)          Hazlemere Parish Council (DNLP 1471)          M &amp; R Fell (DNLP 0879)          M Stephens (DNLP 0612)          R Bellis-Jones (DNLP 0558)          P Ellis (DNLP 2080)          J Birch (DNLP 2366)          N Smith (DNLP 1851)          G Wiseman (DNLP 2706)          F &amp; W Keys (DNLP 1361)          R Wotherspoon (DNLP 2792)          J Crawley (DNLP 2640)          B Simon (DNLP 2227)          E Stoelker (DNLP 2766)          C Harris (DNLP 1656)          R Clinton (DNLP 2930)          D &amp; M Robets (DNLP 1967)          A Cooke (DNLP 2269)          G &amp; G Gomm (DNLP 2512)          R Prior (DNLP 2798)          P Williams (DNLP 2655)          T Dawson (DNLP 3091)          H Bowen (DNLP 2601)          V &amp; P Main (DNLP 2060)          F Paul (DNLP 2589)          I Lewis (DNLP 1464)          B Rodgers (DNLP 3051)          B Ford (DNLP 1999)          J Mitchell (DNLP 2382)          J Ellis (DNLP 2256)          S Cooke (DNLP 2271)          E Curtis (DNLP 1774)          A Cecil (DNLP 1938)</p>
--------------	--

	<p> B Poulton (DNLP 1928)  S Davis (DNLP 0471)  A Kelleher (DNLP 1706)  M Goodall (DNLP 2667)  B Ellis (DNLP 2255)  Persimmon Homes North London (DNLP 2433)  R Farmer (DNLP 1960)  G Markham (DNLP 1043)  Natural England (DNLP 2654)  E Tiangga (DNLP 1087)  W Towers (DNLP 1683)  K Elder (DNLP 2430)  T Green (DNLP 1740)  Alder King (AXA Reim) (DNLP 2669)  R Garner (DNLP 2656)  D Bates (DNLP 2967)  Brands Hill Residents Association (DNLP 2411)  Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390)  Historic England (DNLP 1798)  M Newitt (DNLP 2988)  Penn Parish Council (DNLP 2660)  C &amp; M Andrew (DNLP 1867)  Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682)  Hazlemere Tennis Club (DNLP 1806)  Church of St. Francis of Assisi (DNLP 1866)  P Melrose (DNLP 0057)  J Holder (DNLP 2454)  S Young (DNLP 2199)  T Mason (DNLP 2211)  Terriers Farm Action Group (DNLP 2903)  Aylesbury Clinical Commissioning Group (DNLP 2712)  Berks, Bucks &amp; Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714)  D Field (DNLP 1826)  Wycombe District Council (DNLP 2905)  H &amp; A McCarthy (DNLP 1256)  I McEwan (DNLP 0285)  G Vincent (DNLP 0287)  R King (DNLP 0383)  S Chapman (DNLP 1930)  Z Harnett (DNLP 1965)  G Hall (DNLP 2156)  J Anderson (DNLP 2149)  W Tinkler (DNLP 0234) </p>						
Number of Representations:	94	Objection:	47	Support:	4	Comment:	43

## Summary of issues/comments:

### Supporting:

#### Delivering Homes

- Use of Reserve Sites to help reach WDC's housing needs is supported.
- The Increase of indicative numbers of dwellings for the proposed site from 310-410 to 380-540 is justified by the increase of the site boundary which now include Terriers House and the associated open space.

#### Conservation

- The site will have no adverse effect on the listed buildings setting given the existing arrangement of buildings and the vegetation around them.

### Objecting:

#### Highways

- Traffic congestion already a problem on Amersham Road and Kingshill Road without any additional strain from new development.
- There is no pavement along Kingshill Road, meaning the only way for children from the Terriers area can get to Great Kingshill School is by car.
- Buses not an effective means of transport in the local area.
- Limited parking availability in Terriers. In particular, the Wellesbourne estate, Green Road, Tower Road and Chadwick Street suffer from a shortage of suitable parking.
- Proposed access road onto A404 could prove dangerous, as turning out onto a busy piece of dual carriageway would be difficult.

#### Infrastructure

- Local schools and medical facilities already at capacity.
- Lack of A&E and maternity unit at Wycombe Hospital would be dangerous for new residents.

#### Housing

- Numbers need reconsidering due to the impact of Britain's vote to leave the European Union.
- Concerns over lack of affordable housing.

#### Green Belt

- Loss of Green Belt and AONB land is undesirable.
- Proposed second site access to the A404 will pass through an area of ancient woodland which has protected status, helping to separate Hazlemere from the northern sprawl of High Wycombe.

## Community Facilities

- Loss of Hazlemere Recreational Ground, including facilities for football, bowls and tennis. Planned access road through tennis courts which were recently refurbished using substantial rate payers and lottery funding.

## Sense of Place

- Planned development will contribute to Wycombe's urban sprawl, with a loss of separation for villages such as Hazlemere, Widmer End and Four Ashes merging to become part of a High Wycombe conurbation.
- Site is an inappropriate location for high density development.

## Flooding

- Inadequate assessment of the 100 year flood levels and sustainable disposal of surface water.

## Other

- Noise, light and air pollution, particularly during the delivery of the development.
- Object to the integration of the barns into the development. They are not listed and are in a dilapidated state with little if any heritage value.
- Terriers Farm, with a density of less than 21.3 dwellings per hectare, contributes to WDC's inability to meet its assessed housing requirements, with the result that neighbouring districts are required to build at a much higher density to meet WDC's unmet housing needs.
- Site delivery comes at the same time as HS2 development begins, bringing increased levels of traffic to the area.

## **Commenting:**

### General

- Concern that development of this site along with other proposals puts too much strain on the local area.

### Community Facilities

- Need for social infrastructure in the form of a defined community centre incorporating social, educational, health and retail facilities to serve what will be effectively a new village in terms of population and area.

### Infrastructure

- Improved footpaths and cycle-ways to provide alternative means of transport to local amenities.
- The proposed cancellation or changes to the home-school bus service for secondary schools will result in many more car journeys.

- The Amersham Road is already a site of frequent congestion. Concerned that this will be made worse by any further development unless infrastructure is developed to deal with the increased amount of traffic.
- HW7 should instead be developed into a northern Park & Ride to help relieve town centre congestion.
- Proposed provisions of primary schooling at Gomm Valley and Ashwells for Terriers Farm required clarification, especially on catchment areas.

#### Green Space

- Ensure that green space is maintained by preserving the integrity of the three fields to the east of the site and preserving the existing north-south hedgerow.
- Retain a green link between King's Wood in the south and the AONB countryside to the north to retain its function as a wildlife corridor.
- The plans involve coalescence of Terriers and Hazlemere, where the new development adjoins Willow Chase. This does not leave the strategic open space stated in the development of the site.
- The site includes areas of woodland priority habitat. Development must not be permitted on these woodlands, the woodlands must be buffered from any development.
- Development should only be permitted anywhere in this option if measures are included to ensure no negative impacts on the woodlands.

#### Conservation

- The Historic Environment Record and the Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment should be consulted for non-designated assets, and the Councils Conservation and Archaeological advisors should be consulted for their comments.
- Terriers House is a Grade II listed building and if it is included within the site, then the council should require its retention and that of an appropriate setting. If it is still proposed to convert the property to residential then the acceptability of residential conversion is dependent on how well the interior survives and how much additional development is needed to make residential conversion viable.
- The historic barns and farmhouse should be retained and incorporated into the development. This needs to be informed by an adequate understanding of its significance.

## Site Policy: HW8 – Land off Amersham Road including Tralee Farm, Hazlemere

Respondents:	<p> L Dodd (DNLP 0213)  P Middling (DNLP 0236)  M Duggan (DNLP 0270)  S Danzine (DNLP 0283)  S &amp; I Watson (DNLP 0359)  E Cabbage (DNLP 0366)  J Crompton (DNLP 0392)  P Hopper (DNLP 0404)  A Ruxton (DNLP 407)  G de Graaf (DNLP 0423)  R Crowe (DNLP 0434)  V Ellis (DNLP 0435)  M Newman (DNLP 0436)  N Love (DNLP 0437)  M Trackman (DNLP 0438)  S Plumridge (DNLP 0439)  D King (DNLP 0441)  S Baker MP (DNLP 0449)  J Crussell (DNLP 0450)  J Lynskey (DNLP 0451)  L Withnall (DNLP 0455)  M Young (DNLP 0464)  R Jones (DNLP 0464)  Mr &amp; Mrs Sheppard (DNLP 0466)  Lewy0007 (DNLP 0469)  S Trueman (DNLP 0479)  G Spiller (DNLP 0480)  S Jephcote (DNLP 0481)  D Wall (DNLP 0482)  D &amp; A Baker (DNLP 0483)  R Exley (DNLP 0484)  C &amp; N Stevens (DNLP 0485)  S O'Reilly (DNLP 0487)  T Collins (DNLP 0488)  L O'Reilly (DNLP 0490)  R Shea (DNLP 0491)  B Atkinson (DNLP 0492)  E Wellen (DNLP 0493)  P Matthews (DNLP 0494)  P &amp; T Witney (DNLP 0497)  C Campbell-Pike (DNLP 0499)  K &amp; D Kant (DNLP 0505)  C Hunt (DNLP 0506)  A Postlethwaite (DNLP 0516)  R &amp; J Patterson (DNLP 0518)  T Glaze (DNLP 0521)  M Stapley (DNLP 0531)  A Shayler (DNLP 0534)  C Ryan (DNLP 0539)  K Carr (DNLP 0541)  R Street (DNLP 0542) </p>
--------------	---

O Bridge (DNLP 0544)  
R Bellis-Jones (DNLP 0558)  
I Mance (DNLP 0571)  
J Laurence (DNLP 0575)  
Mr & Mrs Purvis (DNLP 0577)  
N Pattenden (DNLP 0589)  
S Ruxton (DNLP 0591)  
M Stephens (DNLP 0612)  
J & N Landon (DNLP 0628)  
S Capon (DNLP 0629)  
M Tobin (DNLP 0630)  
J & D Wren (DNLP 0633)  
S Fiveash (DNLP 0634)  
C & R Perry (DNLP 0635)  
T Herbert (DNLP 0640)  
D Kipling (DNLP 0641)  
L Norris (DNLP 0642)  
S Watts (DNLP 0643)  
H & C Stevens (DNLP 0644)  
R Plumb (DNLP 0645)  
K Owen (DNLP 0647)  
M Earl (DNLP 0648)  
N Brewer (DNLP 0650)  
M Mahoney (DNLP 0651)  
A Eden (DNLP 0653)  
D Squire (DNLP 0655)  
P Wardle (DNLP 0656)  
C Cockley (DNLP 0659)  
D & J Benge (DNLP 0662)  
P De Neys (DNLP 0663)  
M De Neys (DNLP 0664)  
K Walsh (DNLP 0666)  
C Davis (DNLP 0668)  
A Taylor (DNLP 0672)  
T Sirrell (DNLP 0676)  
C & K Alexander (DNLP 0679)  
S Baker (DNLP 0687)  
R Morgan (DNLP 0692)  
P Putman (DNLP 0697)  
T Cantle (DNLP 0700)  
C Rieger (DNLP 0701)  
D Lee (DNLP 0706)  
I & C Shore (DNLP 0711)  
K Coward (DNLP 0713)  
B Illingworth (DNLP 0714)  
G Ryder (DNLP 0715)  
D Daniel (DNLP 0717)  
N Llewellyn (DNLP 0719)  
B Garrett (DNLP 0732)  
J Williams (DNLP 0738)  
O Plater (DNLP 0739)  
T Warner (DNLP 0740)  
R Newman (DNLP 0743)  
L Sansum (DNLP 0744)  
L Chapman (DNLP 0746)

S Doidge (DNLP 0747)  
R Heaton (DNLP 0751)  
J Pettitt (DNLP 0749)  
A Miller (DNLP 0751)  
K Adams (DNLP 0752)  
R Warner (DNLP 0753)  
C Gregory (DNLP 0754)  
R & I Mcallister (DNLP 0758)  
D Marshall (DNLP 0759)  
K Warne (DNLP 0765)  
L Johnson (DNLP 0769)  
M Taylor (DNLP 0773)  
N Vickery (DNLP 0776)  
T Welch (DNLP 0778)  
V Orange (DNLP 0790)  
L Brown (DNLP 0799)  
J & H Duncan (DNLP 0806)  
D Soni (DNLP 0812)  
M & J Adams (DNLP 0827)  
S Chhugani (DNLP 0839)  
M Anderson (DNLP 0849)  
K & M Lawrence (DNLP 0862)  
T & E Whiteley (DNLP 0863)  
J Conway (DNLP 0864)  
D & A Bolam (DNLP 0865)  
S James (DNLP 0866)  
J Ryan (DNLP 0867)  
D Jones (DNLP 0868)  
S Carmen (DNLP 0871)  
A Vaughan (DNLP 0872)  
T Baker (DNLP 0873)  
HP15 6QX (DNLP 0874)  
J Goulding (DNLP 0878)  
D Knight (DNLP 0881)  
J & J Tripp (DNLP 0882)  
D Reynolds (DNLP 0883)  
B Murphy (DNLP 0885)  
D & W Stripling (DNLP 0886)  
W James (DNLP 0945)  
K Dawes (DNLP 0949)  
A Wells (DNLP 0960)  
S & J Corbett (DNLP 0968)  
E & L Magson (DNLP 0969)  
J Cadle & M Brinton (DNLP 0970)  
A & C Hornsby (DNLP 0992)  
N Scaniglia (DNLP 0996)  
F Gregory (DNLP 1011)  
N White (DNLP 1022)  
K & A Darvill (DNLP 1026)  
A Hale (DNLP 1042)  
G Markham (DNLP 1043)  
E Tebbutt (DNLP 1047)  
B Halai-Soni (DNLP 1050)  
G Pearce (DNLP 1064)  
S Stepien-Korcipa (DNLP 1067)



R Korcipa (DNLP 1068)  
 Hazlemere & Holmer Green resident (DNLP 1077)  
 M White (DNLP 1081)  
 A Smith (DNLP 1083)  
 S & P Sleight (DNLP 1098)  
 K Hall (DNLP 1102)  
 G Whittaker (DNLP 1138)  
 P Aujla (DNLP 1145)  
 S Kent (DNLP 1154)  
 M King (DNLP 1175)  
 M Sealy (DNLP 1194)  
 Mr & Mrs Mansfield (DNLP 1201)  
 S & J Castle (DNLP 1202)  
 S Busler (DNLP 1252)  
 C and S Longman (DNLP 1304)  
 S Edgar (DNLP 1327)  
 Mr & Mrs A Thibault (DNLP 1328)  
 B Evans (DNLP 1338)  
 N Wilson (DNLP 1347)  
 S Harrison (DNLP 1363)  
 E Greatorex (DNLP 1380)  
 S King (DNLP 1393)  
 C Lawton (DNLP 1394)  
 L Cameron (DNLP 1403)  
 R Verity (DNLP 1424)  
 A Harrison (DNLP 1438)  
 S Doyle (DNLP 1439)  
 J Hearn (DNLP 1448)  
 I & M Barber (DNLP 1456)  
 Mr & Mrs Watkins (DNLP 1462)  
 I Mance (DNLP 1466)  
 M Sharpington (DNLP 1469)  
 Hazlemere Parish Council (DNLP 1471)  
 F Clark (DNLP 1480)  
 A Uppington (DNLP 1488)  
 A Kirby (DNLP 1493)  
 L & S Mohammed (DNLP 1500)  
 D Layman (DNLP 1510)  
 N Smith (DNLP 1520)  
 B & R Whitten (DNLP 1526)  
 L Brown (DNLP 1532)  
 E Grice (DNLP 1544)  
 B Whitnall (DNLP 1545)  
 H Aitchison-McDowell (DNLP 1561)  
 Widmer End Residents Association (DNLP 1572)  
 R New (DNLP 1597)  
 S Hawthorne (DNLP 1608)  
 C Harris (DNLP 1656)  
 M Vernon (DNLP 1691)  
 C Padley (DNLP 1692)  
 T & G Barlow (DNLP 1700)  
 B & C Hill (DNLP 1721)  
 P Healy (DNLP 1722)  
 P Patterson (DNLP 1734)  
 Maloney (DNLP 1735)

A & M East (DNLP 1736)  
M Martin (DNLP 1738)  
K Mance (DNLP 1767)  
R Crawshaw (DNLP 1771)  
M Butler (DNLP 1773)  
L Hunt (DNLP 1775)  
R & M Green (DNLP 1778)  
R Whitnall (DNLP 1785)  
S Halms (DNLP 1787)  
S & P Rawbone (DNLP 1791)  
Historic England (DNLP 1798)  
J Davidge (DNLP 1804)  
D Field (DNLP 1826)  
S A Shields (DNLP 1830)  
G Clark (DNLP 1833)  
D Purkayastha (DNLP 1834)  
P Sheen (DNLP 1853)  
B & W Lawson (DNLP 1855)  
C & M Andrew (DNLP 1867)  
S Mason (DNLP 1869)  
K Waterhouse (DNLP 1877)  
P Dee (DNLP 1879)  
S Miller (DNLP 1884)  
S Brady (DNLP 1885)  
D Dow (DNLP 1888)  
A Ashmore (DNLP 1889)  
S Harrison (DNLP 1891)  
C Harbour (DNLP 1905)  
P Foot (DNLP 1915)  
T Barnard (DNLP 1927)  
S Chapman (DNLP 1930)  
J Barnard (DNLP 1935)  
A Cecil (DNLP 1938)  
S Riisnaes (DNLP 1955)  
K Lewis (DNLP 1962)  
Z Harnett (DNLP 1965)  
D & M Roberts (DNLP 1967)  
R Smith (DNLP 1969)  
K Willard (DNLP 1971)  
A Hester (DNLP 1974)  
P Hester (DNLP 1976)  
P O'Brien (DNLP 1982)  
R Bellis-Jones (DNLP 1991)  
P & S Bridge (DNLP 2004)  
P Johnston (DNLP 2008)  
R & L Hunt (DNLP 2012)  
C Daniels (DNLP 2023)  
R & R Dugan (DNLP 2024)  
E Johnstone (DNLP 2029)  
R Smith (DNLP 2054)  
P Allington (DNLP 2057)  
V & P Main (DNLP 2060)  
J Worley (DNLP 2063)  
D Chapman (DNLP 2065)  
D & A Ward (DNLP 2067)

S & M Thorburn (DNLP 2071)  
J Smith (DNLP 2073)  
S Jamson (DNLP 2075)  
P Ellis (DNLP 2080)  
R Edwards (DNLP 2088)  
C Barlow (DNLP 2093)  
R Harrison (DNLP 2102)  
Mr & Mrs B Radmore (DNLP 2108)  
A & T Sollars (DNLP 2109)  
T & V Owen (DNLP 2123)  
S Hall (DNLP 2131)  
C Edwards (DNLP 2150)  
P Bowen (DNLP 2151)  
G Hall (DNLP 2156)  
K Sonley (DNLP 2162)  
N Edgerley (DNLP 2168)  
L Styles (DNLP 2169)  
S Morton (DNLP 2176)  
S & V Camp (DNLP 2177)  
A Holmes (DNLP 2179)  
P Cadman (DNLP 2184)  
S Young (DNLP 2199)  
A Gray (DNLP 2207)  
T Garrett (DNLP 2208)  
M Crowther (DNLP 2210)  
J Anderson (DNLP 2216)  
J Rea (DNLP 2225)  
S & G Studd (DNLP 2230)  
J & J Bailey (DNLP 2235)  
A & K Lee (DNLP 2239)  
K Jamson (DNLP 2243)  
B Ellis (DNLP 2255)  
J Ellis (DNLP 2256)  
A Bowers (DNLP 2260)  
S Barratt-Singh (DNLP 2261)  
A Barber (DNLP 2265)  
S Harcourt (DNLP 2279)  
P Edwards (DNLP 2286)  
C Kitchen (DNLP 2294)  
S Chappell & A Scott (DNLP 2298)  
J & N Mediratta (DNLP 2311)  
P Turner (DNLP 2313)  
M Croucher (DNLP 2316)  
M Pilkington (DNLP 2335)  
Mr & Mrs Richardson (DNLP 2341)  
A Pilkington (DNLP 2350)  
O Turner (DNLP 2363)  
L Dell (DNLP 2381)  
J Mitchell (DNLP 2382)  
Mr & Mrs H Brennan (DNLP 2383)  
J Edwards (DNLP 2389)  
D Kenyon (DNLP 2390)  
A Downie (DNLP 2399)  
Brands Hill Residents Association (DNLP 2411)  
K Elder (DNLP 2430)

Nexus Planning (Inland Holmes) (DNLP 2445)  
 C & P Youens (DNLP 2517)  
 S James (DNLP 2525)  
 R & S Jupp (DNLP 2526)  
 K Banner (DNLP 2527)  
 M Batler (DNLP 2590)  
 H Bowen (DNLP 2601)  
 C Atkinson (DNLP 2604)  
 M Grice (DNLP 2606)  
 Wycombe Wildlife Group (DNLP 2608)  
 D Avery & F Palmer (DNLP 2616)  
 J & M Hind (DNLP 2632)  
 J Halley (DNLP 2649)  
 A Halley (DNLP 2650)  
 Penn Parish Council (DNLP 2660)  
 Little Missenden Parish Council (DNLP 2664)  
 M Goodall (DNLP 2667)  
 Alder King Property Services (DNLP 2669)  
 Savills (Thames Water)(DNLP 2682)  
 J Hayden (DNLP 2685)  
 P Gard (DNLP 2687)  
 Chiltern & South Bucks District Council (DNLP 2698)  
 G Wiseman (DNLP 2706)  
 Chiltern & Aylesbury Vale Clinical Commissioning Groups (DNLP 2712)  
 Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714)  
 R Fry (DNLP 2730)  
 Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735)  
 P Morris (DNLP 2740)  
 R & C Lane (DNLP 2751)  
 C Prior (DNLP 2758)  
 H & B Reynolds (DNLP 2762)  
 H Mengel (DNLP 2765)  
 E Stoelker (DNLP 2766)  
 C Mason (DNLP 2790)  
 C Zolik (DNLP 2791)  
 R Wotherspoon (DNLP 2792)  
 R Prior (DNLP 2798)  
 D Large (DNLP 2800)  
 Mr & Mrs Pell (DNLP 2814)  
 J Benn (DNLP 2822)  
 M & S Russell (DNLP 2834)  
 Paul Dickinson & Associates (Mr & Mrs Capp)(DNLP 2847)  
 S Busby (DNLP 2879)  
 C Oliver (DNLP 2905)  
 L Raddon (DNLP 2920)  
 L Newell (DNLP 2921)  
 M Kottbauer-Barnes (DNLP 2937)  
 C Daniels (DNLP 2939)  
 K Barnes (DNLP 2945)  
 M King (DNLP 2946)  
 R & E Ryan (DNLP 2969)  
 S Watkin (DNLP 2973)  
 V Richer (DNLP 2981)  
 L & P Wareham (DNLP 2982)  
 C Keen (DNLP 3012)

	T Watkin (DNLP 3015) J Kennett (DNLP 3027) K Moore (DNLP 3028) D Lomax (DNLP 3043) M Barnicle (DNLP 3075) W Danzine (DNLP 3089) A & D Snellgrove (DNLP 3092) C Hamilton (DNLP 0260) I McEwan (DNLP 0285) G Vincent (DNLP 0287) H Harding (DNLP 0415) E Parker (DNLP 0528) M Carless (DNLP 2462) W Tinkler (DNLP 0234)						
Number of Representations:	394	Objection:	340	Support:	6	Comment:	48

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

##### Green Belt

- Supporting for removal of land from the Green Belt and allocation for housing.
- Supporting steps planned to be taken to protect areas of environmental interest and to retain Green Infrastructure links should this development proceed.

##### Design/Tenure

- Land released for development must be used as fully and efficiently as possible so as to maximise the number of new dwellings accommodated within the District and reduce the need to release other Green Belt and greenfield sites within Wycombe and Aylesbury Vale District.

#### Objecting:

##### Green Belt

- Site should remain as Green Belt at all costs as a buffer between Wycombe and Amersham/Holmer Green and Hazlemere.
- The suggested access will mean new residents will use the amenities of Holmer Green instead of Hazlemere, making the development physically attached to it and the residents to consider themselves part of Holmer Green. This will cause coalescence.
- Sufficient “exceptional circumstances” to permit removal of land from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated.
- Current Government policy is both at odds with, and supercedes, WDC plans.
- Existing town/village centre brownfield sites need to be used first, especially unused or vacant retail areas.

## Biodiversity/ecology

- Development will have a major impact on wildlife, including:
  - foxes
  - rabbits
  - hedgehogs
  - deer
  - skylarks
  - red kites
  - swallows
  - various species of warbler
  - the breeding social group of badgers that have runs in protected area Badgers Way
- Call for an impact and environmental habitat assessment on nesting birds, affected wildlife, and bat population.
- Proposed developments would leave very little room for badgers to move around, and much of their foraging grounds would disappear.
- The hedgerows and woodlands of Tralee Farm are also home to considerable numbers of other animals and birds.

## Infrastructure

- Local facilities are already under pressure; school, health care, public transport & utility systems, as well as shops and parking, seen as not able to cope with population increase.
- Necessary increase in infrastructure will not be provided, regardless of what is planned or proposed.
- Not seen as 'sustainable development' as most employment for new inhabitants will be located in Wycombe or Amersham, requiring commuting through the town.
- New builds will cause water run-off that then cause flooding.

## Housing Mix/Intended Amount

- No housing built by developers will actually offer affordable housing. Local housing prices and pricing in recent developments evidence of this.
- A disproportionate amount of housing is proposed; the area has already taken its "fair share" of development.
- Confusion over the actual number of homes proposed.
- Decline in local school and social values directly attributed to requirement to build affordable housing in previous developments.

## Transport

- The road is already too busy to allow cars to exit safely from any development.
- There will be more traffic in addition due to this site, but also from the proposed Junction 3A build linking the M40 with London Road and Gomm Valley and Ashwells (HW6).
- Knock-on effect with commuting times.
- Road safety will be compromised by drivers not slowing down sufficiently to make the turn into the new development.

- Adding a roundabout or traffic lights will not ease congestion but add to it.
- Lack of repair of existing potholes on roads in area provide reason for disbelief that any proposed transport infrastructure creation will occur.

#### Process

- The process of informing and/or communicating with residents seen as very poor at best, deliberately designed to be obtuse at worst.
- Some public consultation meetings were apparently only announced on social media or leafleted 24 hours in advance, not publicised in any other way.
- Announcement of consultation around summer holidays and time given to respond both considered inadequate.

#### Other

- If WDC's and Chiltern and South Bucks District Council's (CSBDC) residential developments both take place, the character of the area will change severely.
- If the above occur concurrently with HS2 development, a sudden and profound negative effect on the area is anticipated.
- This site is seen as a better option for the cemetery proposed in the plan (HW19).
- Citation of previous 2007 WDC decision against proposed builds in same land.
- The proposed development will adversely affect property values in Hazlemere and Holmer Green.
- Concerns of a loss of individual community identity, as well as fears of increased crime alongside a diminishing of the "niceness" or positive spirit of residents.
- Village life is the British way of life, and needs preserving.
- There will be no need for increased number of new homes due to the coming drop in immigration following Brexit.
- All agricultural land needs to be kept as such for future self-sufficiency.
- Government is ignoring local views at their own risk.
- Meeting the government-set targets is "playing politics" instead of "natural justice".

#### **Commenting:**

##### Infrastructure

- CSBDC's proposal in adjacent site: if it is to come forward should do so as one development and not two parts in isolation. Both councils should aim to work to concurrent or even consecutive timescales.
- CSBDC & WDC need to co-ordinate work on infrastructure implications of both areas.
- The additional expansion in schools for the situation in which both developments go ahead has not yet been addressed.
- The decision to add a primary school capacity at Gomm Valley (HW6) may need to be reconsidered, to see if it is still the appropriate option given the increased pressure on infrastructure from the new population.
- Hazlemere & Holmer Green are currently serviced by one main NHS practice (Highfield) and two branch surgeries (Desborough and Chiltern House) which are insufficient for proposed development. Current pressures have resulted in some of

these practices considering closure of their patient list. At least one of these premises would require modification/extending to manage the additional growth from these housing development plans.

- Meeting the Government's new homes target must not take away natural amenities or affect local sports areas.
- Major investment in public transport will be required by companies that run them, but will also contribute significantly to the increase in pollution/decrease in air quality.
- There is nowhere for young people to visit or socialise currently in Holmer Green, no space and no plan for a community centre to combat this issue. This problem will only be exacerbated by a 30% population increase.

## Transport

- Policy HW8 and Figure 15 only indicate walk/cycle access into Holmer Green while there is no access into Hazlemere directly.
- Figure 15 also shows potential vehicular access into Holmer Green which is not mentioned in Policy HW8.
- Proposed access onto the A404 is a busy 50 mph road with no pavement for pedestrians.
- There will be no access into the existing residential part of Hazlemere.
- Impact concerns for site-generated traffic flows, notably along Gravelly Way, Penn Bottom, Common Wood Lane and Clay Street.
- These roads are 'rat-runs' in the morning and evening to avoid Wycombe/Hazlemere and/or access the M40/M25.
- These roads remain essentially rural, used frequently by farm tractors, horse riders and recreational cyclists.
- Gravelly Way has at least 4 riding stables, whose users ride on or across the road to reach the permitted bridleways.
- Penn Bottom is part of Route 30 on the National Cycle Network.
- Infrastructure improvements such as safe cycle/riding lanes, adjacent to these roads must be introduced if this proposal is to go-ahead.
- The potential number of homes will generate traffic that must find its way down the Amersham Road and through the Terriers/Totteridge intersection on the A404. This will add to pressure on the road network, and this traffic should be modelled along with the other sources of increased traffic to ensure that the road system can cope.
- The A404 is the key access route for emergency services, especially ambulances to Stoke Mandeville.
- Earl Howe road access to A404 will need to be widened to allow for a left hand and right hand turn lane. In addition, the A404 will need to be widened with turning lanes on both sides.
- Vehicular access should be via Lacey's Drive or Kestrel Way instead.
- New development needs a mini roundabout or traffic lights at access to/from A404, plus another mini roundabout at existing junction of Gravelly Way and Amersham Road as a traffic calming measure.

## Green Belt

- To remove this site from the Green Belt would both contradict Policy CP2 and negate the value of Arup's Green Belt Assessment given they assessed it as 'medium'.



## Biodiversity/ecology

- Site includes areas of both Traditional Orchard and Woodland priority habitats. Development must not be permitted on these areas and the habitats must be well buffered from any development.
- Measures must be taken to ensure no negative impacts on habitats and a management plan will be needed to ensure long-term management for wildlife of these priority habitats.
- There are a number of hedgerows within the site. These should be retained by any development and managed to enhance them for wildlife conservation.
- A green corridor is needed to link the woodland and orchard.
- A full site ecological survey should be carried out to determine the botanical quality of the grassland habitats. Without this survey it cannot be confirmed whether the site is developable without significant impact on wildlife.
- If any of the site is found to be developable it is likely that significant levels of on-site compensation would be needed for impacts on wildlife. This should be carried out by conserving the best areas of grassland and implementing a management plan in perpetuity to maintain and, depending on the existing quality, enhance the species-richness of the grasslands.
- Any development proposals should be assessed using a biodiversity accounting metric.

## Conservation

- The Historic Environment Record and the Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment should be consulted for non-designated assets, and the Councils Conservation and Archaeological advisors should be consulted for their comments.

## Other

- If possible, the Plan should delay release for housing until later in the Plan period, to allow for possible changes in national policies and population trends.
- Suggest confining development to land adjacent to A404 with access from the south and a small area of Green Belt left along the border of Holmer Green and Hazlemere.
- A new town elsewhere in Bucks is a better option.
- This policy does not provide for contributions to the High Wycombe IDP. This is not fair or reasonable and all allocations must be treated the same.
- No mention is made in the Policy HW8 of maintaining the separation between Hazlemere and Holmer Green but it is mentioned in Policies for other development sites.

## Site Policy: HW9 – Land to the rear of Hughenden Road, High Wycombe

Respondents:	Revive the Wye Partnership (DNLP 2925) P Turner (DNLP 2313) A & A Thibault (DNLP 1328) T Konieczny (DNLP 0408) Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) National Trust (DNLP 2625) Alder King (AXA Reim) (DNLP 2669) L Clegg (DNLP 0065) Wycombe Wildlife Group (DNLP 2608) Environment Agency (DNLP 2857) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714) D Leahy (DNLP 1521) Historic England (DNLP 1798)						
Number of Representations:	13	Objection:	2	Support:	2	Comment:	9

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

##### Flooding

- Flooding is not a major issue, as the Hughenden Stream is more likely to dry up as chalk streams naturally do from time to time.

##### Green Infrastructure

- Strong support for the enhancement of the Hughenden Stream through provision of an appropriate buffer.

#### Objecting:

##### Highways

- Concerns over the extra traffic and impact on local roads that more development in the area will generate.
- This development, combined with the plans for further development in Naphill/Walters Ash, will cause serious congestion problems down Coombe Lane and along Valley Road.

##### Local Amenities

- Lack of adequate provisions of community facilities alongside the proposed development.

## Infrastructure

- Local drainage and sewerage system already at capacity.

## Commenting:

### Green Infrastructure

- It would be desirable to secure measures that would appropriate long term management of the riverside buffer by riparian owners and residents.
- There doesn't appear to be enough space to allow development and to ensure that there is a minimum 10m buffer zone between the development and the Hughenden Stream as required by Policy DM15. The stream is a rare chalk stream, and the buffer should be a semi-natural wildlife habitat, and the stream should also be altered to a more natural profile.
- Development on the Hughenden Stream should ensure that it is safe for its lifetime from flooding without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

### Conservation

- If not undertaken sensitively, future development along Hughenden Road could have implications for the setting of Hughenden Manor and its historic significance.
- The council should check its records to see if any designated heritage assets will be affected, and if so, provide protection for them.
- The Historic Environment Record and the Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment should be consulted for non-designated assets, and the Councils Conservation and Archaeological advisors should be consulted for their comments.

### Infrastructure

- HW9 does not provide contributions to the High Wycombe IDP; whilst it is acknowledged that this is an IDP for the reserve sites, if this is the vehicle to achieving an uplift over and above CIL to secure strategic infrastructure then it makes more sense for those sites to be brought into the 'pot' and make achieving those aims more realistic.
- Improvements to Hughenden road are necessary as it is unsightly and generally scruffy. The roads are in disrepair and traffic moves through the area too fast.

## Site Policy: HW10 – Glynswood, Green Hill, High Wycombe

Respondents:	<p>Nexus Planning (Inland Homes) (DNLP 2445)  L Derrick (DNLP 1425)  T Carroll (DNLP 1886)  D Kenyon (DNLP 2390)  J Keck (DNLP 1815)  High Wycombe Society Planning Group (DNLP 2877)  J Reid &amp; M Cain (DNLP 1792)  S Sarsfield (DNLP 2516)  Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735)  J Junnola (DNLP 0495)  T Green (DNLP 1740)  S Webber (DNLP 0757)  D Leahy (DNLP 1521)  T Hatton (DNLP 1568)  Mr &amp; Mrs Caws (DNLP 2518)  K Sarsfield (DNLP 0244)  B Murphy (DNLP 1939)  R Roberts (DNLP 0440)  S Holloway (DNLP 1513)  K Elder (DNLP 2430)  J Richards (DNLP 1431)  S Khan Raja (DNLP 2670)  A &amp; A Thibault (DNLP 1328)  P &amp; P Boston (DNLP 1236)  A &amp; V Windsor (DNLP 0127)  D Moffett (DNLP 1575)  Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390)  J Smith (DNLP 1258)  D Gamble W &amp; M Munroe (DNLP 2325)  Widmer End Residents Association (DNLP 1572)  R Ellis (DNLP 2786)  S Rourke (DNLP 3049)  M Rhodes (DNLP 1593)  Alder King (AXA Reim) (DNLP 2669)  J Smith (DNLP 1258)  J Goddard (DNLP 2645)  Brands Hill Residents Association (DNLP 2411)  Historic England (DNLP 1798)  P Turner (DNLP 2313)  Natural England (DNLP 2654)  Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682)  Berks, Bucks &amp; Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714)  A Gee (DNLP 1707)  G Mason (DNLP 2232)  T Mason (DNLP 2211)</p>						
Number of Representations:	45	Objection:	32	Support:	1	Comment:	12

## Summary of issues/comments:

### Supporting:

#### Infrastructure

- Site is easily accessible from Glynswood, connecting it to the wider High Wycombe Urban Area.

#### Green Belt

- The site can be sensitively designed to limit any impact upon the wider Green Belt, AONB and designated heritage assets.

#### Conservation

- The development at Glynswood will have no negative impact upon the heritage setting of Hughenden Manor, its park and gardens, and the Disraeli monument.

### Objecting:

#### Green Belt

- The walk from Four Ashes to Glynswood on the public footpath will be disrupted by the proposed development, spoiling an area of beautiful wild flower meadow.
- Removal of land from the Green Belt sets a dangerous precedent for the future erosion of the countryside.
- The land is an important ecological site, providing habitats for a wide range of flora and fauna. The eastern part of the site is particularly valuable in this respect as it immediately abuts a more extensive area of similar habitat managed by the National Trust.
- The development will constitute urban sprawl and will have a significant negative impact on the character on the local area.

#### Infrastructure

- The Hughenden Road is already severely congested and the traffic generated by this development will only exacerbate the issue. The junction with Glynswood is already highly congested during morning and afternoon rush hour.
- Access to the site via Glynswood Close is unsustainable, the close being a small residential street made narrower by on street parking.
- Sewer capacity in Green Hill and Hughenden Road is not capable of extra load and already runs at capacity.
- Local school places are limited and new residents may have to travel far to find schools with the capacity to take on more children.
- Current lack of suitable parking for existing residents will be exacerbated by increased development.
- Buses are unreliable in the area, rarely stick to timetable and thus put people off traveling by public transport.

## Other

- The land at Glynswood is a valuable local amenity, used by many locals for walking and accessing the neighbouring National Trust estate.
- Light pollution from the new development will affect existing residents and the neighbouring AONB.
- The eastern part of the site is higher and will therefore have a great visual impact, both in terms of overlooking neighbouring homes and being visible from the surrounding countryside.
- Development likely to have an adverse effect on local property values.

## **Commenting:**

### Conservation

- The Historic Environment Record and the Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment should be consulted for non-designated assets, and the Councils Conservation and Archaeological advisors should be consulted for their comments.

### Green Infrastructure

- Any new development at Glynswood should be properly screened from Hughenden Road and from inside Hughenden Park to prevent significant visual harm to the AONB and heritage landscape.

### Ecology

- A full site ecological survey should be carried out to determine the botanical quality of the grassland habitat.
- If the site is found to be developable it is likely that significant amounts of on-site compensation would be needed to compensate the impacts building would have on local wildlife.
- Compensation should be carried out by conserving the best areas of grassland and implementing a management plan in perpetuity to maintain and, depending on the existing quality, enhance the species-richness of these grasslands.

### Infrastructure

- Traffic lights or a roundabout at the junction between Coates Lane and Hughenden Road would help to reduce congestion in the area.

## Other

- The allocation would benefit from an LVIA in advance of testing the Local Plan to make sure the allocation of up to 50 units is deliverable at this site.
- Policies HW8 to HW14 do not provide for contributions to the High Wycombe IDP. This is not fair or reasonable and all allocations must be treated the same.

## Site Policy: HW11 – Horns Lane, Booker, High Wycombe

Respondents:	M Tilbury (DNLP 0074) G Kotvics (DNLP 0114) N Balint (DNLP 0121) P Dolphin (DNLP 0123) J Patey (DNLP 0166) C & P Pearce (DNLP 0191) K Turner (DNLP 0192) R Whitaker (DNLP 0242) J Houston (DNLP 0256) R & C Townsend (DNLP 0286) E Bunce (DNLP 0303) B Pearce (DNLP 0326) D Saunders (DNLP 0387) J Saunders (DNLP 0388) S Cripps (DNLP 0389) C Goss (DNLP 0390) D Perfect (DNLP 0442) B Lawrence (DNLP 0443) R Wilson (DNLP 0447) C Brant (DNLP 0470) V Vesey (DNLP 0475) J & B Harvey (DNLP 0553) P Morris (DNLP 0570) F Kerner (DNLP 0607) P Thomas (DNLP 0608) P Savage (DNLP 0609) A Priest (DNLP 0610) N Webb (DNLP 0611) G Ireland (DNLP 0614) P Mason (DNLP 0622) Mr & Mrs Rickwood (DNLP 0624) Booker Commons and Woods Protection Society (DNLP 0631) T Bull (DNLP 0636) M & S Smith (DNLP 0639) P Osborne (DNLP 0646) A Berron-Green (DNLP 0702) B Webber (DNLP 0737) W Graham (DNLP 0763) M & K Hennell (DNLP 0775) G Turner (DNLP 0932) K & D Wise (DNLP 0933) J Large (DNLP 0961) J Binks (DNLP 0990) J Clydesdale (DNLP 1008) M Button (DNLP 1137) B Tranter (DNLP 1173) K Edwards (DNLP 1193) C Sharp (DNLP 1223) D Webb (DNLP 1355) M Lafferty (DNLP 1483) T Speechley (DNLP 1578)
--------------	--

	B Webster (DNLN 1709) M Ward (DNLN 1749) Historic England (DNLN 1798) J Hallows (DNLN 1800) H Lynch (DNLN 1802) J Robson (DNLN 1841) P Francis (DNLN 1901) S Harvey (DNLN 1924) T Wright (DNLN 1941) R & B Smith (DNLN 1945) J Wright (DNLN 1946) L Larkin (DNLN 2142) J Larkin (DNLN 2166) S & B Hill (DNLN 2377) D Kenyon (DNLN 2390) S Harvey (DNLN 2419) P Suchowierchi (DNLN 2467) M Green (DNLN 2508) J Jamil (DNLN 2545) R Line (DNLN 2547) S & M Line (DNLN 2549) J Brown (DNLN 2579) Alder King (AXA Reim) (DNLN 2669) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLN 2714) Chiltern Society (DNLN 2735) P Morris (DNLN 2740) Kemp & Kemp LLP (Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd) (DNLN 2785) V May (DNLN 2851) C Stagg (DNLN 2940) P Stagg (DNLN 2964) M Newitt (DNLN 2988) S Line (DNLN 3095) C Robson (DNLN 2194) S Fairclough (DNLN 2408) A Fairclough (DNLN 2409) M Smith (DNLN 2613)						
Number of Representations:	87	Objection:	72	Support:	3	Comment:	12

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

##### Housing

- Three responses stating no objection to the proposals as presented given the need to deliver more housing.



## Objecting:

### Green Belt/AONB

- Objections to wholesale removal of a significant and important area of Green Belt, which was identified as strongly satisfying the Green Belt criteria in the Green Belt Assessment Report and therefore should only be developed under very “exceptional circumstances”. These are not demonstrated.
- Removing this land from the Green Belt would change the character of the area and destroy the effectiveness of the Green Belt. Developing this land would put the area of land between it and Lane End at significant risk of being targeted for development in the future.
- There is no need to remove the allotments; they are an asset to the community that must continue to be protected from development. The area identified for housing off Horns Lane could be used without the need to remove any of the surrounding land from Green Belt.
- The use of the field in HW11 as housing might count as "exceptional circumstances", but the removal of the allotments from the Green belt does not.
- Removal of the allotments from Green belt is contrary to the Strategy of the Plan and Principles.
- Green Belt should be maintained, as once lost it is lost forever denying future generations the advantage of open space.
- Development on Green Belt land will impact the adjacent AONB.

### Biodiversity/ecology

- The barley fields to the side of the M40 are a haven for all sorts of wildlife, including:
  - Foxes
  - Deer
  - Owls
  - Mistle Thrushes
  - Other birds
- It also has a footpath running through it which regularly used by dog walkers, families and ramblers alike; its loss would be significant.

### Infrastructure

- Expanding the housing and the number of people living in this area would put an unacceptable additional load on local roads, medical facilities, local schools and the limited internet bandwidth on the High Wycombe Exchange.
- There should be consideration given to those who currently keep horses on site. Either a new site should be found locally or they should be financially compensated for the disruption in moving.
- Schools and other services cannot cope with current amounts population & traffic.
- Given there is no money to upgrade or maintain the current infrastructure, if the council has money it should use it to bring down council tax rates which are crippling so many low-income families.
- The infrastructure should be in place before any new development is considered.

### Flooding

- The paddock currently offers a large soakaway to prevent adjacent properties being continually flooded when raining. Builds on this land will presumably fill this soakaway, leaving those properties subject to flooding.

### Transport

- Traffic is at full capacity, sometimes gridlocked.

- Horns Lane is double-width but very busy, particularly at the a.m. rush hour.
- Cressex Road is also a very busy road considering it is non-classified, hard to access from Horns Lane or Limmer Lane.
- Due consideration will need to be given to the extra vehicles that will obviously come out onto Horns Lane then onto Cressex Road or Clay Lane.
- Limmer Lane also suffers with congested road parking because of visitors to the care home in Cressex Road which lacks sufficient parking.
- This track is an unclassified road and in the morning rush hour it is used as an illegal shortcut “rat run” due to congestion and delays on Horns Lane/Limmer Lane.
- Very large vehicles use Horn Lane as short cut from Sands Industrial estate to the Cressex Industrial Estate and the M40, which should not be allowed.
- Consideration should be given to the track that leads from Horns Lane to the top of Limmer Lane adjacent to Booker Memorial Hall, running alongside the common itself.
- Highways authority should speak to local residents on this trackway about their views.
- Frustrations expressed over seeming lack of liaison between WDC Planning dept. and BCC Transport. When responses sought from the Highways by members of the public they have failed to respond or engage with complainants despite follow-up emails.
- Requirement to dramatically change the infrastructure for roads, lights, junctions will also affect the look and feel of the semi-rural area.
- Addition of planned access road from The Paddocks is dangerous due to narrowness of the latter road, which also usually contains parked cars, but is too narrow to be an access road.

#### Other

- This site should not be allocated for residential development due to noise and air quality constraints.
- The proximity of the M40 makes this a totally unsuitable site for housing since the living conditions of future residents would fall below an acceptable level.
- The site lies within or close to a zone where air quality is recognised as falling below legal requirements.
- When overhead flight path for the Airpark is in use, low level of landing craft might inhibit development.

#### **Commenting:**

##### Infrastructure

- The noise from the motorway should be identified in the plan and considered, and a barrier constructed to help lessen the noise. This would need to be in keeping with the landscape surrounding the local area.
- Note that the site barrier sketched in the draft plan is not optimum – a more effective barrier would be located at the motorway boundary of sufficient length to protect the proposed site.
- Introduction of housing under HW11 can only exacerbate annoyance with neighbouring Wycombe Airpark.
- In principle no objection to the land adjacent to Horns Lane being developed for housing provided there is suitable consideration of the need to provide a roundabout at the junction of Horns Lane & Cressex Rd.

##### Green Belt/AONB

- The plot of existing Green Belt land abutting the eastern boundary of the allotments off Horns Lane should be removed from the Green Belt alongside HW11 and

classified as suitable for housing developments. This could provide plots for at least 12 housing units.

#### Biodiversity/ecology

- Aerial photography observation suggests the field proposed for development is semi-improved grassland or maybe even better.
- A full site ecological survey should be carried out to determine the botanical quality of the grassland habitats.
- Without this survey it cannot be ascertained whether the site is developable without significant impact on wildlife, potentially contrary to the NPPF.
- If any of the site is found to be developable it is likely that significant levels of on-site compensation would be needed to compensate for impacts on wildlife. The draft site diagram does not show any such on-site compensation which is of great concern.
- Compensation should be carried out by conserving the best areas of grassland and implementing a management plan in perpetuity to maintain and, depending on the existing quality, enhance the species-richness of these grasslands.
- Development proposals should be assessed using a biodiversity accounting metric.

#### Other

- Policies HW8 to HW14 do not provide for contributions to the High Wycombe infrastructure delivery plan. This is not fair or reasonable and all allocations must be treated the same.
- Suggestion of whether it possible to have first time buyer houses that could be sold only to local people.
- Site might be suitable for commercial development considering the noise and air constraints on the site.

## Site Policy: HW12 – Land off Penn Road, Hazlemere

Respondents:	M Froud (DNLP 0070) S Brown (DNLP 0076) R Jones (DNLP 0101) R Miller (DNLP 0124) C Taylor (DNLP 0215) C Hawes (DNLP 0224) W Allen (DNLP 0228) S Jones (DNLP 0233) W Tinkler (DNLP 0234) J Williams (DNLP 0239) J Arnold (DNLP 0246) L Bennett (DNLP 0262) J Child (DNLP 0264) K McEwan (DNLP 0271) I Davey (DNLP 0275) D & D Cooper (DNLP 0279) S Watson (DNLP 0281) I McEwan (DNLP 0285) G Vincent (DNLP 0287) C Nisbet (DNLP 0289) G Millward (DNLP 0291) G Ghanekar (DNLP 0296) V Vincent (DNLP 0302) C Fawcetr (DNLP 0309) Mr & Mrs S Oliver (DNLP 0320) S Amass (DNLP 0328) H Barnard (DNLP 0344) S & C Cranmer (DNLP 0348) M Reynolds (DNLP 0365) E Cubbage (DNLP 0366) J Simpson (DNLP 0379) G & H Perfitt (DNLP 0380) R McAllister (DNLP 0381) C Burnard (DNLP 0384) L Belsey (DNLP 0385) N Anand (DNLP 0394) D Anand (DNLP 0395) K Anand (DNLP 0396) C Anand (DNLP 0397) S & J Garrett (DNLP 0399) C Weller (DNLP 0400) J Tuddenham (DNLP 0409) H Harding (DNLP 0415) E Pearson (DNLP 0429) N Warner (DNLP 0432) G & J Gilmartin (DNLP 0433) R Crowe (DNLP 0434) G & M Mountford (DNLP 0448) D Winder (DNLP 0458) A & R Slater (DNLP 0462) S Long (DNLP 0498) C Campbell-Pike (DNLP 0499)
--------------	---

R Bowen (DNLP 0508)  
F Layne (DNLP 0514)  
E Parker (DNLP 0528)  
M Stapley (DNLP 0531)  
R Street (DNLP 0542)  
O Bridge (DNLP 0544)  
P & S Patel (DNLP 0546)  
D Ayres (DNLP 0556)  
J Powell (DNLP 0564)  
I Mance (DNLP 0571)  
Mr & Mrs Purvis (DNLP 0577)  
A Coombes (DNLP 0578)  
A Boyd (DNLP 0580)  
D Reeves (DNLP 0592)  
Y Blair (DNLP 0593)  
E Blair (DNLP 0594)  
B Livingstone (DNLP 0605)  
W Evans (DNLP 0685)  
Penn and Tylers Green Residents Society (DNLP 0696)  
M & R Clark (DNLP 0704)  
N Seymour (DNLP 0721)  
J Griffiths (DNLP 0742)  
C Dean (DNLP 0750)  
R & I Mcallister (DNLP 0758)  
M Pruszewicz (DNLP 0771)  
C Pruszewicz (DNLP 0772)  
S & J Breakspear (DNLP 0793)  
K Hallatt (DNLP 0820)  
S Chhugani (DNLP 0839)  
K & K Burr (DNLP 0840)  
A Barber (DNLP 0869)  
N Barber (DNLP 0870)  
J & B Bushby (DNLP 0875)  
A Burnard (DNLP 0876)  
J Curry (DNLP 0877)  
D Angus (DNLP 0879)  
V Kingshott (DNLP 0884)  
F & P Chilton (DNLP 0887)  
K Howland (DNLP 0975)  
C & J Doyle & R & M Pedler (DNLP 0985)  
T Tutt (DNLP 1014)  
H Chalk (DNLP 1017)  
G Markham (DNLP 1043)  
K & L Page (DNLP 1065)  
D Shaw (DNLP 1110)  
S Kent (DNLP 1154)  
I & J Fryer (DNLP 1169)  
J & I Kenny (DNLP 1182)  
R Fuell (DNLP 1186)  
A Greenan (DNLP 1195)  
I Warby (DNLP 1238)  
P & K Stebbings (DNLP 1249)  
M Simpson (DNLP 1254)  
P Credland (DNLP 1316)  
Mr & Mrs A Thibault (DNLP 1328)

K Stewart (DNLP 1330)  
I L Beeks Ltd (DNLP 1351)  
Chiltern Conservation Board (DNLP 1390)  
B Bell (DNLP 1434)  
A Mosley (DNLP 1446)  
C Wilson (DNLP 1449)  
E Mosley (DNLP 1450)  
I & M Barber (DNLP 1456)  
I Mance (DNLP 1466)  
Hazlemere Parish Council (DNLP 1471)  
B & R Whitten (DNLP 1526)  
M Doherty (DNLP 1556)  
G Maddams (DNLP 1604)  
S Hawthorne (DNLP 1608)  
B Coombes (DNLP 1622)  
C Thompson (DNLP 1631)  
C Malem (DNLP 1635)  
C Harris (DNLP 1656)  
T & G Barlow (DNLP 1700)  
L Jennings (DNLP 1716)  
S Letley (DNLP 1779)  
J & A Blakeborough (DNLP 1783)  
J & L Hudd (DNLP 1789)  
Historic England (DNLP 1798)  
J Berry (DNLP 1817)  
N Gunton (DNLP 1831)  
D Wilson (DNLP 1859)  
C & M Andrew (DNLP 1867)  
M Cooke (DNLP 1868)  
A Cecil (DNLP 1938)  
A Deung (DNLP 1954)  
P Dennis (DNLP 1966)  
D & M Roberts (DNLP 1967)  
P O'Brien (DNLP 1982)  
L Parsons (DNLP 1997)  
T Harries (DNLP 2019)  
Penn Area Bridleways Committee (DNLP 2042)  
R Smith (DNLP 2054)  
V & P Main (DNLP 2060)  
C Stonell (DNLP 2068)  
P & A Vidyarthi (DNLP 2076)  
T Hobbs (DNLP 2122)  
M Bull (DNLP 2125)  
B Harding (DNLP 2127)  
B Haumann (DNLP 2187)  
M Wood (DNLP 2192)  
S Young (DNLP 2199)  
J Anderson (DNLP 2216)  
K Cooke (DNLP 2217)  
B Plumbridge (DNLP 2250)  
P Schulz (DNLP 2252)  
B Ellis (DNLP 2255)  
J Ellis (DNLP 2256)  
A Cooke (DNLP 2269)  
S Cooke (DNLP 2271)

S Schulz (DNLP 2278)  
 C Mumcu (DNLP 2297)  
 J & N Mediratta (DNLP 2311)  
 L Lawson (DNLP 2329)  
 S Harcourt (DNLP 2333)  
 R Bell (DNLP 2351)  
 J Deung (DNLP 2370)  
 L Dell (DNLP 2381)  
 D Kenyon (DNLP 2390)  
 K Barry (DNLP 2395)  
 A Downie (DNLP 2399)  
 P Randev (DNLP 2402)  
 Brands Hill Residents Association (DNLP 2411)  
 M Morley (DNLP 2424)  
 Nexus Planning (Inland Holmes)(DNLP 2445)  
 M Carless (DNLP 2462)  
 D Kendrick (DNLP 2509)  
 M Brewer (DNLP 2513)  
 H Murray (DNLP 2523)  
 B Bull (DNLP 2524)  
 K Crowe (DNLP 2574)  
 F Armitage (DNLP 2575)  
 M Gillham (DNLP 2584)  
 J Nichol (DNLP 2591)  
 H Bowen (DNLP 2601)  
 D Smith (DNLP 2615)  
 C Dawkings (DNLP 2629)  
 Natural England (DNLP 2654)  
 R Garner (DNLP 2656)  
 Penn Parish Council (DNLP 2660)  
 N Waterhouse (DNLP 2661)  
 M Goodall (DNLP 2667)  
 Alder King (DNLP 2669)  
 Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682)  
 Chiltern & South Bucks District Council (DNLP 2698)  
 Chiltern and Aylesbury Vale Clinical Commissioning Groups (DNLP 2712)  
 Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714)  
 G Shirley (DNLP 2732)  
 Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735)  
 G Watkins (DNLP 2737)  
 P Morris (DNLP 2740)  
 H Mengel (DNLP 2765)  
 C Zolik (DNLP 2791)  
 R Prior (DNLP 2798)  
 E Raftery (DNLP 2838)  
 F A Bennett (DNLP 2848)  
 High Wycombe Society (DNLP 2877)  
 A & A Higgs (DNLP 2884)  
 P Barrett (DNLP 2885)  
 P Brown (DNLP 2899)  
 C Oliver (DNLP 2905)  
 K Banks (DNLP 2918)  
 L Newell (DNLP 2921)  
 A Schulz (DNLP 2922)

	K Barnes (DNLP 2945) J Robinson (DNLP 2971) D White (DNLP 2996) S & L Worsley (DNLP 3010) D Lomax (DNLP 3043) JSB Planning Law (Mr & Mrs G Pond) (DNLP 3048) B Rodgers (DNLP 3051) D Marshall (DNLP 0759) Z Harnett (DNLP 1965) K Sonley (DNLP 2162) O Moore (DNLP 2240) G Smith (DNLP 2241) Pimms Action Group (DNLP 2680)						
Number of Representations:	229	Objection:	182	Support:	1	Comment:	46

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

Green Belt/AONB

- Site does not play strong enough role in preventing unrestricted urban sprawl or encroachment into the countryside to prevent it from being released from the Green Belt.
- Exceptional circumstances to build in the AONB do exist, and it does not represent ‘major development’ particularly if only land in Wycombe District is assessed.
- Boundary should be extended to include adjoining land parcels, together they would greatly enhance the defensibility of the Green Belt boundary.
- Council is demonstrably failing to meet its OAN in the District, and this site would make a meaningful contribution towards the District’s housing needs.

#### Objecting:

Green Belt/AONB

- The land is currently Green Belt & AONB and should remain that way.
- Development will put the Council in breach of its legal duty to conserve and enhance the beauty of the AONB.
- Insufficient “exceptional circumstances” exist for justification of a “major development” in the AONB.
- Green Belt Part 2 Report incorrect to say development will not be “major”.
- Development will reinforce the existing coalescence between Hazlemere, Tylers Green & Penn.
- Common Wood would become bounded on three sides by roads or housing to the detriment of the woodland, its ecology and use by riders, cyclists and pedestrians.
- The south side of Common Wood is not a suitable Green Belt boundary.



- The present hedge line meets all the requirements for a clearly established boundary.
- Assigning this land for recreational use and possibly moving some recreational facilities to this location from other sites, allowing limited small developments on the latter instead, would protect its Green Belt and AONB status.
- Previous WDC decisions refusing permissions due to detrimental effect on the AONB and Green Belt contradict appraisal description of HW12 having minimal impact.
- Inclusion of brief description of proposed development with HW12 policy map would have been welcomed; scale of proposal makes 'major development' test meaningful.

#### Biodiversity/ecology

- Developing the fields could significantly compromise the mature beech woodland behind it, leaving minimal space between back gardens and woodland.
- The plant and wildlife within Common Wood that will be affected include:
  - nesting red kites
  - bluebells
  - bats
  - muntjac deer
  - badgers
  - hazel dormice

#### Infrastructure

- Current infrastructure – education, health, services - cannot cope with current loads; will not cope with resultant loads from added population influx.
- Necessary infrastructure to support developments should be built first.
- Drainage for new developments will increase risk of flooding in Penn Road.
- More people competing for same resources with current infrastructure could lead to frustration expressed as anti-social behaviour.
- House prices already suffering due to post-‘Brexit’ economic issues; building more houses on AONB/Green Belt land will affect prices further.
- Specific objections to Penn School proposal as creating more traffic congestion & parking on residential roads in the area.

#### Housing Mix/Intended Amount

- Housing amounts in draft plan are reliant on a forecast for demand for housing out to 2033; as half the increase in population foreseen by the Office for National Statistics is due to immigration, post-‘Brexit’ the current population estimates will be reduced.
- Cheaper housing far more easily provided if all possibilities of using all brownfield sites are effectively exhausted.
- Area has had its fair share of development via building in gardens/ subdividing plots/infill.
- 3 or 4 Bedroom houses would be more acceptable rather than council houses and or flats.

## Transport

- If all new proposals (including this one) from both Councils go ahead they will cause a dangerous increase in traffic & congestion.
- Ongoing lack of repair of existing potholes on roads in area cited as reason for disbelief that any proposed transport infrastructure creation will occur.

## Process

- Site should not be allocated for development at this stage due to the concept of "permission in principle".

## Other

- If all WDC and CDC residential developments in this area take place, possibly concurrently with HS2 development, they will have negative effects on traffic, existing infrastructure and quality of life for residents.
- Potential restrictive covenant on the site regarding any development not of an agricultural or forestry nature.
- Annual payments by local residents to use & maintain upkeep of the Woods will end.
- The UK's vote to leave the European Union means that WDC should ignore the EU ruling on housing in the UK and all agricultural land needs to be kept as such for future self-sufficiency.
- Identity and proposal of the landowner/developer of the site should be made public to determine better the suitability of proposals in context of current policy.
- WDC has a duty to protect the quality of life of its existing ratepayers as a priority.

## **Commenting:**

### Infrastructure

- Additional housing development in this area will have a serious impact on local amenities and services that have not yet been planned for or developed.
- Water supply required for the proposed scale of development is a significant additional demand; mains that feed the area are running close to capacity.
- Hazlemere & Holmer Green are currently serviced by one main NHS practice (Highfield) and two branch surgeries (Desborough and Chiltern House) who under current pressures are considering closure of their patient list. At least one of these premises would require modification/extending to manage the additional growth from these housing development plans.
- Adequate parking provision needed in new estates to avoid parking on pavements.

### Duty to Co-operate

- A site adjacent to HW12 is being put forward for public comment by CDC, they have yet to complete an assessment of developer-proposed Green Belt sites.
- WDC should share with CDC any conclusions arrived at regarding this potentially wider site which would aid understanding for the publication stage of the Local Plan.

- At this stage the Councils are concerned regarding potential impact on the AONB; a shared view of whether the development as a whole will or will not constitute major development in the AONB would be helpful.
- Essential that any development on the site within Wycombe District does not duplicate development on the adjoining land in Chiltern District.

#### Transport

- If all new proposals (including this one) from both Councils go ahead they will cause a dangerous increase in traffic & congestion.
- HW12 not on any existing bus route, therefore people will resort more to car travel which will put strain on roads.
- Home-school bus services for secondary schools to be cancelled or charged for, as a result there will be increased car traffic.
- No traffic modelling seems to have been carried out to determine the cumulative effect on traffic volumes of the combined sites including HW12.

#### Infrastructure Delivery

- This policy does not provide for contributions to the High Wycombe IDP. This is not fair or reasonable and all allocations must be treated the same.

#### Green Belt/AONB

- Green Belt Review asserts status of site as 'moderate'.
- Site currently prevents unrestricted sprawl and encroachment into the countryside.
- Although no Policy available as yet, because the allocation is within the AONB it would benefit from a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (based on the type of development envisaged for the site) to inform the evidence base for selection.
- Priority habitat & LWS woodland sites must be buffered by semi-natural habitat or at least 50m from any development, and development should only be permitted if measures are included to ensure no negative impact on them from changes in hydrology, air quality, light or noise pollution, recreation or any other reason.
- The size of the plot means that if it were developed to its full capacity it would constitute 'major development' in the AONB with no exceptional circumstances.
- Only 7% of the site has buildings on, so the openness of the Green Belt is preserved.
- The Green Belt status of the plot of land to the west of the site would be weakened by having development on its east side as it would then have development on 3 sides.

#### HELAA

- Site HW12 is listed in the HELAA as one of the 'Non Deliverable or Developable Sites without planning permission', where the reason for its exclusion is solely as 'Green Belt'. It does not refer to the AONB designation as an obstacle to development so it should not be in the Local Plan process.
- Given the significant housing shortfall identified in the HELAA, and the 'Medium' Green Belt rating identified, exclusion from current consideration of site HW12 is unreasonable and premature, particularly given its sustainable location in close proximity to built-up areas, local shops and services and transport links.

## Biodiversity/ecology

- Combined impact of developments (HW12, HW7, HW8) detrimental on stabling, grazing and recreational riding; notable lack of local alternatives.
- Impact assessments needed for local animal populations, in particular to see specific assessment of the impact on the local population of bats.
- A full site ecological survey should be carried out to determine the botanical quality of the grassland habitats; essential to assess whether site is developable without significant impact on wildlife.
- If any of the site is found to be developable it is likely that significant levels of on-site compensation would be needed to compensate for impacts on wildlife.
- Any proposals should be assessed using a biodiversity accounting metric.

## Other

- No designated heritage assets are recorded on this site but the Historic Environment Record and Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment should be consulted for non-designated assets, and the Council's Conservation and Archaeological Advisers should also be consulted for their comments.
- WDC should not underestimate the effect of ignoring the local population while pandering to Central Government.

## Site Policy: HW13 – Leigh Street, Desborough Area, High Wycombe

Respondents:	P Morris (DNLP 2740) R Deed (DNLP 1729) High Wycombe Society Planning Group (DNLP 2877) Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) Storage King (DNLP 1420) Historic England (DNLP 1798) Alder King (AXA Reim) (DNLP 2669)						
Number of Representations:	7	Objection:	0	Support:	5	Comment:	2

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

##### Brownfield sites

- Support for the use of brownfield sites.

##### Regeneration

- The need for regeneration was noted due to the neglected feel of the area, lack of security within the area leading the fly-tipping and unsociable activities, the continued decline within the area, and the inability of the estate to attract occupiers with the resources to redevelop the area.
- Regeneration of the area will be catalysed through this proposal.

##### Conservation

- Support for parts of Commercial Square's ground floor space being used for woodworking and bespoke furniture production as this is in keeping with the conservation area's intent.
- Support for the requirements of the policy for development to retain buildings with Heritage value and to be designed to provide significant environmental improvements as the area is located in the Leigh Street conservation area.

##### Policy

- Support was noted for need to retain key views and the retention of the relative heights of Commercial square and Birch House.
- The flexibility regarding the provision of employment floor space is supported.

#### Objecting:

- No letters of objection received for policy.

**Commenting:**

- Concern over lack of progress within the area.
- Questions whether support will be provided from the Council for infrastructure and maintenance costs of the proposal.
- Amendments need to be made to clarify that buildings of heritage and value other than Birch and Albany house are to be retained.
- The site doesn't contribute to the High Wycombe IDP making the aim of achieving over and above CIL to secure strategic infrastructure less achievable.

## Site Policy: HW14 – Former Bassetsbury Allotments, Bassetsbury Lane

Respondents:	P Meek (DNLP B0135) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714) Wycombe Wildlife Group (DNLP 2608) Alder King (AXA Reim) (DNLP 2669) Historic England (DNLP 1798) Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) R Farmer (DNLP 1960) High Wycombe Society (DNLP 2877) Environment Agency (DNLP 2857) R Coombs (DNLP 0118) A Shankland (DNLP 2711) J and B Harvey (DNLP 0553)						
Number of Representations:	12	Objection:	1	Support:	0	Comment:	11

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Objecting:

##### General

- Policy is too vague.

##### Accessibility

- Increased traffic will increase hazards due to a tight double bend in the Lane before the site.
- Lack of footpath from the entrance of Bowden Lane.
- Concern over suitability of residential use due to access issues and proximity to Funges Meadow nature reserve.

#### Commenting:

##### General

- Misrepresentation of the border of a surrounding property.
- The development shouldn't have sightlines from surrounding properties and trees at the edge of boarding properties shouldn't be removed.

##### Conservation

- As the site lies in Central Chiltern Chalk Rivers Biological Opportunity Area (BOA) it should contribute to targets for the BOA.
- The site is adjacent to Woodland priority habitat which can't be developed on and must be well buffered by semi-natural habitat from any development. Measures must be taken to ensure no negative impacts on the habitat.

- Additional onsite habitat creation will be needed for biodiversity compensation and net gain.
- Amendments need to be made so the biodiversity of the adjoining nature reserve is protected and enhanced.
- Reference should be made of an ecological buffer zone and cross referenced with DM15 if the site is located 19 meters from the main river.
- Residential development to be kept well back from Funges Meadow's boundary.
- Protecting the High Wycombe Town Centre conservation area and listed buildings should be requirements within the policy due to the development adjoining these.

#### Green infrastructure

- The development should be restricted to an area near the road to safeguard the green infrastructure network and cycle and walking routes.
- Connectivity through the site needs to be retained as the site forms part of a green infrastructure network – possibly through leaving a portion of the site along the embankment undeveloped.

#### Infrastructure

- The site doesn't contribute to the High Wycombe IDP making the aim of achieving over and above CIL to secure strategic infrastructure less achievable.

#### Affordable housing

- The site should provide a historic skill centre/environment centre and affordable housing exclusively for local Ryemead residents.
- All housing needs to be affordable managed by a housing association.
- Due to the desirability of the area, the homes are unlikely to be affordable to younger and less well-off buyers, so the focus should be on medium-expensive properties.

#### Access

- Vehicular access should be through the Wye Dene development, not Bassetsbury Lane.

#### Flooding

- The site will need to pass the sequential test and be included in a level 2 SFRA as the site has Flood Zones 2 and 3 and is close to the main river.
- Reference needs to be made to the sequential approach and more vulnerable development according to table 2 'Flood Risk Vulnerability Classification' should go where flood risk is lowest.
- Flood risk mitigation measures should be included, such as safeguarding land for flood defence.
- Due to the area being a risk from flooding the development would need to be raised to solve this issue.
- Due to the area currently acting as flood storage, this storage would need to be provided elsewhere.



## Site Policy: HW15 – Wycombe Airpark, High Wycombe

Respondents:	<p> P Dolphin (DNLP 0123)  R &amp; F Dolphin (DNLP 2588)  Mr &amp; Mrs Braddock (DNLP 2048)  M Green (DNLP 2508)  Booker Gliding Club (DNLP 0959)  T Elliott (DNLP 1306)  M Lafferty (DNLP 1483)  J Clydesdale (DNLP 1008)  S King (DNLP 1305)  D Campbell (DNLP 2793)  A Moody (DNLP 1442)  D Putnam (DNLP 1187)  High Wycombe Society (DNLP 2877)  D Caunt (DNLP 1155)  J White (DNLP 2874)  D Evans (DNLP 2878)  R Turner (DNLP 1402)  M Button (DNLP 1137)  M King (DNLP 0931)  S Line (DNLP 3095)  B Tranter (DNLP 1173)  K &amp; D Wise (DNLP 0933)  R Smith (DNLP 3037)  H Scutt (DNLP 2892)  B Pearce (DNLP 0326)  B Black (DNLP 1075)  E Kmiecik (DNLP 1441)  D Webb (DNLP 1355)  G Turner (DNLP 0932)  A Green (DNLP 2815)  C Davies (DNLP 2801)  D Moody (DNLP 1443)  M Moody (DNLP 1444)  P Stagg (DNLP 2964)  C Sharp (DNLP 1223)  N Webb (DNLP 0611)  M Scaccia (DNLP 0250)  Booker Commons and Woods Protection Society (DNLP 0631)  P Jennings (DNLP 0723)  M Ward (DNLP 1749)  S Harvey (DNLP 2419)  P Osborne (DNLP 0646)  M &amp; S Smith (DNLP 0639)  Mr &amp; Mrs Rickwood (DNLP 0624)  P Francis (DNLP 1901)  N Balint (DNLP 0121)  C Arnold (DNLP 2120)  Y Brown (DNLP 2579)  S &amp; M Line (DNLP 2549)  R Line (DNLP 2547)  B Lawrence (DNLP 0443)  P Mason (DNLP 0622) </p>
--------------	---

	<p>J Idle (DNLP 1923)  C Law (DNLP 1995)  D Perfect (DNLP 0442)  A &amp; J France (DNLP 1389)  P Thomas (DNLP 0608)  P Savage (DNLP 0609)  J Hallows (DNLP 1800)  T Bull (DNLP 0636)  Copas Farms (DNLP 3053)  R Neal (DNLP 1687)  D Darby (DNLP 0063)  C Robson (DNLP 2194)  D Savostiyarov (DNLP 0185)  G Kotvics (DNLP 0114)  A Carter (DNLP 2173)  S Clowry (DNLP 0108)  R &amp; J Coombs (DNLP 2612)  P Bianchi (DNLP 0373)  M Fletcher (DNLP 2034)  Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735)  M Pritchard (DNLP 2470)  R Romano-Jackson (DNLP 2935)  Berks, Bucks &amp; Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714)  J &amp; B Harvey (DNLP 0553)  C Stagg (DNLP 2940)  G Fletcher (DNLP 1770)  C Hunter (DNLP 2288)  A Priest (DNLP 0610)  Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390)  C Porton (DNLP 1019)  The Marlow Society (DNLP 1705)  J Moore (DNLP 1279)  Sport England (DNLP 2889)  H MacDonald (DNLP 1291)  A Johnstone (DNLP 1835)  C Rowland (DNLP 1299)  P Morris (DNLP 0570)  J O'Keeffe (DNLP 1506)  T Orchard (DNLP 0504)  D Hilton (DNLP 1395)  K Edwards (DNLP 1193)  Wycombe Wildlife Group (DNLP 2608)  A Berron-Green (DNLP 0702)  B Webster (DNLP 1709)  R Davey (DNLP 2942)  Grundon (DNLP 1037)  P Mulville (DNLP 0112)  Historic England (DNLP 1798)  Natural England (DNLP 2654)  H Lynch (DNLP 1802)  R &amp; B Smith (DNLP 1945)</p>						
Number of Representations:	103	Objection:	67	Support:	5	Comment:	31

## Summary of issues/comments:

### Supporting:

- Retaining Airpark for aviation uses is supported.
- Proposed industrial development is well situated and would suit commercial activity.
- Protection of policy to ensure continued use of sports facilities is welcome.
- As long as activities at the Airpark are not affected, development proposals are supported.
- Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment requirement to support development is welcomed.

### Objecting:

#### General

- Development of the Airpark puts the area between Booker and Lane End at risk of development.
- There is no justification for including undeveloped land in the proposal for the Airpark.
- Site is not well located to the M40, particularly with the issues at the Turnpike roundabout.
- No additional employment space is needed, Cressex and Marlow industrial parks often contain vacant lots.

#### Impact on community/properties

- Further development of the Airpark would destroy the community feel of Booker.
- Justification of removing Claymoor Park residential area for the purposes of tidying up boundaries is unacceptable.
- Concerns that the proposals may impact the sale of houses within the immediate proximity.

#### Green Belt

- Objection to removal of the site and surrounding area from the Green Belt.
- There are no exceptional circumstances present for removing the Green Belt around the Airpark.

#### AONB/Wildlife

- Site has weak boundaries which adjoin the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, development with no firm boundary should be avoided.
- Development of HW15(b) would endanger wildlife.

#### Highways

- Road network surrounding the Airpark is not of a sufficient standard to allow heavy vehicles and would decrease safety of the road.
- Existing traffic issues would be exasperated by further development, particularly the B482 and the entrance to Horns Lane from Clay Lane.

#### Aviation activity

- Proposed area for the shooting range expansion would compromise use of the North-South runway (35) at the Airpark.
- North-South runway (35) cannot be relocated.
- Plan is currently too ambiguous over the locations and use of the three runways at the Airpark.
- Character of the area will be negatively impacted by development.
- Proposals are inconsistent with the continuation of gliding at the Airpark.

#### Shooting range proposal

- Shooting expansion would impose a safety risk on activity at the Airpark.
- Concerns over potential noise from both shooting and further aviation activity.

#### **Commenting:**

##### General

- HW15(a) should be taken forward as an allocation, however HW15(b) should be removed.
- More clarification is needed on what the new 'light industrial' area may be.
- Maps of the site must clearly display all three runways.
- Restrictions outlined in Policy should apply to entire site area, not just the southern part.
- Policy does not take into account the effect proposals will have on existing businesses situated at the Airpark nor the squash and racketball club/facilities.

##### Evidence

- More clarity is needed on how HW15(b) was assessed and how the conclusion came to an employment allocation.
- Claim that there are no commercial flying operations is not true.
- Plan should acknowledge the range, scope, and nature of the varied operations at the Airpark, to properly assess its importance for both employment and industry.

##### Alternative suggestions

- Parts of the existing Airpark, particularly to do with waste and recycling, would be better situated in HW16.
- Airfield should not remain in use, redeveloping the site would assist meeting the Districts' housing need

#### Aviation activity

- Any planned development should not interfere with current operations at the Airpark. It is critical that all three runways are available for use with any proposed development at the Airpark.
- Clarification is needed on whether 'aviation uses' of the Airpark refer to both General Aviation and Gliding.

- Runway 35 should be developed into another hard runway rather than developed for industrial use.
- Covenants restricting the uses on the land to aviation uses only must be respected.
- Relocation of gliding activities to the north of the site should be explored.
- In the interests of national security, the Airpark should be safeguarded for emergencies and possible resurgence plans.

#### Impact on properties

- Development should take into consideration those living in the immediate proximity to the site.

#### Highways

- Additional industrial development should consider the increase in traffic and pressure on existing highway network.
- If development was to lead to pressure for major road developments affecting the AONB, proposal will receive opposition.

#### Brownfield

- Appropriate development on the brownfield aspect of the site should be explored before developing the greenfield element of the site.

#### Shooting range proposal

- It is unclear why the shooting ground expansion is being consulted on as part of the Plan, it should be subjected to usual planning procedures.
- It is questioned on how an extension to the shooting range was identified.
- Shooting range is disruptive in its current forms, it should be questioned whether an expansion is needed.
- Policy must ensure that the proposed shooting range must not compromise the two existing footpaths and associated green infrastructure links between Booker and the Widdenton Park Wood SSSI.

#### Wildlife/Conservation

- Site is adjacent to a priority habitat ancient woodland, a 30m buffer is required from any built development and development must only be permitted if measures are taken to ensure there is no negative impact on the ancient woodland.
- Site contains woodland priority habitats, no development must be permitted on that section of the site, and the area must be well buffered by semi-natural habitat and measures must be taken so there is no negative impact on the habitat.
- If other parts of the site are suitable for development, significant levels of on-site compensation would be needed to compensate for impacts on wildlife.
- Compensation could be carried out through conserving the best areas of habitats and managing the site in perpetuity.
- Any development proposals should be assessed using a biodiversity accounting metric.

## AONB

- It should be acknowledged in the policy that part of the site falls in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and criteria for safeguarding the natural beauty of the site should be set out.
- HW15 (a) will require careful consideration over location, height and design in the setting of the AONB.
- B8 uses are discouraged due to the potential negative impact of the AONB.

## Site Policy: HW16 – Land Adjoining High Heavens Household Recycling Centre, Off Clay Lane

Respondents:	Grundon (DNLP 1037) D Perfect (DNLP 0442) M Button (DNLP 1137) J & A Murry (DNLP 2185) A Carter (DNLP 2173) M Moody (DNLP 1444) A Macdonald (DNLP 1486) D Moody (DNLP 1443) Mr & Mrs Braddock (DNLP 2048) S King (DNLP 1305) A Moody (DNLP 1442) E Kmiecik (DNLP 1441) C Cooke (DNLP 1482) T Elliot (DNLP 1306) C Stagg (DNLP 2940) Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) B Lawrence (DNLP 0443) DP Architects Ltd (Mr & Mrs Stoddart) (DNLP 2778) Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390) Historic England (DNLP 1798) Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714) R & B Smith (DNLP 1945)						
Number of Representations:	22	Objection:	14	Support:	1	Comment:	7

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

- Including the permanent County Council waste sites will give greater flexibility for those operations into the future.

#### Objecting:

##### Highways

- Roads too busy and not built for high volumes of traffic. Specific concerns about the additional traffic on the B482 that the development would bring, as well as the associated congestion and pollution.

##### Green Belt

- Objection to land being removed from the Green Belt.

##### Infrastructure

- Restricted capacity for sewerage and waste disposal.

## Other

- Light commercial industrial and business units out of character with the area.
- Negative effect proposals will have on local house prices.

## **Commenting:**

### Highways

- Access to site via Cressex Road not suitable for HGV traffic, being effectively a residential street.

### Green Belt

- A proper assessment should be undertaken of whether this proposed allocation constitutes 'major development' in the AONB/Green Belt, and if so, whether the exceptional circumstances and public interest tests are met.
- The cumulative impacts of policies HW15, GT020, and HW16 need to be assessed. Together they represent a large westward expansion of urban development from High Wycombe breaching the M40 and are likely to lead to pressure for other fields in the AONB east of Clay Lane to be developed.

### Ecology

- The field proposed for development is semi-improved grassland. A full site ecological survey should be carried out to determine the botanical quality of the grassland habitats.
- If the site is developed it is likely that significant levels of on-site compensation would be needed to compensate for the impacts of wildlife.

### Conservation

- The Historic Environment Record should be consulted for non-designated assets, and the Council's Conservation and Archaeological Advisers should also be consulted for their comments.



## Site Policy: HW17 – Cressex Business Park, High Wycombe

Respondents:	N/A						
Number of Representations:	N/A	Objection:	N/A	Support:	N/A	Comment:	N/A

### Summary of issues/comments:

- No representations were received regarding this site allocation.

## Site Policy: HW18 – High Wycombe Town Centre – Former Local Development Order Area

Respondents:	S Hutler (DNLP 0019) High Wycombe Society Planning Group (DNLP 2877) Bradenham Parish Council (DNLP 2722) A Cicin-Sain (DNLP 3019)						
Number of Representations:	4	Objection:	1	Support:	0	Comment:	3

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

#### Objecting:

- Money invested in development in the town centre would be wasted.

#### Commenting:

##### Historic assets

- Due to the historic value of buildings and street structure, the Council should remind owners and tenants of listing status and ensure appropriate premise use.
- Ancient passageways should be opened up to enhance the town's visible heritage.

##### Residential Conversions

- Greater attempt to convert vacant commercial buildings into low cost residential should be considered to help rejuvenate central High Wycombe.

##### Sustainable transport

- Improvements to cycle paths need to be made to provide access through the High Street and Eden centre

## Site Policy: HW19 – Land at Queensway, Hazlemere

Respondents:	B Burnett (DNLP 0198) W Tinkler (DNLP 0234) J Child (DNLP 0264) Mr & Mrs S Oliver (DNLP 0320) M Reynolds (DNLP 0365) C Weller (DNLP 0400) R Crowe (DNLP 0434) A Coombes (DNLP 0578) M Stephens (DNLP 0612) G Markham (DNLP 1043) B Coombes (DNLP 1622) G Clark (DNLP 1833) D & S Warne (DNLP 1950) D & M Roberts (DNLP 1967) R Bellis-Jones (DNLP 1991) V & P Main (DNLP 2060) T & V Owen (DNLP 9 2123) S Hall (DNLP 2131) G Hall (DNLP 2156) S Young (DNLP 2199) K Cooke (DNLP 2217) S Barratt-Singh (DNLP 2261) R Bell (DNLP 2351) A Barrow (DNLP 2459) Penn Parish Council (DNLP 2660) M Goodall (DNLP 2667) J Benn (DNLP 2822) M Holmes (DNLP 2909) M Kottbauer-Barnes (DNLP 2937) H Buckle (DNLP 2941) K Barnes (DNLP 2945) B Rodgers (DNLP 3051) S Chapman (DNLP 1930)						
Number of Representations:	33	Objection:	19	Support:	2	Comment:	12

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

- Allocation and new cemetery provision is supported.

#### Objecting:

##### Green Belt

- Objection to any use of Green Belt/AONB including the permitted cemetery function.
- Preference for current site's dual usage as allotments and dog walking/exercise area.

## Transport

- Too close to the crossroads – potential to add to hamlet-wide traffic disruption and jams on the A404.

## Other

- Implement residents' plan for "tranquil area" (to honour Queen's Golden Jubilee) as approved by WDC 2011/12 but never carried out.
- Ransom strip owned by several Parish Councils surround the entire site. As such, those Councils' agreement would be required for change of use.
- Burial is impractical/environmentally unfriendly in modern society and should be left to individual religious institutions to arrange for on their own property.
- No evidence presented of need for new burial sites within the area; Four Ashes and Holtspur facilities sufficient for now.

## Commenting:

### Transport

- If the entrance/exit is onto either the A404 or B474 (Penn Road), the impact on the A404 and the Hazlemere Crossroads will be significant and add to the traffic build-up around this area. At peak times it is already a source of great concern.
- Alternative access suggestions include:
  - via roundabout on the Penn Road that would serve the Golf Club as well.
  - Queensway widened or opened up to form a link road between the A404 and B474.
  - Remodel the B474 and/or A404 into a similar road layout to the entrance/exit into the Crematorium on the A404 at Amersham (modelled to allow free access to passing traffic).

### Ecology/diversity

- There is nothing within the planning document that covers different types of burial requirement; one large site may limit choice and discourage other sustainable and more ecologically friendly options.

## Other

- Suggested compensation for neighbouring homeowners for loss of value due to being located next to a cemetery.
- Confusion over whether this cemetery provision is for the Wycombe District or to serve the town of High Wycombe (the existing cemetery presumably serving High Wycombe only), and how this relates to burial needs for other areas.
- Suggest add a provision for the Council to have the ability to leverage windfall sites that are suitable for burial purposes as and when they arise whether in High Wycombe town or wider in the District area – similar to former policy CF7.
- The draft Policy HW19 needs to be updated to provide choice on the provision of Cemeteries / burial types; either HW19 needs to be amended or CF7 retained.

## Site Policy: MR6 – Seymour Court Road, Marlow

Respondents:	<p> A Clee (DNLP 0027)  J Copestake (DNLP 0058)  C Harris (DNLP 0126)  S Cooper (DNLP 01390)  L Cornish (DNLP 0141)  S Cornish (DNLP 0155)  A Wratten (DNLP 0158)  K Harling (DNLP 0159)  M Jackson (DNLP 0160)  J Hickey (DNLP 0168)  T Busby (DNLP 0184)  J Wells (DNLP 0237)  L Jennings (DNLP 0241)  H Duffy (DNLP 0265)  C Mayo (DNLP 0273)  S Harwood &amp; J Bracewell (DNLP 0297)  K Elstone (DNLP 0299)  Mr &amp; Mrs B Adlington (DNLP 0301)  E Fenley (DNLP 0308)  P and J Haynes (DNLP 0311)  K Vijn (DNLP 0354)  S Brassington (DNLP 0382)  Mr &amp; Mrs R Rycroft (DNLP 0398)  M Adams (DNLP 0411)  Mr &amp; Mrs J McFarlane (DNLP 0414)  D Wilson (DNLP 0421)  C Tyler (DNLP 0459)  D Riches (DNLP 0579)  G and H Glynn (DNLP 0583)  A Norris (DNLP 0675)  W &amp; G Jackson (DNLP 0703)  G Greenhous (DNLP 0991)  C Evans (DNLP 1010)  J Gray (DNLP 1038)  G Smart (DNLP 1076)  S Bowes (DNLP 1080)  P Prince (DNLP 1084)  E Collingwood (DNLP 1096)  W &amp; G Jackson (DNLP 1209)  C O'Connell (DNLP 1212)  E Nally (DNLP 1248)  C May (DNLP 1374)  R Vijn (DNLP 1388)  Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390)  D Bagge (DNLP 1440)  N Dormand (DNLP 1531)  E Bridges (DNLP 1538)  P White (DNLP 1550)  L Parkins (DNLP 1552)  J Stratford (DNLP 1553)  E Collins (DNLP 1645)  N Vakharia (DNLP 1663) </p>
--------------	--

	M Miller (DNLP 1669) C Chan (DNLP 1678) The Marlow Society (DNLP 1705) G Fletcher (DNLP 1770) Historic England (DNLP 1798) Great Marlow Parish Council (DNLP 1862) M Fletcher (DNLP 2034) S May (DNLP 2097) M Parkins (DNLP 2149) A Carter (DNLP 2173) L Dormand (DNLP 2181) C Hunter (DNLP 2288) A Collingwood (DNLP 2336) S Valentine (DNLP 2388) J Harris (DNLP 2506) A Hogg (DNLP 2519) P Borrows (DNLP 2565) N Pike (DNLP 2610) J Burnham (DNLP 2638) C Carter (DNLP 2666) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714) Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) G Nuttall (DNLP 2809) A Lee (DNLP 2991) P & D Deering (DNLP 3059)						
Number of Representations:	77	Objection:	54	Support:	11	Comment:	12

## Summary of issues/comments:

### Supporting

- Site is a sensible allocation for additional housing.

### Objecting

#### Green Belt/AONB

- Objection to building on both Green Belt and AONB land.
- Allowing this development would set an unwelcome and inappropriate precedent.
- The site provides a successful transition between the north-west residential urban edge of Marlow and the open AONB countryside beyond, which would be lost from development.
- There is a footpath through the site and impressive views from Seymour Court Road which would likely be blocked by development.
- The site would likely constitute ribbon development.

#### Access

- Site provides the only safe means for walkers to access path is the current gateway adjacent to the entrance to the flats at 89 Seymour Park Road; it should be retained. Moving this path is not an option; further up the hill it becomes increasingly dangerous to cross.

- The junction with Sunnybank and crossing at any point north of Pinecroft would bring walkers closer to the end of the 30 mph zone at the brow of the hill, an area subject to frequent Thames Valley Police speed monitoring events.
- Land to the right (facing uphill) of the public footpath is a drainage ditch to take storm water from the hill. During heavy rain this can be full of water, making it impossible to divert the path to the lower section of this next field.

### **Commenting**

- Policy should be amended to recognise AONB status.
- Site should be used to deliver affordable social housing.
- Records show no designated heritage assets on this site but the Historic Environment Record and Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment should be consulted for non-designated assets.
- The Council's Conservation and Archaeological Advisers should also be consulted for their comments.
- The site lies within Medmenham Biological Opportunity Area so if any development at all is appropriate within this option it should contribute to the targets for this BOA.

## Site Policy: MR7 – Land North of Oak Tree Road, Marlow

Respondents:	C Murton (DNLP 0001) SL85TP (DNLP 0002) P Sambrook (DNLP 0004) J Dickinson (DNLP 0010) M Steel (DNLP 0018) S Peacock (DNLP 0025) A Steel (DNLP 0029) J Packer (DNLP 0031) A Dawes (DNLP 0039) B Tilley (DNLP 0042) P Jackson (DNLP 0046) C Witcher (DNLP 0069) M & N Bristol (DNLP 0072) C Brownbill (DNLP 0078) J Brownbill (DNLP 0079) E Sharp (DNLP 0084) T Coates (DNLP 0088) J Blyth (DNLP 0095) D Cuttle (DNLP 0097) A & P Gilman (DNLP 0102) A Dowler (DNLP 00117) K Espwall (DNLP 0119) E Ley and V Cano (DNLP 0120) C Harris (DNLP 0126) S Glen (DNLP 0128) J Hargreaves (DNLP 0133) Scothcare Services (DNLP 0136) M Jackson-Cook (DNLP 0137) L Cornish (DNLP 0141) A Sutherland (DNLP 0143) C Russell (DNLP 0154) N Cornish (DNLP 0157) A Wratten (DNLP 0158) M Jackson (DNLP 0160) R Lee (DNLP 0161) K Fayers (DNLP 0162) D Storey (DNLP 0163) A Jones (DNLP 0164) P Storey (DNLP 0165) K F (DNLP 0167) D Glennon (DNLP 0169) A Potton (DNLP 0170) B Harbutt (DNLP 0171) C Rackstraw (DNLP 0175) S James (DNLP 0176) S Taylan (DNLP 0178) T Taylan (DNLP 0179) D Murphy (DNLP 0182) D Holloway (DNLP 0183) T Busby (DNLP 0184) R Simmons (DNLP 0186) M Bennett (DNLP 0189)
--------------	---



C Brooker (DNLP 0190)  
E Symmons (DNLP 0196)  
D Brown (DNLP 0197)  
J Tidbury (DNLP 0200)  
C Rodgers (DNLP 0201)  
R & A Walton (DNLP 02040)  
L Robinson (DNLP 02050)  
S Budd (DNLP 0206)  
T & J McIndoe (DNLP 0207)  
P Flint (DNLP 0208)  
M Gibbons (DNLP 0209)  
C Milne (DNLP 0211)  
C Hovery (DNLP 0212)  
L Spragg (DNLP 0220)  
I Dodds (DNLP 0221)  
D Bryant (DNLP 0222)  
J & M Symmons (DNLP 0223)  
R Cooper (DNLP 0225)  
J Walker (DNLP 02260)  
T Harbutt (DNLP 0229)  
S & K Pearson (DNLP 0230)  
S Suddaby (DNLP 0231)  
R Smart (DNLP 0232)  
J Wells (DNLP 0237)  
R Earnshaw (DNLP 0238)  
N Hutchinson & L Lowe (DNLP 0243)  
N Harris (DNLP 0247)  
M Colwill (DNLP 0248)  
D Pizey (DNLP 0253)  
P & W Turnbull (DNLP 0255)  
M Kite (DNLP 0258)  
H Duffy (DNLP 0265)  
M Cowan (DNLP 0268)  
C Mayo (DNLP 0273)  
M Jones (DNLP 0280)  
R Desmond (DNLP 0290)  
M Williams (DNLP 0292)  
H Robinson (DNLP 0294)  
D Ambrose (DNLP 0295)  
S Harwood & J Bracewell (DNLP 0297)  
Mr & Mrs B Adlington (DNLP 0301)  
L & J Barrett (DNLP 0305)  
F Duncan (DNLP 03060)  
J Berger (DNLP 0307)  
E Fenley (DNLP 0308)  
P & J Haynes (DNLP 0311)  
K & S Punwani (DNLP 0314)  
D Ambrose (DNLP 0318)  
G Ryan (DNLP 0319)  
H Jackson (DNLP 0322)  
S DeSouza (DNLP 0324)  
E Aylett (DNLP 0327)  
A Marsh (DNLP 0329)  
L Lorente (DNLP 0335)  
R Lewis (DNLP 0336)

K Hovery (DNLP 0337)  
J Galopin (DNLP 0340)  
J Gill (DNLP 0346)  
P Burgess (DNLP 03470)  
C & P Billinghamurst (DNLP 0353)  
K Vijin (DNLP 0354)  
R Stewart (DNLP 0356)  
C Hurst (DNLP 0358)  
J Griggs (DNLP 0362)  
K & H Baxter (DNLP 0364)  
B Jenkins (DNLP 0368)  
K Anderson (DNLP 0371)  
R Field (DNLP 0376)  
S Brassington (DNLP 0382)  
S Davie (DNLP 0386)  
F Rouse (DNLP 0393)  
M Adams (DNLP 0411)  
Mr & Mrs McFarlane (DNLP 0414)  
B Jackson (DNLP 0417)  
D Painter (DNLP 0420)  
J Meredith (DNLP 0424)  
R Frith (DNLP 0430)  
E Britton (DNLP 0446)  
C Tyler (DNLP 0459)  
V Cano (DNLP 0461)  
S Langford (DNLP 0472)  
S Langford (DNLP 0473)  
J Carro-Tevfik (DNLP 0474)  
J Gallop (DNLP 0486)  
P Morton (DNLP 0489)  
W Moore (DNLP 0502)  
E & J Nye (DNLP 0522)  
R Wheatley (DNLP 0532)  
C McCan (DNLP 0537)  
I Benfell (DNLP 0543)  
K Tan (DNLP 0547)  
I George (DNLP 0559)  
M Isaac (DNLP 0560)  
J Barlow (DNLP 0561)  
R Paxton (DNLP 0566)  
T Dust (DNLP 0574)  
D Riches (DNLP 0579)  
C Welham (DNLP 0581)  
M Hamill (DNLP 0582)  
G & H Glynn (DNLP 0583)  
N Hillier (DNLP 0615)  
J Haddock (DNLP 0632)  
D Southon (DNLP 0652)  
T Dennis (DNLP 06540)  
S Collins (DNLP 0657)  
A Whitman (DNLP 0661)  
R Potton (DNLP 0667)  
C Barry (DNLP 0673)  
E Haddock (DNLP 0674)  
A Norris (DNLP 0675)

L Haddock (DNLP 0677)  
L Burgess (DNLP 0681)  
A Stearn (DNLP 0682)  
K Butler (DNLP 0684)  
J Smith (DNLP 0689)  
A Marsden (DNLP 0695)  
N Robertson (DNLP 0699)  
W & G Jackson (DNLP 07030)  
C Pack (DNLP 0705)  
K Morgan (DNLP 0707)  
H Cooke (DNLP 0709)  
J Potton (DNLP 0710)  
R Avery (DNLP 0712)  
C Tilley (DNLP 0722)  
A Hill (DNLP 0729)  
A Barlow (DNLP 0735)  
F Cuttle (DNLP 0745)  
S Lindsay-Carlin (DNLP 0755)  
R Carlin (DNLP 0756)  
J Coster (DNLP 0760)  
K Warne (DNLP 0765)  
V Sharp (DNLP 0768)  
C Hill (DNLP 0770)  
M Pack (DNLP 0779)  
J Coombs (DNLP 0781)  
N Coombs (DNLP 0782)  
B Hunt (DNLP 0783)  
C Lipscomb (DNLP 0785)  
N & A McDougall (DNLP 0786)  
K Riley (DNLP 0788)  
S Riley (DNLP 0789)  
J Urie (DNLP 0791)  
C Addison (DNLP 0792)  
J Budd (DNLP 0794)  
J Shepherd (DNLP 0796)  
T Dickinson (DNLP 0800)  
M Simons (DNLP 0801)  
K Perry (DNLP 0802)  
C Pearman (DNLP 0803)  
A Perry (DNLP 0804)  
M Perry (DNLP 0805)  
D Hallet (DNLP 0808)  
C Riley (DNLP 0810)  
C Morton (DNLP 0811)  
A Cowan (DNLP 0814)  
K Morton (DNLP 0815)  
J Raddon (DNLP 0816)  
S Riley (DNLP 0817)  
S May (DNLP 0819)  
G Rees (DNLP 0822)  
A Rees (DNLP 0823)  
V Pretty (DNLP 0824)  
W Johnson (DNLP 0825)  
G Pretty (DNLP 0826)  
L Vassiliou (DNLP 0832)

G Evans (DNLP 0833)  
C Royds (DNLP 0834)  
C Simons (DNLP 0835)  
C Bailey (DNLP 0837)  
L Abbott (DNLP 0838)  
J Leonard (DNLP 0841)  
S Lipscomb (DNLP 0842)  
A Desmond (DNLP 0843)  
J Mills (DNLP 08440)  
R Bristow (DNLP 0845)  
C Royds (DNLP 08460)  
A Morton (DNLP 08470)  
K Philips (DNLP 08510)  
I Loughlin (DNLP 0854)  
D Jones (DNLP 0855)  
A Hull (DNLP 0856)  
M Reed (DNLP 0857)  
J Reed (DNLP 0858)  
J Moody (DNLP 0860)  
S Wana (DNLP 0902)  
F Bishop (DNLP 0903)  
C Newton (DNLP 0904)  
V Phillips (DNLP 0905)  
M Watterson (DNLP 0906)  
P Mogg (DNLP 0907)  
M Mitchell (DNLP 0909)  
B Walker (DNLP 0910)  
R & V Aggarwal (DNLP 0911)  
D Harbutt (DNLP 0912)  
K Jones (DNLP 0913)  
L Emmerson (DNLP 0914)  
J Jones (DNLP 0915)  
V Norwood (DNLP 0916)  
R Coster (DNLP 0917)  
E Norwood (DNLP 0918)  
S Harbutt (DNLP 0919)  
J Redman (DNLP 0920)  
D Knott (DNLP 0921)  
J Knott (DNLP 0922)  
Homer (DNLP 0923)  
C Evans (DNLP 0924)  
A Twine (DNLP 0925)  
B Phillips (DNLP 0926)  
E Bennett (DNLP 0927)  
R Bennett (DNLP 0928)  
S Phillips (DNLP 0929)  
J Phillips (DNLP 0930)  
M & S Durrant (DNLP 0946)  
K Ottaway (DNLP 0950)  
K Whitlock (DNLP 0952)  
E Prior (DNLP 0953)  
A Whitlock (DNLP 0954)  
S McGeorge (DNLP 0965)  
SL73JX (DNLP 0967)  
S Caskey (DNLP 0971)

SL73JX (DNLP 0972)  
J Moger (DNLP 0976)  
K Vockins (DNLP 0977)  
C Murphy (DNLP 0979)  
A Turnell (DNLP 0980)  
G & S Greenhous (DNLP 0991)  
N Hillier (DNLP 1001)  
C Austin (DNLP 1002)  
D Hope (DNLP 1003)  
E Davis (DNLP 1005)  
A Davis (DNLP 1006)  
M Davis (DNLP 1007)  
T Dodds (DNLP 1012)  
J Douglass (DNLP 1020)  
K Linfoot (DNLP 1021)  
B Tilley (DNLP 1024)  
J Nowak (DNLP 1027)  
P Shaw (DNLP 1031)  
D Caldwell (DNLP 1032)  
P Matson (DNLP 1033)  
S Jackson-Cook (DNLP 1034)  
L White (DNLP 1036)  
J Gray (DNLP 1038)  
P Metherell (DNLP 1040)  
S Jordan (DNLP 1045)  
A Blagg (DNLP 1046)  
S Potton (DNLP 1056)  
P Hunt (DNLP 1058)  
J Harris (DNLP 1059)  
J Metherell (DNLP 1061)  
M Dagg (DNLP 1066)  
J Davis (DNLP 1069)  
H Dodgson (DNLP 1074)  
G Smart (DNLP 1076)  
B Temblett (DNLP 1078)  
S Bowes (1080)  
P Prince (DNLP 1084)  
N Inker (DNLP 1085)  
A Williams (DNLP 1086)  
O Tribe (DNLP 1088)  
M Vallance (DNLP 1090)  
M Edlin (DNLP 1091)  
B Vallance (DNLP 1092)  
E Collingwood (DNLP 1096)  
C Read (DNLP 1099)  
G Quarterman (DNLP 1100)  
S Avery (DNLP 1104)  
H McLean (DNLP 1105)  
I McLean (DNLP 1108)  
L Quarterman (DNLP 1111)  
S Quarterman (DNLP 1112)  
S Roberts (DNLP 1113)  
N Comben (DNLP 1115)  
P Hodge (DNLP 1117)  
L Comben (DNLP 1118)

J O'Reilly (DNLP 1120)  
A Leibowitz (DNLP 1122)  
D Johnson (DNLP 1123)  
F White (DNLP 1126)  
M Cooke (DNLP 1130)  
S Johnson (DNLP 1131)  
T Nugent (DNLP 1132)  
K Lewis (DNLP 1135)  
J Brasier (DNLP 1136)  
A Shave (DNLP 1139)  
A Hargreaves (DNLP 1140)  
L Wilson (DNLP 1144)  
A Corrick (DNLP 1146)  
S Grill (DNLP 1147)  
R Burns (DNLP 1156)  
K Lawton (DNLP 1157)  
T Haveron Jones (DNLP 1158)  
S Giles (DNLP 1159)  
C Roberts (DNLP 1162)  
P Dawes (DNLP 1165)  
R Hogg (DNLP 1166)  
L Hogg (DNLP 1171)  
S Berry (DNLP 1180)  
Z O'Reilly (DNLP 1181)  
M Smith (DNLP 1183)  
H Phillips (DNLP 1184)  
D Putnam (DNLP 1187)  
D Gilronan (DNLP 1189)  
H Hunter (DNLP 1190)  
E Kazanji (DNLP 1192)  
A Avery (DNLP 1196)  
N Fletcher (DNLP 1197)  
N Dickinson (DNLP 1198)  
M Simpson (DNLP 1199)  
M Luton (DNLP 1203)  
R Lynch (DNLP 1204)  
A Hyatt (DNLP 1205)  
A Smith (DNLP 1206)  
L Corrick (DNLP 1207)  
C Hyatt (DNLP 1207)  
W & G Jackson (DNLP 1209)  
R Ellis (DNLP 1210)  
A Smith (DNLP 1211)  
I Woodbridge (DNLP 1214)  
M Miles (DNLP 1220)  
D Potton (DNLP 1222)  
R Cornish (DNLP 1224)  
M Coster (DNLP 1226)  
T Coster (DNLP 1227)  
I Barrett (DNLP 1228)  
S Woodbridge (DNLP 1230)  
E Gwozdicki (DNLP 1231)  
W Allan Wyllie (DNLP 1233)  
R Gwozdicki (DNLP 1235)  
L Hyatt (DNLP 1239)

C Ridges (DNLP 1240)  
C Francis (DNLP 1242)  
V McMillan (DNLP 1244)  
H Gallop (DNLP 1245)  
S Viney (DNLP 1246)  
A Bennett (DNLP 1250)  
J Knott (DNLP 1251)  
D Knott (DNLP 1260)  
C Allen (DNLP 1266)  
S Allen (DNLP 1267)  
K Oakes (DNLP 1273)  
J & L Hughes (DNLP 1277)  
P Gray (DNLP 1280)  
D Wade-Smith (DNLP 1286)  
M Obergfell (DNLP 1287)  
C Glennon (DNLP 1294)  
A Harding (DNLP 1295)  
J Newstead (DNLP 1298)  
E Prior (DNLP 1312)  
E Prior (DNLP 1313)  
S McPherson (DNLP 1314)  
R Venison (DNLP 1315)  
J Honey (DNLP 1319)  
M Ireland (DNLP 1322)  
V Ovens (DNLP 1323)  
T Smith (DNLP 1329)  
S D'Alton (DNLP 1332)  
J & A Mason (DNLP 1335)  
K Hillsdon (DNLP 1342)  
J S Robson (DNLP 1343)  
Mr & Mrs Hopkinson (DNLP 1348)  
M Smith & S Schultz (DNLP 1349)  
J Hawkins (DNLP 1352)  
T Hillsdon (DNLP 1356)  
B Pooley (DNLP 1366)  
J Skoyles (DNLP 1367)  
L Evertsen (DNLP 1370)  
C Needham (DNLP 1371)  
C May (DNLP 1374)  
P Avery (DNLP 1375)  
A Hawkins (DNLP 1377)  
J & J Richardson (DNLP 1378)  
T Needham (DNLP 1379)  
P & S Osborne (DNLP 1381)  
H Tolmie (DNLP 1382)  
A Hailstone (DNLP 1383)  
Mr & Mrs C Ford (DNLP 1384)  
D White (DNLP 1385)  
S, A & T Pinkham (DNLP 1386)  
R Vijn (DNLP 1388)  
Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390)  
A Platt (DNLP 1391)  
Mr & Mrs Andrews (DNLP 1392)  
D Harbutt (DNLP 1397)  
P Thomson (DNLP 1404)

S Jones (DNLP 1405)  
G Coutts (DNLP 1408)  
G Aram (DNLP 1409)  
E Querfurth (DNLP 1410)  
L Lewis (DNLP 1413)  
S Knox-Brown (Residents of Seymour Plain) (DNLP 1418)  
P Honey (DNLP 1422)  
T McLoughlin (DNLP 1426)  
S Adams (DNLP 1428)  
R Taylor (DNLP 1430)  
R Wollett (DNLP 1436)  
A Langley (DNLP 1445)  
P Querfurth (DNLP 1451)  
S Sounders Miller (DNLP 1452)  
J Hague (DNLP 1455)  
L Martin (DNLP 1457)  
S Smyth (DNLP 1459)  
P Martin (DNLP 1460)  
M Hague (DNLP 1461)  
R Steel (DNLP 1468)  
K Whittaker (DNLP 1472)  
R Gregory (DNLP 1476)  
N Meller (DNLP 1479)  
C Cooke (DNLP 1482)  
A Macdonald (DNLP 1486)  
J Donnison (DNLP 1487)  
B Tibbels (DNLP 1489)  
G Hill (DNLP 1498)  
M Keighley (DNLP 1499)  
C Almand (DNLP 15020)  
D Martinez (DNLP 1505)  
C Battersby (DNLP 1508)  
C Battersby (DNLP 1511)  
Z Ambrose-Kay (DNLP 1518)  
G Stratford (DNLP 1525)  
V Prosser (DNLP 1529)  
N Dormand (DNLP 1531)  
P Robson (DNLP 1533)  
E Bridges (DNLP 1538)  
M Rodgers (DNLP 1541)  
F Morton (DNLP 1542)  
C Ellison (DNLP 1543)  
L Parkins (DNLP 1546)  
R Jeffrey (DNLP 1549)  
P White (DNLP 1550)  
J Stratford (DNLP 1553)  
D Keys (DNLP 1554)  
P Ormsby (DNLP 1555)  
V Gardner (DNLP 1557)  
A Picard (DNLP 1560)  
T Kemp (DNLP 1563)  
K Sylvester (DNLP 1574)  
S Blakeney (DNLP 1576)  
R Patton (DNLP 1583)  
F Harper (DNLP 1587)



G Evertsen (DNLP 1594)  
 R Crane (DNLP 1598)  
 M Page (DNLP 1640)  
 B Mulady (DNLP 1643)  
 M Mulday (DNLP 1644)  
 E Colins (DNLP 1645)  
 M Hunt (DNLP 1657)  
 M Davis (DNLP 1664)  
 A Jeffs (DNLP 1667)  
 M Miller (DNLP 1669)  
 G Minns (DNLP 1670)  
 C Chan (DNLP 1678)  
 K & S Harrison (DNLP 1679)  
 V Beadle (DNLP 1689)  
 M Greenwell (DNLP 1693)  
 A Smart (DNLP 1695)  
 H Winter (DNLP 1699)  
 A Spratley (DNLP 1702)  
 The Marlow Society (DNLP 1705)  
 M Andrews (DNLP 1708)  
 A de Cunha (DNLP 1715)  
 S Davie (DNLP 1723)  
 O Mount (DNLP 1725)  
 I Maiden (DNLP 1730)  
 S Rhymer (DNLP 1741)  
 G Lavers (DNLP 1742)  
 S Hurworth (DNLP 1746)  
 E Fletcher (DNLP 1751)  
 P Redfern (DNLP 1760)  
 G Toms (DNLP 1762)  
 S Wells (DNLP 1769)  
 G Fletcher (DNLP 1770)  
 Mr & Mrs Richardson (DNLP 1776)  
 Scottwood Homes (Heavens Above) (DNLP 1794)  
 A Robinson (DNLP 1797)  
 J Wilson (DNLP 1801)  
 A Stratford (DNLP 1810)  
 R Hurworth (DNLP 1812)  
 J Nicholls (DNLP 1814)  
 N Brown (DNLP 1820)  
 T & D Hilton (DNLP 1821)  
 A Logan (DNLP 1823)  
 J Mitchell (DNLP 1825)  
 R East (DNLP 1828)  
 J White (DNLP 1843)  
 M Suddaby (DNLP 1845)  
 L Nowak (DNLP 1848)  
 C Slack (DNLP 1849)  
 S Gentry (DNLP 1852)  
 Great Marlow Parish Council (DNLP 1862)  
 J Forgenie (DNLP 1876)  
 C van den Berghe (DNLP 1880)  
 S Mace (DNLP 1881)  
 C Harding (DNLP 1882)  
 L Keeley (DNLP 1892)

Marlow Bottom Valley Residents Association (DNLP 1895)  
 S van den Berghe (DNLP 1897)  
 E Smith (DNLP 1898)  
 Mrs Wakefield (DNLP 1902)  
 J & L Allpass (DNLP 1919)  
 E Lowdon (DNLP 1933)  
 J Lowdon (DNLP 1934)  
 R Keeley (DNLP 1942)  
 S Fletcher (DNLP 1947)  
 N Metcalfe (DNLP 1948)  
 N Butler (DNLP 1956)  
 D Driscoll (DNLP 1958)  
 J Booth (DNLP 1963)  
 K Hearne-Potton (DNLP 1964)  
 M Venison (DNLP 1975)  
 M Cottrell (DNLP 1979)  
 T McIndoe (DNLP 1981)  
 C Ellis (DNLP 1983)  
 L Cottrell (DNLP 1984)  
 P Woodbridge (DNLP 1987)  
 S Woodbridge (DNLP 1988)  
 G Woodbridge (DNLP 1989)  
 R Woodbridge (DNLP 1990)  
 C Holmes (DNLP 1992)  
 A Fitzgerald (DNLP 2007)  
 P & T Long (DNLP 2013)  
 D Fitzgerald (DNLP 2015)  
 W Gibbs (DNLP 2018)  
 M Billinghamurst (DNLP 2020)  
 R Honey (DNLP 20250)  
 B Szczech (DNLP 2033)  
 M Fletcher (DNLP 2034)  
 D Adami (DNLP 2035)  
 J Adami (DNLP 2036)  
 L Highgate (DNLP 2037)  
 K Whitman (DNLP 2044)  
 S Hicks (DNLP 2047)  
 L van den Berghe (DNLP 2053)  
 G Hicks (DNLP 2058)  
 E Engall (DNLP 2059)  
 L Engall (DNLP 2061)  
 D Whitman (DNLP 2066)  
 I Engall (DNLP 2070)  
 P Kirkley (DNLP 2092)  
 S May (DNLP 2097)  
 J Hyatt (DNLP 2117)  
 K Douglass (DNLP 2118)  
 S Cooper (DNLP 2134)  
 G Gray & S Bennett (DNLP 2136)  
 R Engall (DNLP 2141)  
 M Parkins (DNLP 2149)  
 A Dennis (DNLP 2152)  
 D Watt (DNLP 2155)  
 P Farrand (DNLP 2163)  
 J Lindsay-Carlin (DNLP 2164)

A Carter (DNLP 2173)  
R Dennis (DNLP 2174)  
S Lattimer (DNLP 2175)  
L Dormand (DNLP 2181)  
J & A Murray (DNLP 2185)  
B & K Jones (DNLP 2197)  
P Legge (DNLP 2198)  
S Young (DNLP 2199)  
A Farrand (DNLP 2200)  
L Woollett (DNLP 2201)  
N Hall (DNLP 2202)  
S Innes (DNLP 2222)  
O Carro-Tevfik (DNLP 2229)  
M Ashford (DNLP 2233)  
G & G Cooper (DNLP 2238)  
S Lee (DNLP 2244)  
A Woollett (DNLP 2257)  
M Rolfe (DNLP 2258)  
A Leach (DNLP 2262)  
D Walker (DNLP 2280)  
L Richards (DNLP 2287)  
C Hunter (DNLP 2288)  
S Kemp (DNLP 2292)  
S Hall (DNLP 2305)  
S Walker (DNLP 2309)  
E Collyer (DNLP 2321)  
C Tipler (DNLP 2324)  
A Woollett (DNLP 2327)  
R Browning (DNLP 2328)  
C Battersby (DNLP 2334)  
A Collingwood (DNLP 2336)  
K Pearson (DNLP 2340)  
J Battersby (DNLP 2346)  
H Rogers (DNLP 2347)  
P Tremelling (DNLP 2358)  
M Spencer-Jones (DNLP 2359)  
C Wann (DNLP 2361)  
Mr Loughlin (DNLP 2367)  
H Taylor (DNLP 2372)  
J Taylor (DNLP 2376)  
J Symmons (DNLP 2385)  
W Denison (DNLP 2387)  
S Valentine (DNLP 2388)  
A Tibbels (DNLP 2397)  
M Brownlie (DNLP 2400)  
Y Simms (DNLP 2403)  
B Simms (DNLP 2404)  
F Simms (DNLP 2405)  
L Sellers (DNLP 2410)  
J Harper (DNLP 2417)  
S Barnes (DNLP 2421)  
C Hillsdon (DNLP 2422)  
B Collyer (DNLP 2429)  
A Walton (DNLP 2432)  
P Ryan (DNLP 2465)

J Hart (DNLP 2477)  
J Harris (DNLP 2506)  
A Hogg (DNLP 2519)  
T Noble (DNLP 2521)  
S & P Osborne (DNLP 2534)  
O Picard (DNLP 2535)  
P Clemens (DNLP 2536)  
C Mussai (DNLP 2537)  
S Mussai (DNLP 2538)  
SL73JZ (DNLP 2539)  
G Niven (DNLP 2540)  
E Owen (DNLP 2541)  
S Winter (DNLP 2543)  
S Winning (DNLP 2546)  
A Gibbs (DNLP 2551)  
SL73JX (DNLP 2552)  
D Russell (DNLP 2553)  
H Glover (DNLP 2554)  
C Hamilton-Jones (DNLP 2558)  
B Chimes (DNLP 2560)  
J Atkinson (DNLP 2561)  
A Atkinson (DNLP 2562)  
F Bishop (DNLP 2563)  
SL73JX (DNLP 2564)  
P Borrows (DNLP 2565)  
H Young (DNLP 2567)  
SL73JZ (DNLP 2568)  
SL73JZ (DNLP 2569)  
SL73JZ (DNLP 2570)  
P Browne (DNLP 2571)  
D Walker (DNLP 2572)  
B Jenkin (DNLP 2576)  
B & D Pearce (DNLP 2577)  
S Helfacre (DNLP 2578)  
SL73HB (DNLP 2581)  
G Caton (DNLP 2582)  
M & G Fessey (DNLP 2592)  
S Taylor (DNLP 2596)  
N Welicome (DNLP 2597)  
SL73PN (DNLP 2598)  
N Pike (DNLP 2610)  
M Smith (DNLP 2613)  
F Smith (DNLP 2614)  
M Wright (DNLP 2620)  
V Wright (DNLP 2621)  
O Holmes (DNLP 2626)  
J Burnham (DNLP 2638)  
M Fillmore (DNLP 2642)  
Natural England (DNLP 2654)  
K & D Massie (DNLP 2658)  
J Knight (DNLP 2663)  
L Forgenie (DNLP 2678)  
Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682)  
J Michel (DNLP 2684)  
DP Architects (Mr & Mrs Redgrave) (DNLP 2693)

L Fessey (DNLP 2704)  
B Tilbury (DNLP 2713)  
Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714)  
S Highgate (DNLP 2717)  
J Witcher (DNLP 2718)  
K Bevins (DNLP 2720)  
Fisher German LLP (DNLP 2723)  
J Northover (DNLP 2724)  
C Northover (DNLP 2726)  
J Spencer (DNLP 2727)  
Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735)  
R Ashton (DNLP 2746)  
S Haveron Jones (DNLP 2748)  
A Turnbull (DNLP 2757)  
DP Architects (Mr & Mrs Stoddard) (DNLP 2778)  
H Saunders (DNLP 2779)  
Mrs White (DNLP 2784)  
C Keighley (DNLP 2807)  
G Nuttall (DNLP 2809)  
K Maillard (DNLP 2816)  
J van den Berghe (DNLP 2823)  
R Partridge (DNLP 2825)  
M Bruce (DNLP 2827)  
T Hunter (DNLP 2831)  
G Hoare (DNLP 2835)  
A Weavers (DNLP 2843)  
H Holloway (DNLP 2854)  
J Towns (DNLP 2868)  
D Bruce (DNLP 2869)  
R Bevins (DNLP 2871)  
D & A Smart (DNLP 2890)  
L Raddon (DNLP 2920)  
K Bruce (DNLP 2926)  
M Weller (DNLP 2932)  
M Symmons (DNLP 2949)  
J Smyth (DNLP 2950)  
A Hope (DNLP 2952)  
A Bigsby (DNLP 2953)  
V West (DNLP 2957)  
D Smyth (DNLP 2963)  
V Bird (DNLP 2972)  
M Sloane (DNLP 2979)  
R Cooper (DNLP 2980)  
G Fessey (DNLP 2987)  
A Lee (DNLP 2991)  
D White (DNLP 2996)  
M Jeffs (DNLP 3000)  
J Powell (DNLP 3003)  
L Milne (DNLP 3006)  
J Powell (DNLP 3007)  
E & D Bray (DNLP 3008)  
S Berry (DNLP 3018)  
I Berry (DNLP 3021)  
R Cooper (DNLP 3031)  
J Finch (DNLP 3032)

	A Partridge (DNLP 3046) R Avery (DNLP 3050) P & D Deering (DNLP 3059) J & J Melville-Jackson (DNLP 3061) J Finch (DNLP 3062) M Greening (DNLP 3068) M Spencer (DNLP 3069) M Ferguson (DNLP 3073) R Anand (DNLP 3077) Save Marlow AONB and Green Belt (DNLP 3081) Richard Buxton Environmental and Public Law (Residents of Seymour Plain) (DNLP 3082) C Cowling (DNLP 3086) A Gray (DNLP 0252) A Fitch (DNLP 3001) P & G Savage (DNLP 1044) J Slack (DNLP 2147) M Elin (DNLP 2674)						
Number of Representations:	784	Objection:	724	Support:	5	Comment:	55

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

##### General

- Support for joining all Seymour Plain houses onto the Barnhill site which would tie all sites into a larger site, which would need a replacement off road in Oak Tree Road and Seymour Plain. This road could join up towards Booker/ Lane End.
- Support based on evidence in the plan, additional homes are needed but reserve site should be considered first if they're available.

##### Housing allocations

- The site is a logical and suitable location for development.
- There is a lack of infill land.
- As a 2nd tier development, Marlow should be accommodating additional housing above the 300 dwellings.
- The site is a reasonable choice as the land isn't used by the public, or very visible and new housing is necessary
- A limited development (100 houses on one sides of the road) would be supported.

##### Accessibility

- Safe and sensitive access to the site can be achieved with minimal impact to Oak Tree Road.
- Oak Tree Road has the capacity to cope with additional traffic.
- The site is well located in relation to amenities and services and sustainable transport.

- A number of pedestrian links will be created to link to existing public rights of way.
- The volume of accidents recorded on roads near the site doesn't give cause for concern.

#### Sustainable development

- The site has the ability to provide a mix of housing.
- Jobs will be created during the construction phase and more residents will increase spending.
- The site provides an opportunity to offer Green infrastructure.
- Green corridors and open spaces will be included as part of the Green Infrastructure framework, working with the site's natural features.

#### Green Belt and AONB

- The impacts of the release of land at Oak Tree Road will be very localised.
- Appropriate landscaping will mean the quality of the AONB setting could be enhanced.
- Green Belt release is essential given the constrained availability of developable land.
- The need to deliver housing needs provides exceptional circumstances for Green Belt release.
- Green Belt assessment part 2 supports this proposal.
- The development would seek to ensure provisions of the Chiltern management plan regarding the design of the buildings.
- The proposal wouldn't cause coalescence between Marlow and Marlow Bottom, and wouldn't lead to unrestricted sprawl of Marlow. Therefore this proposal wouldn't constitute as a major development in the AONB.

#### Conservation

- The proposal site can be supported from a landscape and visual context.
- The site doesn't contribute to the scenic quality of the area.
- Appropriate design will ensure the development appears as a natural addition.
- Any localised ecological considerations will be incorporated into the development.
- The context of the site is established by neighbouring built form.
- Appropriate planting will maintain a 'green edge' to the site and screen out views.
- The site has low recreational value.
- It's not considered the development would adversely affect listed buildings and the nearest conservation site is in Marlow town centre.
- No landscape features associated with the site are considered rare and there are no historic associations with the site.
- Development of this site can be achieved without harming the existing landscape character of the visual environment.

#### Affordable housing

- Support for the need for more affordable housing for young people wishing to stay in the area.

## Objecting:

### General

- Objection to the proposal and it should be rejected.
- The proposal is bad planning, and isn't in the public interest.
- Lack of consideration given to the proposal.
- Residents views should be considered.
- This development is unsustainable.
- The site is the least viable option for the Council's requirements.
- Further development needs greater consideration and there has to be a long term plan, not this piecemeal mentality, and an increase in homes must be fully thought out, and the impact on the town reviewed.
- A more definitive and structured approach is needed.
- How will the increased population be absorbed?
- The proposal appears to be a knee jerk reaction to an immediate housing need with biased assistance from a developer and without any evidence of long-term strategic thinking.
- Underground streams run through the chalk below the fields, which has created sinkholes, so the suitability of this site needs reconsidered.
- The development contradicts the wishes of the majority of residents in Marlow and Marlow bottom, including councillors.
- A similar proposal was put forward in the past and was fought by surrounding residents and if this proposal goes ahead many residents will fight against it.
- Residents were assured this site wouldn't be considered for development and this proposal contradicts this.
- Queries over what percentage of s106 contribution is ring-fenced for local area.
- No factors to suggest these fields are plausible for housing, especially as the development isn't required to meet the 300 homes target.
- Living in an ever expanding area won't benefit residents and an increase in crime could be related to sacrificing Green Belt.

### Green Belt

- Objection to the release of Green Belt land. It should be permanently preserved and protected.
- This site is highly rated and serves many of the Green Belt purposes.
- This proposal will significantly impact the Green Belt which is highly valued, and will cause permanent destruction and will have far reaching consequences.
- No exceptional circumstances or justification exist to support release of this site.
- Allowing encroachment of the Green Belt would be a neglect of the Council's responsibility and a betrayal of the supposed permanence of the Green Belt.
- The site is developer promoted rather than promoted by the Green Belt review.
- The proposal to build on Green Belt and AONB should be an illegal act. The Government states that Green Belt is sacrosanct.
- Housing needs shouldn't outweigh loss of Green Belt.



- Existing residents have always been restricted in terms of house alterations due the designations, and the same should apply to this development.
- Concern over removing land from Green Belt and AONB and developing on it, which is enjoyed by residents.
- This proposal would lead to the coalescence of Marlow, Seymour Plain and Marlow Bottom, threatening their separate identities. Threat of eventual coalescence with Booker and the Wycombe conurbation should this go ahead.
- The map appears disingenuous, showing a small development in MR7 with a broad stretch of forest separating Marlow and Marlow Bottom but this is a very thin strip of woodland
- It has always been a policy that Marlow and Marlow Bottom should be separate areas to maintain the Green Belt/ AONB status and to conserve and enhance these areas
- This development would link Barnhill Road/ Barn Close/ Sunnybank with Seymour Plain which are separate communities, and Seymour Plain is part of the High Wycombe parliamentary constituency whereas the other roads are part of the Beaconsfield parliamentary constituency.
- The importance of these fields preventing Marlow merging with Seymour Plain should be reviewed as well as the importance in preventing Marlow merging with Marlow Bottom. The separate identity of Seymour Plan has been missed in assessments.
- Marlow's boundaries should be retained
- The fields provide buffer between the local dump and the residents of Marlow and Marlow Bottom
- The development will extend major ribbon development and cause urban sprawl.
- Removing these fields wouldn't leave the remaining Green Belt area with any permanent and defensible boundary, so there will be inclination for development to go beyond these fields.
- WDC stated a similar amount of land was added to the Green Belt in 2008, but this doesn't serve the purpose of preventing urban sprawl and coalescence

#### Green Belt - Assessment

- The ARUP report is inaccurate, for example: The bus service referred to is a limited service, and mentioning it has little value; also the site to the west of Oak Tree Road makes no mention of the right of way on the western boundary running from Seymour Park Road to Seymour Plain which is well used and enjoyed.
- The proposal makes a mockery of the ARUP report, which identifies 7 other sites.
- The review fails to comprehend the significant harm the development would cause.
- The review of MR7 is inconsistent when compared to other reviews.
- The wider parcel of land scored 12+ in the ARUP report, so wasn't recommended for release. If the individual sites are scored using the same criteria, they should score the same, and therefore not be recommended for consideration.
- Lack of consideration of access issues in the initial highway assessment in the Green Belt assessment.

- The reviews show no weight to the fact the area is an AONB, and proposes this site over areas which aren't AONB and the leaflet doesn't even mention the AONB which is misleading.
- Concern over the amount of homes proposed and the density of the development.

#### AONB

- Objection to use of land in an AONB – it must be preserved.
- No assessment as to whether this development constitutes as major development in an AONB and if so whether exceptional circumstances and public interests tests are met which needs to be done.
- Development would constitute major development in the AONB, Green Belt and countryside.
- Adverse impacts would significantly outweigh benefits when assessed against the NPPF.
- Concern over building on land which until a couple of weeks ago had a very high Green Belt rating, which was then removed to be reassessed separately and rating was drastically reduced after the consultation process.
- It is unlawful to build in the AONB. Development will diminish the status of the AONB and prevent it from being used as intended.
- Proposing development sets a dangerous precedent.
- The development wouldn't contribute to the AONB and would cause significant harm to the landscape. This has not been properly assessed,
- The Chilterns attract people to the area, which contribute to its preservation, so if its ability to do this is reduced, the essence of the Chilterns will decline and it will lose its character
- Charities have worked hard to protect AONB, and this proposal is an abuse to the trust placed in the government to protect AONB

#### Agricultural Land

- The site is currently used for agriculture, which would be lost.
- The farmer of the land sets aside an area for wildlife, this would be compromised as a result of development.
- Objection to developing rural areas which are currently used for agriculture.

#### Sense of place

- The development will impact the beauty, unique feel, openness, tranquillity, wildlife, attractiveness, nature, character, quality and setting of the area and the views into the area, which are important to residents, and Marlow unique quality attracts visitors, so this proposal would lead to loss of the appeal of the area for residents and tourism.
- Marlow's green spaces are a finite resource and they offer many benefits, this site should be preserved.
- The fields provide a visual Green Belt, as from the town fields can be seen all around, lending the area its atmosphere and identity as a beautiful historic Thames

side Market town. This development, and other previous developments, risk Marlow losing that identity.

- Seymour Plain will lose its identity as a tranquil Hamlet.
- Marlow Bottom will lose its identity as a vibrant Alpine-like village.
- Marlow is already becoming an urban sprawl, if this continues, Marlow will become an unpleasant place to live and won't attract tourists.
- The site provides a sense of greenery and enhances the rural environment.
- The high elevation of the site means the development would be highly noticeable and would ruin the historic view of the area.
- The fields form a break between the developments at Ridgeway/ Hillside Road and at Seymour Plain.
- The development would harm the landscape and character of adjacent neighbourhoods.
- Any development would be out of character with the surrounding area.
- Taking on too many people in a short timeframe will change the core spirit of the area.

## Highways

- The development will adversely impact traffic, highways, the transport network and limited public transport, leading to issues and this will have a significant impact.
- Roads around the area already suffer from a range of issues, and additional traffic will exasperate these and lead to other issues. The network won't be able to cope, meaning new roads and access onto Lane End Road will have to be created.
- Objection to the possibility of 300 cars in 1 area.
- The development could lead to the creation of new 'rat runs'.
- Objection to the expense involved of altering roads so they could cope with this proposal.
- Lack of information about how highway and parking issues will be addressed.
- The developer should be required to improve, and build new roads to meet the developments needs.
- The suggestion buses will reduce congestion on roads is misplaced, as many residents will use their car, even for short journeys, adding to the traffic.
- The development would require a bus service but roads wouldn't facilitate this and buses accessing roads will create logistical issues.
- The roads wouldn't be able to support larger vehicles.
- The plan states Ragman's lane is an expandable bottleneck; but there is no provision to get the flow of Marlow to Handy Cross traffic passed Burford school which as a bigger bottleneck.
- Analysis on Ragman's Lane and the impact on traffic is narrow scoped and inaccurate.
- Upgrading roads to cope with additional traffic would cause issues.
- Access would entail building on Green Belt and AONB and removing protected woodland, and given the trees must be preserved the site can't easily be accessed.
- Objection to any future link road onto Marlow Bottom.
- The access road houses a football ground, meaning access would be difficult during games, and poses a risk for children.

- Access may entail destroying existing housing to access adjoining residential road, and change the character of residential area.
- Access via the rumoured alternative route via Sunnybank will have a significant impact and lead to issues, and this road has problems.
- Access from Seymour Plain isn't possible as most of the land is privately owned.
- The lanes between Seymour Plain and Oak Tree Road should be retained and not widened.
- Using the lane through Seymour Plain as a way out onto Lane End Road B482 will cause issues.
- The site is topographically unsuitable with steep inclines and difficult access

### Conservation

- The development would significantly impact the environment, protected woodland, ecosystems, ecology, and range of plant life, flora, fauna, wildlife and habitats which would be detrimental.
- The site forms part of a migration corridor for species, so the development would have a significant impact, and contribute to the decline of wildlife and biodiversity.
- Major engendering and excavation works would be required, impacting the landscape and could lead to flooding issues.
- The site has high nature conservation value.
- The hedgerows and treelines would need to be protected, as they are vital for wildlife, and future residents of the proposal would be unlikely to maintain these as natural wild habitats.
- These fields are unusual wildflower meadows, and as a significant amount of wildflower meadows have been removed, the remaining fields should be protected.
- Surveys on natural wildlife in this area should be conducted as well as a bat survey, and an ecological survey to ensure wildlife in Marlow's protected sites isn't being disturbed.
- Trees in the Green Belt and protected trees must be preserved.
- Land between the site and surrounding properties has been left fallow, which would be affected.
- How and where will new habitat be created to compensate for loss of Green Belt?
- The site is athletically valuable to the town and residents.
- Concern over land being cleared at the top of Kingsley Drive which was an AONB and home to endangered species, as there are plans to create a road to the B482 through the track at the top of this field.
- Concern the site will lose its environmental protection offered by its designations.

### Infrastructure

- The development will increase strain on infrastructure/services/resources which won't be able to cope, leading to issues. There is no mention of how this will be resolved and this must be considered.
- Concern that there are no plans to provide emergency service access.
- The site is poorly located in relation to services and amenities.
- It unlikely infrastructure can be made adequate to cope.
- The developer should be required to improve infrastructure and services.

- Objection to the local housing plan being delivered in isolation to the infrastructure plan.
- Previous applications for development in this area raised issues relating to infrastructure, and if they were relevant then they should be even more relevant today.
- The development would alter school catchment areas, which would upset those who bought housing based on access to schools.
- Priority when it comes to services needs to be given to existing residents before additional strain is placed on the town.
- The water supply required for this proposal is significant additional demand and the mains feeding the area are close to capacity.

#### Parking

- The development will increase strain on limited parking.
- Parking issues aren't being addressed, and the recently introduced parking restrictions and other developments will add further pressure.
- Adequate parking will be needed for this development including on road parking for visitors, and this hasn't been considered.
- The plan mentions new sites for jobs and this will place additional strain on the limited parking.

#### Flooding/ Drainage

- The site is prone to flooding, so the homes will be at risk, as well as homes backing on to the site.
- The site is crucial to soaking up water and the development will increase runoff, causing flooding and drainage issues. Additional water due to increased runoff will make ice worse in winter. The plan needs to address this.
- Drainage is already overstretched and experiences issues, so it wouldn't be able to cope and would need to be remodelled, causing disruption.

#### Impact on existing residents

- Concern some residents may be subject to compulsory purchase who weren't consulted.
- Issues with properties being overlooked, and there is no way of screening the new houses.
- Property prices will be adversely affected by the development.
- Housing is needed but not at the disadvantage to existing residents.

#### Community facilities

- There are footpaths and bridleways on and adjacent the site, which have great views, are frequently used by those exercising, dog walkers, and horse riders, which are a short diversion from the Chiltern Way. These would be lost or compromised if this development went ahead. The Council haven't made this clear, it is not shown on the

plan, and the loss of these footpath would mean the footpath users would use narrow roads without footpaths instead, causing safety concerns.

- 300 homes will bring noise from an overcrowded densely populated urban development which isn't consistent with the existing countryside neighbourhood areas.
- If the proposed site opposite Pine Croft/ Sunnybank goes ahead, are there plans to conserve the footpath as pushing the entrance further up the hill would be more dangerous.
- The small post office and one local shop wouldn't be able to cope with additional population.
- Is there space for additional facilities like toilets and town halls.
- Residents would no longer be close to Green Belt land and nature, which is something many enjoy about the area.
- Open spaces like this are a community resource and should only be given up if there is compelling benefit to the community, which there isn't.
- Marlow is entitled to be left with some green and pleasant land, as it will be irrevocably lost after development. This will have an impact on physical and mental health.

#### Housing mix

- There's a need for more smaller homes and apartments for older residents, so they can release larger family homes on the edge of the town.
- Other sites within Marlow should be considered to ensure the new developments aren't car dependent and they need to benefit the people wishing to live here  
Concern over the density of the housing as it would be an eyesore and an unpleasant / unhealthy way of living.

#### Affordable housing

- Concern that the housing won't be affordable.
- The proposal is in the wrong location for social and affordable housing. Therefore the development must take into account issues facing young people and address how smaller housing units can be incorporated.
- This proposal will benefit people moving into the area, and not the children of Marlow's residents who would be unable to afford Marlow properties.
- The homes have to be 2-3 bedroom affordable housing for the use of Marlow residents and their families and public sector workers only and not 'buy to let' or second homes.
- The extension of permission to build on the Green Belt is subject to proviso that it can provide affordable housing which this development won't do.

#### Process

- Concern over the influence developers and private sector consultancies could have on WDC.
- The council seems haphazard and hasn't followed government guide lines, standard operating procedures and processes.

- A coherent, well-argued and explicit proposal is needed so constructive responses can be made.
- It was expected objections will be ignored and the plan will proceed regardless, given WDC receive payments based on the amount of properties built and are under pressure from the government.
- Concern over the lack of involvement from Marlow councillors or public meetings in Marlow Bottom.
- Concern over confusing presentations about this proposal.
- Concern some residents didn't receive a copy of proposal or the Local Plan and therefore could not have a say.
- The Sustainability Appraisal suggests implementing an assessment of impact and appropriate mitigation measures and a fully informed response can't be made without this, and the potential mitigation section of the SA is insufficient and should be disregarded.
- Concern and suspicion over the limited consultation period, and input is needed from local groups as well as individuals.
- Objection to the sneaky way notices have been posted on footpaths developers want to destroy.

#### Density

- This estate is already large and densely populated with housing and this proposal would worsen this.
- Development must be through higher density housing/flats closer to the town centre which would have environmental and social benefits such as reduced traffic.

#### Economy

- The consultation was discussed at a recent chamber of commerce meeting who were against the proposal, and if they don't support the Marlow elements of the plan then the 'Foster economic growth target' isn't being satisfied.
- Queries over whether this proposal is necessary for the economy.
- The development isn't of significant benefit to the local economy.
- The adverse impact on tourism of this development will affect local businesses.
- The plan stated the land wasn't used; this is incorrect as the land to the west side of the top of Oak Tree Road is used for cattle grazing and that on the east either for grazing horses and/ or providing silage.

#### Sustainable development

- It would be difficult to include this site into a long-term vision for the development of Marlow and provision of suitable infrastructure.

#### **Commenting:**

##### General

- If this proposal goes ahead it must be a community based development plan encompassing housing, a school, doctors and local shop.
- Only properties up to 2 stories high should be built.

- A strip of trees should be planted to divide this development from Seymour Plain. Seymour Plain residents should be consulted on this proposal.
- The hilly nature of the plot will create noise with speeding vehicles.
- The 4 bullet points made in the draft plan are very important issues.
- Currently there isn't a policy for this allocation as Wycombe district are still considering whether to include it within the plan.
- The style of the development should be similar to the existing homes south of the development and not like Seymour Plain.

#### Infrastructure

- Infrastructure issues and the extra provision of infrastructure should be addressed before development.
- Although mentioned infrastructure facilities will be installed by developers, there are no guarantees for this.
- The infrastructure plan should be updated to address the existing and future infrastructure requirements for the town.
- The footpath running through the field opposite to Sunnybank must be kept as pedestrian access on the B482.
- Tiered parking should be provided behind Sainsbury's and Liston Road to accommodate additional development in Marlow.
- Will a bus route be required for this development? If so, how would the roads be restructured to cope with bus traffic, as well as delivery and utilities vehicle traffic?

#### Highways

- General support for the Marlow letter, but its contradictory to object to this proposal and support the site as a possible route for a northern relief road which would be impossible to achieve, shouldn't be built through a beautiful area and would encourage the housing the Marlow Society opposes.
- The re-routing of the A40 through High Wycombe town centre acts as a warning to those seeking a traffic congestion solution through Marlow town centre.
- Traffic problems in Marlow are acknowledged, but this isn't addressed; there needs to be proposals for traffic relief, Liston Car Parks should have cycle racks to encourage cycling, and as part of the Globe Park initiative there should be a park and ride and even a train station as part of the Marlow – Bourne End track.
- The road at the north of Oak Tree Road would need to be widened, which could be combined with development of the existing byway from Seymour Plain to Seymour court road.
- Queries over what compensation will be given for drops in house prices and for the acquisition of private land.
- Queries over whether Oak Tree road is a public or private road.
- It might be possible to improve the road of Seymour Plain to add a roundabout on the Lane End road but this would remove some of the Chiltern Way footpath.



## Accessibility

- Issues with access to Lane End road due to poor line of vision and fast moving traffic
- Congestion and maintenance costs on Marlow bridge will increase.
- Oak Tree Road and surrounding roads wouldn't be able to support access to the site.
- Access will be through already busy streets.
- As current roads don't give satisfactory access more land may be taken up for access.
- The NPPF requires a transport assessment to be made regarding safe and suitable access to the site.

## Green Belt

- Green Belt development is inappropriate unless it can be outweighed by other material considerations. Unless these can be proved, Green Belt shouldn't be developed.
- Planning practice guidelines emphasis the need to protect Green Belt when constructing Local Plans.
- The site is adjacent to the Marlow built up area, which is boarded by uniform built development forming a strong boundary.
- No consideration to whether Seymour Plain should be inset from the Green Belt or is likely to be proposed in the future which according to the NPPF should be considered, as much the justification for removing this site is Seymour Plain being in the Green Belt, once the possibility of the being removed is considered the purpose 2 of Oak Tree Road is considered in a different light.
- No information about the use of Green Belt land apart from replacing lost land with newly specified land.
- Brownfield sites should be examined and exhausted before greenfield sites are considered. There are numerous other sites available in the immediate area which would create negligible resistance.
- The existing development at Seymour Plain and the woods and valley sides are a significant constraint to preventing urban sprawl.
- The development would reduce access to the Green Belt.
- Unrestricted urban sprawl already exists at the top of Marlow, and shouldn't be added to.
- The appeal to residents and visitors is the amount of open space, encouraging wildlife and allowing access to the countryside, so removing this land from the Green Belt will affect residents and wildlife.

## Green Belt - Assessment

- According to the Green Belt assessment, the scale of the gap the site provides is key to the prevention of settlements coalescing, it was given a high score of five.
- Greater explanation is needed for the site's 1/5 score against purpose 2 of the Green Belt from the stage 2 Green Belt review, given the wider parcels scores 5/5 and oak tree road land is inferred as the reason for this score.  
Support for ARUPs recommendation that all Green Belt land around Marlow strongly fulfils Green Belt requirements.

## AONB

- The merging of communities is contrary to the idea of the AONB.
- The site forms part of the Chiltern Skyline and make a positive contribution to the AONB.

## Process

- It would be helpful for residents to understand the arguments if the different stakeholder positions could be explained.

## Evidence base

- As the proposal is with an AONB, it would benefit from an LVIA to inform the evidence base.

## Housing allocations

- The site can accommodate a greater quantity of dwellings.
- This development won't meet the housing needs of Marlow Bottom or contribute providing additional facilities the development requires.
- Queries over why the allocation of 160 homes for Marlow in the original plan has increased.
- The solution to the development should be based on the grounds of maintaining the attractiveness of Marlow and not commercial developers.
- Concern over the amount of houses.
- This site is the only suitable option for 300 homes.
- Lack of clarity about what the draft is proposing from 'Table 2 Current position on housing and land supply'.
- There needs to be a general mix of starter homes, flats, shared accommodation and affordable family homes which is what Marlow needs to benefit the people.
- Queries over whether there are over 1000 people in Marlow needing houses.

## Conservation

- An ecological survey should be carried out to assess the quality of the grassland habitats to identify impact on wildlife.
- On-site compensation is likely to be needed to compensate for wildlife impacts through conserving best grassland areas and implementing a management plan to maintain or enhance the species richness of the land.
- The proposal should be assessed using a biodiversity accounting metric to assess if a net gain in biodiversity could be achieved.
- The woodland north of Seymour Plain should never be developed and there need to be binding assurance of this, to prevent Marlow and Marlow Bottom merging completely.
- Areas with better road capacity should be considered for development.

### Sense of place

- The boundary between the site and Marlow is made up of garden fences backing the site; this boundary could be strengthened with tree or hedge planting.
- The fields help provide the 'sense of place' and the proposed development would erode the 'quality of place' with increased traffic and congestion.

### Affordable housing

- The development should be as affordable as possible, while of attractive appearance and quality of building.
- Queries of the percentage of affordable homes to meet the local community's needs.
- One of the housing availability issues is the imbalance in the size of the properties, once smaller homes have been extended, therefore reducing the amount of homes suitable for those entering the property market, and the development must offer 2 & 3 bedroom homes, preferably with limited scope for expansion, in order to provide growth within the community.

### Community facilities

- Better cycling provision should be included within this development.
- Oak Tree Road is a quiet country lane which is unusual.
- The plan acknowledges Green space is valued and mentions development of facilities that promote healthy living including for sports, open space and recreation, however this proposal removes open space.

### Flooding / Drainage

- The site is located in Flood zones 1 and sustainable drainage methods will be utilised.
- The development would require the provision of adequate drainage.

### Alternative proposals

- 'Earth' houses should be built instead.
- Smaller houses within walking distance of the town should be built, to encourage older people living alone in larger houses to move, so there would be more larger homes available for families.

## Site Policy: MR8 – Globe Park, Marlow

Respondents:	E Sharp (DNLP 0084) G Greenhous (DNLP 0991) C Hurst (DNLP 0358) D Potton (DNLP 1222) The Marlow Society (DNLP 1705) K Vijn (DNLP 0354) N Ketley (DNLP 0210) Little Marlow Parish Council (DNLP 1318) Flackwell Heath Residents Association (DNLP 2830) S Moon (DNLP 1685) S May (DNLP 2097) D Putnam (DNLP 1187) R Crane (DNLP 1598) K Warne (DNLP 0765) J Hart (DNLP 2477) V West (DNLP 2957) J Burnham (DNLP 2638) Little Marlow Country Park Community Partnership (DNLP 2933) Bell Cornwell LLP (Folbro Y Limited) (DNLP 2652) S Carter (DNLP 2864) H Saunders (DNLP 2779) P Sharp (DNLP 0181) P Honey (DNLP 1422) G Carter (DNLP 2159) R Dennis (DNLP 2174) K Morgan (DNLP 0707) C May (DNLP 1374) L King (DNLP 0419) P Northcroft (DNLP 1650) J Slack (DNLP 2147)						
Number of Representations:	30	Objection:	5	Support:	7	Comment:	18

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

- Support for trade from Globe Park due to support for the local economy.
- Support for regenerating Globe Park and improvements to it to realise the full potential of Globe Park, however its location is a key part of why it needs regenerating
- Support for proposed parking and access and road network improvements, which will improve access to Globe Park and ease traffic congestion and improve traffic flow, and reduce on road parking.
- Support for residential development not being allowed, but as B1 is permitted, the removal of permitted development rights may be needed.
- Support for this policy which brings people to the area, who will use its facilities and shops and add to the vibrancy and character.

- Support for the land adjacent to Marlow station being designated for employment and this land would be ideal for an imaginative scheme to encourage the growth of small businesses.

### **Objecting:**

- Access and parking issues are identified, but proposals for a new car park on WDC land in conjunction with a hotel aren't mentioned although contentious and relevant.
- Details of improved access to improve congestion aren't mentioned, nor are any timetables available, so improvements unlikely to occur in the short term.
- Expansion of commercial development will increase strain on congested roads, and congestion negatively impacts the economy of areas, which is demonstrated in MR8.
- Increased utilisation of the site will worsen the town's parking issues.
- Globe Park should not be extended into the area designated for the Little Marlow Lakes Country Park.
- This site should be used for housing with a carpark rather than offices – many of its offices are empty, it already has infrastructure and access and transport links are good, and is a brownfield site. Development would be unobtrusive.
- The Plan implies that Globe Park will be improved without describing in real terms how this will be achieved given the current economic climate.

### **Commenting:**

- Additional parking at Globe Park should be considered.
- Robust width restrictions should be put on Fieldhouse Lane, as there issues with large vehicles driving down it and speeding.
- Doubt over whether parking and access improvements will reverse the deterioration of MR8.
- Lack of joined up vision for the immediate station area is disappointing – there is no provision for taxi parking, the exit road leads directly onto a road, there is inadequate parking provision for commuters.
- This gateway to the town could be made into a welcoming transport hub, with a clearly signed route into the town, additional parking, and advertising for what the town has to offer.
- Traffic congestion at the exit from Globe Park and the A404 Bisham Roundabout is heavy and this restricts business growth which needs addressing. There is similar congestion towards Wycombe at Handy Cross, as traffic builds up on the A404 into Wycombe, restricting movement on the roundabout.
- The feasibility of temporary traffic signals operating during rush hour to facilitate exit from the business park needs investigating.
- Support for regenerating Globe Park, but there are reservations about its expansion, particularly as the Business improvement district is reported as being unlikely to resolve offsite access issues.
- Unused parking from surrounding properties could, by agreement of the owners be freed up for general parking as a short term measure.
- The high standard design of the existing modern buildings at the Thames Valley Industrial Estate should be used as a benchmark for the regeneration of Globe Park.

- The policy identifies lack of parking as an issue, and by identifying Newtown Pit, Fieldhouse Lane as a dedicated business carpark will reduce parking on roads whilst maintaining the same level of employment space
- There is a need to ensure each company has the right amount of parking and that unused sites have parking redistributed.
- With the addition of Crossrail, the Marlow link should be improved and this travel option is ignored.
- Globe Park should be developed on the east side towards the A404.
- Emphasis on business development should remain on Globe Park.

## Site Policy: BE1 – Slate Meadow, Bourne End and Wooburn

Respondents:	<p> SL85TP (DNLP 0002)  L Browne (DNLP 0006)  K Poole (DNLP 0007)  C Percy (DNLP 0014)  C Stockdale (DNLP 0023)  C Havelock (DNLP 0035)  Z Allen (DNLP 0048)  T Botha (DNLP 0055)  E Bawden (DNLP 0067)  B Hallett (DNLP 0081)  J Whillis (DNLP 0086)  SL6 7QN (DNLP 0090)  B Wiseman (DNLP 0116)  S Slater 2 (DNLP 0129)  S Slater (DNLP 0130)  P Cooley (DNLP 0148)  R Tiller (DNLP 0149)  J Marshall (DNLP 0151)  E Cleugh (DNLP 0153)  M Praeger (DNLP 0180)  L Williamson (DNLP 0187)  W Howell (DNLP 0199)  S Springall and A Hogben (DNLP 0240)  R Carter (DNLP 0266)  M Ware (DNLP 0310)  N Lancum (DNLP 0352)  H Warren (DNLP 0410)  R Huxley (DNLP 0467)  H McIntosh (DNLP 0478)  P Godfrey (DNLP 0555)  R Gregory (DNLP 0572)  R Joseph (DNLP 0678)  A Baxter (DNLP 0761)  D Holland (DNLP 0852)  C Gittings (DNLP 0859)  A, R, S, Z, and H Redway (DNLP 0891)  P Treanor (DNLP 0895)  J Russell (DNLP 0897)  J Anderson (DNLP 0901)  P Butler (DNLP 0956)  A &amp; C Lewis (DNLP 0981)  F Kelly (DNLP 0986)  Hawks Hill Widmoor Residents Group (DNLP 0987)  E Paine (DNLP 0997)  A Greenwood (DNLP 1018)  S Alexander (DNLP 1029)  M Symons (DNLP 1054)  S &amp; R Green (DNLP 1082)  S Maxwell (DNLP 1106)  N Pink (DNLP 1119)  G Britt (DNLP 1142)  G Tomkins (DNLP 1167) </p>
--------------	---

K Williams (DNLP 1168)  
S Rowbottom (DNLP 1172)  
J Horgan (DNLP 1216)  
C Gregory (DNLP 1259)  
P Grubnic (DNLP 1296)  
M Fraser (DNLP 1301)  
T Hinks (DNLP 1310)  
R Venison (DNLP 1315)  
N Jones (DNLP 1331)  
A Grun (DNLP 1346)  
A Shepherd (DNLP 1432)  
C Pettit (DNLP 1478)  
S Dukes (DNLP 1485)  
H Bolton (DNLP 1527)  
A & I Pendergast (DNLP 1537)  
J & J Harrison (DNLP 1539)  
W Round (DNLP 1566)  
J Norris (DNLP 1569)  
K Corne (DNLP 1585)  
D George (DNLP 1586)  
M & E Amos (DNLP 1592)  
O'Connell (DNLP 1601)  
L Daley (DNLP 1602)  
K Quantrill (DNLP 1605)  
P Lambden (DNLP 1606)  
C Mantripp (DNLP 1610)  
R Gould (DNLP 1611)  
A Race (DNLP 1614)  
C Leech (DNLP 1617)  
R Parker (DNLP 1619)  
A Spruce (DNLP 1621)  
P Lim (DNLP 1627)  
J Gould (DNLP 1633)  
G Gallagher (DNLP 1636)  
G Anderson (DNLP 1648)  
S Anderson (DNLP 1649)  
H Jackson (DNLP 1654)  
B Jackson (DNLP 1655)  
M Walklin (DNLP 1659)  
D Axworthy (DNLP1668)  
S Hurst (DNLP 1675)  
A Evans (DNLP 1684)  
T Lane (DNLP 1697)  
T Marchment (DNLP 1698)  
E Lane (DNLP 1712)  
J Stacey (DNLP 1713)  
E Bowman (DNLP 1717)  
B Smith (DNLP 1727)  
S Annis (DNLP 1731)  
J Munro (DNLP 1732)  
S Croall (DNLP 1737)  
R & S Lawrence (DNLP 1744)  
D Bain (DNLP 1755)  
P Lambert (DNLP 1777)  
A Roberts (DNLP 1786)



Historic England (DNLP 1798)  
 J Awuah (DNLP 1827)  
 S Michel (DNLP 1844)  
 P Wagstaffe (DNLP 1846)  
 T Hoare (DNLP 1878)  
 T Son (DNLP 1903)  
 M Marshall (DNLP 1911)  
 S Lewin (DNLP 1918)  
 Hedsor Parish (DNLP 1925)  
 L Beaton (DNLP 1926)  
 Don't Destroy Bourne End (DNLP 1929)  
 A Holland (DNLP 1949)  
 A Donnelly (DNLP 2009)  
 M Livings (DNLP 2021)  
 A Delaloye (DNLP 2094)  
 H & M Bellairs (DNLP 2143)  
 N, A and E Smart (DNLP 2153)  
 L Marsh (DNLP 2182)  
 C Bartier (DNLP 2188)  
 L Elkins (DNLP 2190)  
 H Smart (DNLP 2191)  
 A Cattaruzza (DNLP 2204)  
 A & E Levings (DNLP 2205)  
 M Stockdale (DNLP 2213)  
 M Burkitt (DNLP 2214)  
 A Kelly (DNLP 2219)  
 S Foster-Lyons (DNLP 2224)  
 H Fisher (DNLP 2228)  
 C Pettigrew (DNLP 2237)  
 R Griffith (DNLP 2251)  
 M Shore (DNLP 2263)  
 E Arnold (DNLP 2267)  
 D, K & I Kingsbury (DNLP 2272)  
 S Craig (DNLP 2276)  
 J Newman (DNLP 2277)  
 I Howe (DNLP 2281)  
 R Park-Weir (DNLP 2284)  
 C Daplyn (DNLP 2289)  
 S Di Maria (DNLP 2295)  
 Z Richards (DNLP 2299)  
 S Green (DNLP 2303)  
 A & B Traynor (DNLP 2331)  
 A Herrington (DNLP 2349)  
 S Herrington (DNLP 2365)  
 N Cahuac (DNLP 2379)  
 P Japp (DNLP 2380)  
 N Jones (DNLP 2394)  
 C & K Ringrose (DNLP 2414)  
 S Brown (DNLP 2418)  
 Z Royle (DNLP 2438)  
 Wooburn & Bourne End Parish Council (DNLP 2442)  
 M Hudson (DNLP 2447)  
 P Aston (DNLP 2449)  
 J Waterman (DNLP 2450)  
 D Gibson (DNLP 2455)

S Gibson (DNLP 2456)  
S Leech (DNLP 2471)  
R Sheehan (DNLP 2496)  
R Sheldon (DNLP 2503)  
J Smith (DNLP 2511)  
D Hughes Mrs (DNLP 2531)  
D Hughes (DNLP 2532)  
E M Butler (DNLP 2550)  
R McVie (DNLP 2583)  
R Thomas (DNLP 2593)  
M Delaloye (DNLP 2605)  
Wycombe Wildlife Group (DNLP 2608)  
S Budd (DNLP 2611)  
M Griffith (DNLP 2619)  
J Raam (DNLP 2641)  
J Tricker (DNLP 2644)  
C Budd (DNLP 2665)  
G Taylor (DNLP 2671)  
Mr & Mrs Levett (DNLP 2676)  
Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682)  
M Havelock (DNLP 2683)  
C Makepeace (DNLP 2690)  
K & L Hnat (DNLP 2694)  
Chiltern & South Bucks District Council (DNLP 2698)  
J & R Nattress (DNLP 2699)  
Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714)  
S McCabe (DNLP 2719)  
L Brown (DNLP 2742)  
Mr & Mrs Bingham (DNLP 2747)  
V Pilon (DNLP 2760)  
J Axworthy (DNLP 2767)  
H Pye (DNLP 2782)  
S Chard (DNLP 2787)  
M Mulcahy (DNLP 2788)  
G Warren-price (DNLP 2789)  
A Garmonsway (DNLP 2802)  
J Davis (DNLP 2803)  
C Lane (DNLP 2824)  
Environment Agency (DNLP 2857)  
S Carter (DNLP 2864)  
P Jones, M Langenbrinck & Q Jones (DNLP 2865)  
J Drayton (DNLP 2870)  
C Carter (DNLP 2898)  
J Stockdale (DNLP 2913)  
C Forrest (DNLP 2914)  
G & H Ayscough (DNLP 2915)  
R Walklin (DNLP 2916)  
Revive the Wye Partnership (DNLP 2925)  
S Yost (DNLP 2929)  
I Yost (DNLP 2931)  
K Davies (DNLP 2934)  
W Whyer (DNLP 2954)  
G Sheppard (DNLP 2960)  
S & T Lawrence (DNLP 2974)  
N Collins (DNLP 2975)

	A Amos (DNLP 2978) M Sloane (DNLP 2979) J Anderson (DNLP 2989) J & S Cleere (DNLP 2994) R Gregory (DNLP 3011) J Knight (DNLP 3036) Copas Farms (DNLP 3053) K Bilsborough (DNLP 3080) West Waddy ADP (Bourne End Residents Association) (DNLP 3093) D Moore (DNLP 0249) D Barnes (DNLP 1832) E & J Freeman (DNLP 1977) M & I Gleeson (DNLP 2101) K Jamson (DNLP 2243) J Hunt (DNLP 2105) L Shepard (DNLP 2139) J Barnes (DNLP 2139) P Singleton (DNLP 2215) S Singleton (DNLP 2234) R Wise (DNLP2234) C Gun (DNLP 2248) S Schofield (DNLP 2249) A Duncan (DNLP 2253) M Nicholls (DNLP (2319) G Stacey (DNLP 2315) J Davies (DNLP 2434) S Hammerlindl (DNLP 2461) L Brewer (DNLP 2474) F Poulson (DNLP 2481) P Steinberg (DNLP 2486) S Wilson (DNLP 2487) M Tyrell (DNLP 2490) A Trotter (DNLP 2492) D Davis (DNLP 2497) J Tricker (DNLP 2644) J Southworth (DNLP 2651) D Dicker (DNLP 3029) M Colwill (DNLP 0248)						
Number of Representations:	256	Objection:	204	Support:	4	Comment:	48

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting

##### Green Belt/AONB

- Slate Meadow has much greater potential than RUR11, enabling the latter to remain within the Green Belt.

##### Biodiversity/ecology

- Support for enhancement of ecological value of former Bourne End to High Wycombe Railway Line corridor and the River Wye.

### Infrastructure

- The idea of a cycling path connecting Bourne End, Wooburn Green and High Wycombe is supported.
- Suggestion to link Bourne End and Wycombe by rail should be acted upon, and as soon as possible, before the track is swallowed in development.

### Other

- Slate Meadow is a suitable site for development as it is surrounded by development on 3 sides out of 4.
- Support for the development of Slate Meadow.

### Objecting

#### Green Belt/AONB

- Ongoing confusion about status of Slate Meadow as to whether it is Green Belt or not.
- Sites proposed outside the Green Belt are capable of meeting WDC's housing needs without using the proposed sites in Bourne End.
- Strong views in regard to whether:
  - The utilisation of brownfield sites include existing commercial areas.
  - WDC has conducted a thorough review of alternative sites to ones proposed.
  - WDC will be compliant with Central Government requirements on maximizing the use of 'brownfield' land before Green Belt land is used for housing.
- Against coalescence of Wooburn Green, Cores End, Hedsor, and Bourne End.
- Slate Meadow should be returned to the Green Belt.

#### Biodiversity/ecology

- Site comprises of Grade 2 high quality farmland which should be retained for food production purposes.
- Provides a natural habitat to a diverse set of wildlife including:
  - roe deer
  - muntjack deer
  - hedgehogs
  - breeding red kites
  - pheasants
  - endangered kestrels
  - herons
  - The 'Little Egret', which is currently listed on the RSPB BoCC4 Green List.
  - bats (nesting & feeding area for them)
  - grazing for horses
- New developments will add to existing noise, air and light pollution, all of which are compounded by Bourne End being in low lying land surrounded by Chiltern Hills.
- Long-established flora serves the community and needs protecting.
- The valley at Wooburn is a 'dirty air' trap and temperature inversion also occurs, causing polluted air to sink into the valley. Until the Council has plans for improving air quality it cannot allow proposed developments with associated vehicles.
- Query whether a full species audit been taken.

- Any building work, and related pollution, would disturb the flora and fauna which supports the food supply of the bats. The costs of attempting to relocate these species cannot be justified.

#### Infrastructure

- Infrastructure cannot handle increased population from new developments, including: schools, blue light services, public transport, standing healthcare facilities, gas, electricity, water, sewage and parking— existing facilities already insufficient for current needs.
- Need to urgently improve the current infrastructure to bring it up to the current capacity.
- Draft Infrastructure Report provides for no infrastructure improvements to Bourne End and Wooburn Green other than enhancing an existing bridleway.
- Poor condition of the local roads unable to support increased traffic in form of H.G.V. traffic.

#### Flooding

- The 2014 Jacobs Strategic Flood Risk Assessment notes increased incidents of surface water flooding and sewer flooding in Bourne End.
- Maps provided by the council fail to outline the floodplain.
- This inaccurate and misleading information may have negligently affected both the public consultation and the responses the Council may have received.
- County and Parish have not factored in the extra costs and services that will be required to deal with disaster-level flooding.
- High natural water table cannot be 'managed', will lead to additional flooding.
- There is no assessment included as to whether the mitigation measures would be sufficient to overcome the adverse impacts and so result in the provision of sustainable development.
- No application of the sequential test in relation to flooding.
- Substantial areas of Slate Meadow are in Flood Zone 2 and a small part in Flood Zone 3, which is an important part of the access route to the site.
- A substantial part of the site is at risk of high probability of surface water flooding, particularly the areas in the south west part of the site close to Brookbank and Cores End Road.
- There has not been an assessment of alternatives to the Bourne End sites which must be carried out to comply with the Regulations, and there is a particular need for the flooding sequential test to be applied to this site and, if necessary, the Exception Test which entails carrying out site specific Flood Risk Assessments.
- Question over whether properties will be insured against flooding for no additional premium.
- Conflicts with Government policy to protect floodplain.

#### Housing

- Concern over impact of proposed number of dwellings.
- The ability of Aylesbury Vale to absorb more of the WDC housing needs because of their new "garden town" strategy means Slate Meadow is not needed for housing.

- These developments will do nothing to improve the availability of the type of housing that is predominantly needed in this area.
- These developments make affordable housing highly unlikely to be built given average house prices in the area.
- Creating new towns in the District instead would allow for real affordable housing.
- Glory Mill appeal suggests a lack of consistent WDC policy.

#### Transport

- Any housing on the Slate Meadow site would increase use of the roads; such increases would give rise to traffic congestion, pollution increase, and parking problems.
- Concern over impact on road use from both BE1 and BE2 combined, both traffic after developed but also traffic during construction, especially in safety terms.
- It is inconsistent to claim that the transport impact would be positive.
- Impact on Cookham Bridge would be severe.
- Site development should not be permitted unless a sustainable vehicular access option to the A4094 is provided by the proposed developers.

#### Sustainability Appraisal

- No information is given as to the sources for this assessment, which means that it is not possible to check the reliability of the source.
- There is also no information provided as to why other impacts, such as on landscape and traffic, are not considered to be significant.
- It does not mention that the part of the site at least risk of flooding is the village green on the northern part of the site, which cannot be developed.
- The percentage area of the site that would be developed that is at risk of flooding is much higher than the 43% indicated on the Sustainability Appraisal.
- There have been no specific studies or other assessments since the initial SA.
- It follows that it is unsound for WDC to make significant change in the draft SA without up-to-date information or specific robust evidence upon which to inform decision-making.
- It is wrong to give Slate Meadow anything less than a 'very negative' score for landscape and countryside. The Sustainability Appraisal Framework outlines the appropriate criteria which includes considering the impact on existing landscape character.
- The Slate Meadow appraisal shows a single negative score for flooding despite half the site being included in identified Flood Zone 2 and 3.
- There have been no specific transport studies in Bourne End to determine the impact of the proposed development or impact of Crossrail. It is unclear how transport has been appraised as positive for this site.

#### Other

- Slate Meadow was given to the Parish on condition it would not be built on.

## Commenting

### Conservation

- The Historic Environment Record and the Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment should be consulted for non-designated assets, and the Councils Conservation and Archaeological advisors should be consulted for their comments.

### Infrastructure

- Ensure that a proper access route is built to any new developments, as Frank Lunnon Close is narrow and is frequently blocked by normal traffic.
- Buses cannot get down the road presently.
- The Close cannot be widened.
- Cannot put double yellow lines down it because there is nowhere else for people to park, either in Frank Lunnon Close or on the main Cores End Road.
- Stratford Drive is also currently totally unsuitable to be an access road to a major development.
- WDC need to make developers fund proper access roads off Town Lane.
- Local GP surgeries already at capacity, if all three BE proposals went ahead then this should be a requirement to be included in the development plans and at the cost of the developers involved.
- Water supply required for the proposed scale of development is a significant additional demand.
- Developer will be required to work with Supplier on an impact study of the existing water infrastructure to determine the magnitude of spare capacity.

### Housing

- If developed sympathetically this could be a nice site.
- Consideration should also be given to providing retirement homes, enabling elderly people in the District to 'downsize', thus freeing up family accommodation.
- Questioning whether these homes will be affordable to local people.

### Transport

- Transport links could be vastly improved by reinstating a rail link between Bourne End and High Wycombe, taking traffic off the roads.
- Currently proposal does not expressly link up with Crossrail and other infrastructure plans.

### Green Belt/AONB

- No decisions should be made about this site until the AONB application on Bourne End is resolved.

### Biodiversity/ecology

- The site lies adjacent to the River Wye which is a rare chalk river. If any development at all is appropriate in this option, then it must have a semi-natural buffer of at least 10m.

- Development should only be permitted anywhere in this option if it is proven that measures can be taken to ensure no negative impacts of any kind on the biodiversity value of the River Wye.
- At least one of the fields proposed for development is semi-improved grassland, a full site ecological survey should be carried out to determine the quality of the grassland habitats.
- If any of the site is found to be developable it is likely that significant levels of on-site compensation would be needed to compensate for impacts on wildlife.
- The site includes woodland habitat, development must not be permitted on this area and it should be well buffered by semi-natural habitat.

#### Other

- Slate Meadow stands at the bottom of a rare 'Banjo' enclosure, a 1st Millennium BC settlement, a full archaeological survey should be done prior to building work.
- Records show no historic designated assets on or adjacent to this site, other than the Grade II listed Heart In Hand in the row of properties to the south-east.
- Given the size of the proposal, the development disruption will be immense and there is little confidence in professional delivery.
- The plan mentions Slate Meadow as a reserve site, but this is not factored in to the sites to be used for housing
- To increase housing in this area would provide much needed regeneration and employment, along with the additional infrastructure and public services, such as additional school expansion, recreation grounds, and suchlike.



## Site Policy: BE2 – Hollands Farm, Bourne End and Wooburn

Respondents:	<p> SL85TP (DNLP 0002)  Copas Farms (DNLP 3053)  Land and Partners Ltd (DNLP 2452)  Planning Works Ltd (L Noe) (DNLP 1234)  K Corne (DNLP 1585)  McGough Planning Consultants Ltd (Lunnon family) (DNLP 2900)  S Bingham (DNLP 2747)  H Fisher (DNLP 2228)  D &amp; J Kench (DNLP 0134)  R Williams (DNLP 0054)  M Griffith (DNLP 2619)  Anonymous (DNLP 2290)  A Roberts (DNLP 1786)  C Daplyn (DNLP 2289)  T &amp; S Jellyman (DNLP 2529)  C Pettigrew DNLP 2237)  A Holland (DNLP 1949)  E Paine (DNLP 0997)  M Forsyth (DNLP 1936)  C Lane (DNLP 2824)  A Stevenson (DNLP 1781)  D Hughes (DNLP 2532)  A &amp; I Pendergast (DNLP 1537)  A Darley (DNLP 1354)  D Hughes (DNLP 2531)  B Thompson (DNLP 0037)  S Slater (DNLP 0129)  S Di Maria (DNLP 2295)  M Fraser (DNLP 1301)  M Delaloye (DNLP 2605)  D &amp; J Kench (DNLP 0134)  J East (DNLP 1931)  Upper Hedsor Road Residents Association (DNLP 1178)  M Oliver (DNLP 1818)  H Shephard (DNLP 1894)  I Wernham (DNLP 1839)  R Park-Weir (DNLP 2284)  R Gregory (DNLP 0572)  S Craige (DNLP 2276)  D Langford (DNLP 0900)  D, K &amp; I Kingsbury (DNLP2272)  J Newman (DNLP 2277)  R McVie (DNLP 2583)  Z Richards (DNLP 2299)  A Kelly (DNLP 2219)  J C Parkinson (DNLP 2566)  P Wagstaffe (DNLP 1846)  P Cooley (DNLP 0148)  C Thomas (DNLP 0082)  T Hoare (DNLP 1878)  P Bigg (DNLP 1912)  G Paine (DNLP 1795) </p>
--------------	--

S Phelps (DNLP 1303)  
L Beaton (DNLP 1926)  
S Witcomb (DNLP 0536)  
S Lewin (DNLP 1918)  
M Burkitt (DNLP 2214)  
C Michaels (DNLP0073)  
K Booth (DNLP 1200)  
J, C & K Cooper (DNLP 1914)  
P Ireland (DNLP 2599)  
K Bent (DNLP 0080)  
V Gern-Gross (DNLP 1837)  
R Griffith (DNLP 2251)  
M Marshall (DNLP 1911)  
S Bulter (DNLP 2556)  
A & K Wood (DNLP 2586)  
C Lovell (DNLP 1909)  
S Annis (DNLP 0585)  
J Hardwick (DNLP 0316)  
P Howland (DNLP 2464)  
P Moxon (DNLP 2095)  
A Dalaloye (DNLP 2094)  
S Brown (DNLP 2418)  
H & F Smart (DNLP 2191)  
M Moxon (DNLP 2086)  
B Jackson (DNLP 1655)  
A Budd (DNLP 2082)  
K Goodacre (DNLP 2193)  
P Maddox (DNLP 0276)  
S Atkins (DNLP 0277)  
P Collyer (DNLP 2339)  
E Martin (DNLP 2427)  
M & L Gleeson (DNLP 2101)  
J Turvey (DNLP 3041)  
J Gatfield (DNLP 2111)  
L Callow (DNLP 0321)  
G Crichton (DNLP 2338)  
J Summerlin (DNLP 2039)  
J Davies (DNLP 2434)  
R Gregory (DNLP 3011)  
M Morgan (DNLP 2457)  
S Budd (DNLP 2611)  
J Mornement (DNLP 2031)  
S Hammerlindl (DNLP 2461)  
L Browne (DNLP 0006)  
J Summerlin (DNLP 2026)  
F Broadbent (DNLP 2069)  
K Findlay (DNLP 2386)  
D Kolodziej (DNLP 2364)  
S Herrington (DNLP 2365)  
M Praeger (DNLP 0180)  
R Vockins (DNLP 2368)  
A MacLeod (DNLP 0194)  
L March (DNLP 2182)  
L Eynon (DNLP 2356)  
W Howell (DNLP 0199)

C Bartier (DNLP 2188)  
T Lane (DNLP 1697)  
A & D Selman (DNLP 1784)  
L Elkins (DNLP 2190)  
J Dalton (DNLP 0708)  
E Cleugh (DNLP 0153)  
J & J Russell (DNLP 0897)  
N Shephard (DNLP 2353)  
K Williams (DNLP 1168)  
W Slone (DNLP 2189)  
S Springall & A Hogben (DNLP 0240)  
N Jones (DNLP 2394)  
M Colwill (DNLP 0248)  
Y Pullan (DNLP 2348)  
P Slater (DNLP 2119)  
H Hulme (DNLP 0691)  
J Nicholls (DNLP 2112)  
N, A & E Smart (DNLP 2153)  
A Ghouse (DNLP 0402)  
C Mantripp (DNLP 1610)  
P Petersen (DNLP 2319)  
N Saldanha (DNLP 0024)  
R Sheldon (DNLP 2503)  
M Moore (DNLP 0026)  
M Nicholls (DNLP 2310)  
Z Royle (DNLP 2438)  
A Merton (DNLP 2006)  
K Reid (DNLP 0360)  
P Wills (DNLP 2507)  
R & M Graham (DNLP 0032)  
S Morton (DNLP 1993)  
M Sparkes (DNLP 2501)  
D Elmer (DNLP 2307)  
D Byass (DNLP 2306)  
J Smith (DNLP 2511)  
J Ostinelli (DNLP 0034)  
D Weidenbaum (DNLP 2515)  
A Moore (DNLP 2301)  
R Forsyth (DNLP 1970)  
N Donkin (DNLP 2668)  
T Quantrill (DNLP 1953)  
C Lane (DNLP 2824)  
J Piney (DNLP 2000)  
V Wakefield (DNLP 0377)  
J Fenner (DNLP 2468)  
P Walsh (DNLP 2332)  
S Leech (DNLP 2471)  
M Livings (DNLP 2021)  
L Brewer (DNLP 2474)  
A & B Traynor (DNLP 2331)  
S Wood (DNLP 2475)  
J Rowe (DNLP 2476)  
K Bilsbrorough (DNLP 3080)  
M Jobson (DNLP 2478)  
K Poole (DNLP 0007)

A Wills (DNLP 2502)  
A Todd (DNLP 2484)  
M Horne (DNLP 2522)  
G Buckley (DNLP 2485)  
C Vockins (DNLP 2326)  
A Donnelly (DNLP 2009)  
S DeMuynck (DNLP 2489)  
J Tyrrell (DNLP 2491)  
A Trotter (DNLP 2492)  
D Crichton (DNLP 2493)  
P Platt (DNLP 2494)  
C White (DNLP 2495)  
E Pemble & D Maher (DNLP 2322)  
R Sheehan (DNLP 2496)  
S Wilson (DNLP 2483)  
J Sharman (DNLP 0973)  
D Bryan (DNLP 1475)  
J Ward (DNLP 0962)  
R Robinson (DNLP 0963)  
J & J Harrison (DNLP 2539)  
C Forrest (DNLP 2914)  
B Gilbert (DNLP 1536)  
G & H Ayscough (DNLP 2915)  
R Walkin (DNLP 2916)  
J Ward (DNLP 0962)  
A Butler (DNLP 2923)  
H Bolton (DNLP 1527)  
S Yost (DNLP 2929)  
I Yost (DNLP 2931)  
K Davies (DNLP 2934)  
Anonymous (DNLP 1515)  
C Joh (DNLP 1496)  
R Moore (DNLP 1492)  
A Hogben (DNLP 1491)  
F Kelly (DNLP 0986)  
M Woods (DNLP 2862)  
C Leech (DNLP 1617)  
R Gould (DNLP 1611)  
L Meakes (DNLP 1609)  
A Garmonsway (DNLP 2802)  
B Whyer (DNLP 2813)  
K Quantrill (DNLP 1605)  
L Daley (DNLP 1602)  
A O'Connell (DNLP 1601)  
B & L Greene (DNLP 0889)  
Future of our Village (DNLP 2398)  
R Phelps (DNLP 0894)  
D George (DNLP 1586)  
J Ward (DNLP 0962)  
J Rowe (DNLP 2860)  
S Carter (DNLP 2864)  
P Jones, M Langenbrinck and Q Jones (DNLP 2865)  
J Norris (DNLP 1569)  
J Drayton (DNLP 2870)  
M Ware (DNLP 0310)

A Wilkinson (DNLP 1567)  
P Treanor (DNLP 0895)  
J Honour (DNLP 0898)  
C Matthews (DNLP 2883)  
P Butler (DNLP 0956)  
P Sharman (DNLP 0958)  
C Day (DNLP 1579)  
J Kelly (DNLP 1333)  
A Cattaruzza (DNLP 2204)  
G Wells (DNLP 1364)  
R Waxman (DNLP 1357)  
Hawks Hill & Widmoor Residents Action Group (DNLP 0987)  
D Dicker (DNLP 3029)  
D Platt (DNLP 3030)  
K Turvey (DNLP 3045)  
E Greener (DNLP 1344)  
J Mackay (DNLP 1337)  
J Rowe (DNLP 1261)  
A Nye (DNLP 2993)  
W Byren (DNLP 1334)  
Hedsor Parish Meeting (DNLP 1925)  
J Rowe (DNLP 1261)  
N Jones (DNLP 1331)  
P Tripp (DNLP 1263)  
Thomas (DNLP 1271)  
H Martin (DNLP 1317)  
P Grubnic (DNLP 1296)  
T Hinks (DNLP 1310)  
S Kelly (DNLP 1307)  
West Waddy ADP (Bourne End Residents Association) (DNLP 3093)  
S Abbott (DNLP 3058)  
M Symons (DNLP 1054)  
E Slater (DNLP 1470)  
Wooburn & Bourne End Parish Council (DNLP 2442)  
L Elkins-Jarrett (DNLP 1039)  
M Hudson (DNLP 2447)  
S Gilbert (DNLP 2448)  
P Aston (DNLP 2449)  
J Waterman (DNLP 2450)  
S & T Lawrence (DNLP 2974)  
N Collins (DNLP 2975)  
A Amos (DNLP 2978)  
S Gibson (DNLP 2456)  
J Cable (DNLP 2984)  
R Donnelly (DNLP 1368)  
A Lee (DNLP 2991)  
Z Stekla (DNLP 2891)  
Y Robinson (DNLP 1057)  
S & R Green (DNLP 1082)  
G Kenward (DNLP 1089)  
C & J MacDonald (DNLP 1097)  
N Pink (DNLP 1119)  
M Fowkes (DNLP 1121)  
A Rowe (DNLP 1407)  
M Tripp (DNLP 1398)

G Tomkins (DNLP 1167)  
Little Marlow Parish Council (DNLP 1318)  
S Rowbottom (DNLP 1172)  
J Anderson (DNLP 2989)  
M & A Shepherd (DNLP 1432)  
A & D Theobald (DNLP 1711)  
M Greenfield (DNLP 0830)  
M Moss (DNLP 2700)  
L Brown (DNLP 2742)  
F Moss (DNLP 2726)  
S Lambert (DNLP 2743)  
A Baxter (DNLP 0761)  
S Granger (DNLP 2744)  
J & R Nattress (DNLP 2699)  
A Horne (DNLP 2763)  
P Jones (DNLP 2697)  
M Shephard (DNLP 1743)  
S Fisher (DNLP 0848)  
R Thomas (DNLP 2593)  
C Budd (DNLP 2665)  
L Cleere (DNLP 2750)  
R Joseph (DNLP 0678)  
S Holey (DNLP 0798)  
J Giggs (DNLP 1041)  
M Walkin (DNLP 1659)  
L Hammas (DNLP 2745)  
J Tricker (DNLP 2644)  
D Smith (DNLP 1690)  
M Havelock (DNLP 2683)  
S Croall (DNLP 1737)  
T Wright (DNLP 0795)  
P & V Allred (DNLP 0688)  
S Holey (DNLP 0798)  
J Southworth (DNLP 2651)  
T Burkitt (DNLP 2653)  
P Hulme (DNLP 0693)  
D Axworthy (DNLP 1668)  
T Marchment (DNLP 1698)  
R Parker (DNLP 1619)  
D Bain (DNLP 1755)  
R & S Lawrence (DNLP 1744)  
C Carter (DNLP 2898)  
T Greenfield (DNLP 0828)  
N Greenfield (DNLP 0829)  
C Gruner (DNLP 2702)  
A O'Keefe (DNLP 2754)  
S Derry (DNLP 0780)  
E Paine (DNLP 0997)  
G Anderson (DNLP 1648)  
C Makepeace (DNLP 2690)  
A Makepeace (DNLP 2695)  
J Anderson (DNLP 1647)  
B Maxwell (DNLP 1106)  
Anonymous (DNLP 1639)  
B Smith (DNLP 1727)

H Pye (DNLP 2782)  
S Anderson (DNLP 1649)  
S Foster-Lyons (DNLP 2224)  
S Annis (DNLP 1731)  
B Penfold (DNLP 2587)  
A Greenwood (DNLP 1018)  
S Chard (DNLP 2787)  
M Mulcahy (DNLP 2788)  
G Warren-Price (DNLP 2789)  
E Bawdencoull (DNLP 0067)  
E Bowman (DNLP 1717)  
Mr & Mrs Levett (DNLP 2676)  
B Hughes (DNLP 1634)  
L Birrell (DNLP 2768)  
G Evans (DNLP 1764)  
K & L Hnat (DNLP 2694)  
P Lambert (DNLP 1777)  
J Axworthy (DNLP 2767)  
S Dukes (DNLP 1485)  
D Taylor (DNLP 1772)  
C Gittings (DNLP 0859)  
M Blazey (DNLP 2401)  
H Owen (DNLP 0762)  
S Jones (DNLP 2692)  
J Stacey (DNLP 1713)  
D Gibson (DNLP 2455)  
P & F Allen (DNLP 2943)  
J Harris (DNLP 2506)  
J Suter (DNLP 1816)  
S Michel (DNLP 1844)  
J Munro (DNLP 1732)  
Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682)  
Environment Agency (DNLP 2857)  
S Percival (DNLP 2688)  
L Ryan (DNLP 2995)  
H Jackson (DNLP 1654)  
R Campbell (DNLP 0015)  
B Jones (DNLP 1481)  
J & S Cleere (DNLP 2994)  
P Godfrey (DNLP 0555)  
G Sheppard (DNLP 2960)  
K Tomkins (DNLP 0535)  
South Bucks District Council (DNLP 2698)  
Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735)  
T Wild (DNLP 2231)  
C Havelock (DNLP 0035)  
B Cross (DNLP 0251)  
H Burgess (DNLP 1535)  
R Carter (DNLP 0266)  
P Moxon (DNLP 2095)  
C & K Ringrose (DNLP 2414)  
A Mc Dougle (DNLP 2472)  
I & N Skeggs (DNLP 0463)  
E Levings (DNLP 2205)  
R Robinson (DNLP 0963)

<p>J Crookes (DNLP 2622)  Historic England (DNLP 1798)  M Keyte (DNLP 2220)  Z Tolley (DNLP 2936)  V Morgan (DNLP 2458)  Rapleys LLP (Comland PLC) (DNLP 2849)  Berks, Bucks &amp; Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714)  D &amp; E Holcombe (DNLP 0216)  D Sheehan (DNLP 2499)  I Howe (DNLP 2281)  J Rowland (DNLP 1632)  J Davis (DNLP 2803)  D Moore (DNLP 0249)  A Evans (DNLP 1684)  J Raam (DNLP 2641)  K Singleton (DNLP 2236)  J Howden (DNLP 2479)  S Bentley (DNLP 0618)  S Singleton (DNLP 2234)  J Brearley (DNLP3052)  A Spruce (DNLP 1621)  M Smith (DNLP 2965)  V Dommatt (DNLP 2275)  Bourne End Residents Association (DNLP 2441)  E Arnold (DNLP 2267)  D Barnes (DNLP 1832)  J Anderson (DNLP 0901)  E &amp; J Freeman (DNLP 1977)  J Hunt (DNLP 2105)  L Shepard (DNLP 2138)  J Barnes (DNLP 2139)  M Stockdale (DNLP 2213)  P Singleton (DNLP 2215)  H Fisher (DNLP 2228)  R Wise (DNLP 2246)  C Gun (DNLP 2248)  S Schofield (DNLP 2249)  A Duncan (DNLP 2253)  G Stacey (DNLP 2315)  G Fenner (DNLP 2469)  F Poulson (DNLP 2481)  P Steinberg (DNLP 2486)  S Wilson (DNLP 2487)  M Tyrell (DNLP 2490)  D Davis (DNLP 2497)  J Tricker (DNLP 2644)  A Race (DNLP 1614)</p>							
Number of Representations:	429	Objection:	364	Support:	6	Comment:	59



## Summary of issues/comments:

### Supporting:

#### Highways

- Site development may provide the opportunity for a link road between Cores End Road and Ferry Lane, delivering an alternative route allowing traffic to avoid Bourne End.

#### Suitability

- Site is already surrounded on all sides by existing development.
- Site is of poor agricultural quality (grade 4) and is no longer suitable for farming, therefore site is suitable to be removed from the Green Belt and developed to meet housing needs.

#### Infrastructure

- Support for the linking of Bourne End and High Wycombe by rail.

#### Ecology

- The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) of the site indicates that there are no significant ecological constraints to the proposed development, providing species specific assessments are undertaken to inform appropriate mitigation where required.

#### Design

- Support focusing development on the lower, flatter areas and keeping the slopes and treed areas free from development.

### Objecting:

#### Green Belt

- Object to building on Green Belt land, loss of green space in Bourne End.
- The Green Belt at Hollands Farm fulfils a key role in checking unrestricted urban sprawl and preventing Bourne End and Hedsor merging into one another.
- Acts as a green relief zone between the Wessex Road industrial park and the denser urban housing in Bourne End.
- Hollands Farm is an important habitat which supports many species of flora and fauna, and therefore must be protected from development.
- Preference for building on available brownfield sites before building on Hollands farm or other Green Belt areas.
- Land at Hollands Farm is prime Grade 2 agricultural land.
- The ARUP assessment of Hollands Farm appears misjudged.

#### Highways

- Infilling, such as at Hollands Farm, will lead to increased congestion on Bourne End's road network.

- Poor pedestrian access to Claytons Primary School, leading to a prevalence of children being driven to school.
- Bourne End is used as a 'rat run' between the M4 and M40. Traffic levels are thus very high, and more development in the area would exacerbate the issue further.
- Adding a new road at Cores End won't solve the problem of congestion either through Bourne End or across the single track bridge to Cookham. The Cookham Bridge is Grade II listed and therefore would be unsuited to any attempt to widen it.

#### Infrastructure

- The new volume of housing in Bourne end will have a serious impact on already strained services, particularly school availability, elderly care and local GP surgeries.
- Any expansion of Bourne End must address infrastructure improvements.
- Parking in Bourne End is extremely limited, whilst on street parking adds to congestion through the village, matters which will be made worse by increased development in Bourne End.
- Trains from Bourne End already at capacity. The positioning of the railway station and track at Bourne End limits the number of carriages that can come into the station. The introduction of Crossrail will lead to an additional influx of people and their cars, with no obvious extra parking provisions being provided.
- Building at Hollands Farm will destroy an area with high recreational value. The land at Hollands Farm has long been used by local residents who use its footpaths and rights of way for walking, jogging and general exercise.

#### Flooding

- Building on Hollands Farm will remove a large area of natural drainage in a flood-prone area.
- The drainage system is inadequate, with heavy rain often overflowing the drainage system and running down the road. No guarantee in the Local Plan the drainage system will be updated despite already being unable to cope.
- Flood relief works upriver in Marlow have the potential to exacerbate the flooding situation in Bourne End even without the proposed developments.
- The site access onto Hollands Farm is within the Flood Zone.
- The difficulty of obtaining home insurance due to the proximity of the flood plain.

#### Sense of Place

- Development at Hollands Farm would totally change the feel and character of the village. Developments across Bourne End have the potential to increase the village's population by 30%.

#### Affordable Housing

- Housing in Bourne End is expensive and the homes built on Hollands Farm will not be affordable for most medium income families.

## Conservation

- Many historic listed properties in the vicinity of Hollands Farm which would be adversely affected by its development such as the Grade II United Reform Church which fronts onto Cores End roundabout.

## Green Infrastructure

- Current plan has poor Green Infrastructure design as it maintains green space backing onto industrial areas but fails to protect the conservation area of Hedsor Road.

## Other

- Adverse effect on local property values.
- Objection to the Settlement Hierarchy, including Bourne End as a tier 2 settlement by including Wooburn, when these are separate settlements.
- Removal of policy C16 will mean Hollands Farm's hedges, paths and bridleways will no longer be protected.

## **Commenting:**

### Sustainability Appraisal

- Settlements should not be ruled out as unsustainable for development based only on current service/facility provision.

### Highways

- If satisfactory access can be provided then the proposal seems viable.
- The access at the northern end by the roundabout may be constrained by existing buildings.
- Access road should be via Wessex Road, leaving historic farm house and barns intact.
- Additional technical work on highways has been carried out, focused on the sustainability of achieving site access from the Cores End Road roundabout. A new four-arm roundabout can be successfully accommodated and provided within maintainable highway land.

### Housing allocations

- Many local brownfield sites which could be converted to residential use rather than building on Green Belt land. Many express a desire to see which brownfield sites were rejected by the council before greenfield sites such as Hollands Farm were approved.
- More housing is required, but the infrastructure to support the additional population also needs to be planned for.
- More detail requested over the numbers and type of housing to be built at Hollands Farm.

## Green Infrastructure

- Whilst screening has been provided to those existing properties on Hawks Hill and Harvest Hill, no such screening is shown for the existing six properties down the farm track off Hawks Hill which are immediately adjacent to the proposed development. This needs adding to protect the privacy and rural character of these properties.
- Significant levels of on-site compensation will be needed to compensate for impacts on wildlife. Compensation should be carried out by conserving the best areas of habitat and implementing a management plan in perpetuity to maintain and enhance the species-richness of this habitat.
- Wide shelter belt at southern end of Hollands Farm should be established to provide AONB protection and a distinct border.

## Flooding

- Flood risk mitigation measures should be included as required for the future development, this may include safe guarding areas of the land for future flood defences if considered appropriate.

## Conservation

- Hollands Farm is within the Bourne End/Wooburn area, which is an important historic environment with 47 listing entries on the National Heritage List for England. The conservation and enhancement of this historic environment and the heritage assets therein should be a key issue for the area, and therefore any development should be sympathetic to this.

## Site Policy: BE3 – Land off Northern Heights, Bourne End and Wooburn

Respondents:	<p> SL85TP (DNLP 0002)  L Browne (DNLP 0006)  S &amp; M Cole (DNLP 0061)  J Whillis (DNLP 0086)  R &amp; J Ferris (DNLP 01470)  P Cooley (DNLP 0148)  E Cleugh (DNLP 0153)  M Colwill (DNLP 0248)  A Walker (DNLP 0333)  B Wadman (DNLP 0369)  D Ferris (DNLP 0406)  R Joseph (DNLP 0678)  A Baxter (DNLP 0761)  J Flynn (DNLP 0764)  M Knowles &amp; L Kennedy (DNLP 0809)  K Storey (DNLP 0821)  A Laraocque (DNLP 0836)  C Gittings (DNLP 0859)  D Tracey (DNLP 0888)  B &amp; L Greene (DNLP 0889)  A, R, S, Z, and H Redway (DNLP 0891)  G Tester (DNLP 0892)  P Treanor (DNLP 0895)  P Butler (DNLP 0956)  I, J &amp; J Roxburgh (DNLP 0957)  J &amp; B Cole (DNLP 0974)  Quadrant Town Planning (Northern Heights residents) (DNLP 0983)  E Paine (DNLP 0997)  A Greenwood (DNLP 1018)  S &amp; R Green (DNLP 1082)  J Budd (DNLP 1141)  G Tomkins (DNLP 1167)  K Williams (DNLP 1168)  L Fairclough (DNLP 1219)  J Gibbons (DNLP 1243)  R Shaw &amp; J Lewis (DNLP 1257)  M Fraser (DNLP 1301)  S Smart (DNLP 1302)  S Phelps (DNLP 1303)  Little Marlow Parish Council (DNLP 1318)  N Jones (DNLP 1331)  J Mackay (DNLP 1337)  E Greener (DNLP 1344)  C Cooley (DNLP 1365)  M Markowski (DNLP 1400)  D Ferguson (DNLP 1429)  A Shepherd (DNLP 1432)  Ufton Court Management Limited (DNLP 1447)  F Wadman (DNLP 1467)  B Jones (DNLP 1481)  C John (DNLP 1496) </p>
--------------	--

C Lawson (DNLP 1523)  
J & J Harrison (DNLP 1539)  
K & W Nash (DNLP 1571)  
D George (DNLP 1586)  
J & D Cook (DNLP 1600)  
A O'Connell (DNLP 1601)  
L Daley (DNLP 1602)  
K Quantrill (DNLP 1605)  
A Race (DNLP 1614)  
R Parker (DNLP 1619)  
A Spruce (DNLP 1621)  
H Jackson (DNLP 1654)  
B Jackson (DNLP 1655)  
J Gander (DNLP 1665)  
C Pocock (DNLP 1673)  
A Evans (DNLP 1684)  
T Marchment (DNLP 1698)  
S Seber (DNLP 1701)  
A & D Theobald (DNLP 1711)  
J Stacey (DNLP 1713)  
D Ferguson (DNLP 1719)  
B Smith (DNLP 1727)  
S Annis (DNLP 1731)  
R & S Lawrence (DNLP 1744)  
D Bain (DNLP 1755)  
P Lambert (DNLP 1777)  
A Roberts (DNLP 1786)  
G Paine (DNLP 1795)  
Historic England (DNLP 1798)  
S Michel (DNLP 1844)  
P Wagstaffe (DNLP 1846)  
G Gregory (DNLP 1860)  
O Seber (DNLP 1899)  
M Marshall (DNLP 1911)  
M Daley (DNLP 1932)  
R Forsyth (DNLP 1970)  
F & J Farrow (DNLP 1986)  
G Vickers (DNLP 2001)  
A Donnelly (DNLP 2009)  
K Plank (DNLP 2137)  
J Barnes (DNLP 2139)  
C & E Allsop (DNLP 2171)  
L Marsh (DNLP 2182)  
M Burkitt (DNLP 2214)  
A Kelly (DNLP 2219)  
S Foster-Lyons (DNLP 2224)  
C Pettigrew (DNLP 2237)  
R Griffith (DNLP 2251)  
E Arnold (DNLP 2267)  
D, K & I Kingsbury (DNLP 2272)  
S Craig (DNLP 2276)  
J Newman (DNLP 2277)  
I Howe (DNLP 2281)  
R Park-Weir (DNLP 2284)  
S Di Maria (DNLP 2295)

Z Richards (DNLP 2299)  
A Moore (DNLP 2301)  
J Seber (DNLP 2375)  
Future of Our Village Forum Bourne End (DNLP 2398)  
M Blazey (DNLP 2401)  
SL8 5BU (DNLP 2440)  
Bourne End Residents Association (DNLP 2441)  
P Aston (DNLP 2449)  
J Waterman (DNLP 2450)  
L Brewer (DNLP 2474)  
A Todd (DNLP 2484)  
G Buckley (DNLP 2485)  
P Steinberg (DNLP 2486)  
S DeMuyneck (DNLP 2489)  
J Smith (DNLP 2511)  
S & S Jellyman (DNLP 2529)  
J & J Brant (DNLP 2555)  
A & S Barclay (DNLP 2573)  
A Wood (DNLP 2586)  
S Hawkes (DNLP 2594)  
D Sharman (DNLP 2595)  
M Delaloye (DNLP 2605)  
S Budd (DNLP 2611)  
M Griffith (DNLP 2619)  
J Crookes (DNLP 2622)  
J Raam (DNLP 2641)  
J Tricker (DNLP 2644)  
C Budd (DNLP 2665)  
Mr & Mrs Levett (DNLP 2676)  
M Havelock (DNLP 2683)  
C Makepeace (DNLP 2690)  
K & L Hnat (DNLP 2694)  
J & R Nattress (DNLP 2699)  
The Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735)  
L Hammans (DNLP 2745)  
A & S Barclay (DNLP 2749)  
V Pilon (DNLP 2760)  
I Markowska (DNLP 2773)  
H Pye (DNLP 2782)  
G Warren-price (DNLP 2789)  
C Johnson (DNLP 2842)  
S Carter (DNLP 2864)  
F & B Dudman (DNLP 2894)  
C Carter (DNLP 2898)  
C Forrest (DNLP 2914)  
G & H Ayscough (DNLP 2915)  
S Yost (DNLP 2929)  
I Yost (DNLP 2931)  
K Davies (DNLP 2934)  
G Sheppard (DNLP 2960)  
S & T Lawrence (DNLP 2974)  
N Collins (DNLP 2975)  
J Anderson (DNLP 2989)  
A Nye (DNLP 2993)  
J & S Cleere (DNLP 2994)

	P & D Parrish (DNLP 3023) Copas Farms (DNLP 3053) J, P, S & R Granger (DNLP 3056) S Abbott (DNLP 3058) K Bilsborough (DNLP 3080) West Waddy ADP (Bourne End Residents Association) (DNLP 3093) D Moore (DNLP 0249) D Barnes (DNLP 1832) G & T Simmons & E Fox (DNLP 1920) E & J Freeman (DNLP 1977) M & I Gleeson (DNLP 2101) G Fenner (DNLP 2469) J Hunt (DNLP 2105) L Sherpard (DNLP 2138) M Stockdale (DNLP 2213) P Singleton (DNLP 2215) S Singleton (DNLP 2234) R Wise (DNLP 2246) C Gun (DNLP 2248) S Schofield (DNLP 2249) A Duncan (DNLP 2253) M Nicholls (DNLP 2310) G Stacey (DNLP 2315) J Davies (DNLP 2434) S Hammerlindl (DNLP 2461) F Poulson (DNLP 2481) S Wilson (DNLP 2487) M Tyrell (DNLP 2490) A Trotter (DNLP 2492) D Davis (DNLP 2497) J Tricker (DNLP 2644) Wooburn and Bourne End Parish Council (DNLP 2442)						
Number of Representations:	193	Objection:	168	Support:	2	Comment:	23

## Summary of issues/comments:

### Supporting

#### Green Belt/AONB

- Land should be removed because it is very weak in all Green Belt purposes.
- It is capable of delivering housing within the Plan period.
- Development impact from a landscape perspective would be limited to impacts at a local level.
- Development would make a meaningful contribution to District's need for additional housing.

#### Biodiversity/ecology

- Detailed ecological surveys would be undertaken for any site planning applications.
- Site does not have any ecological designations.
- Site is unlikely to support a wealth of biodiversity, therefore enhancement opportunities may exist.



## Infrastructure

- Safe and suitable access can be provided with the required visibility splays.
- Site is located within low risk Flood Zone 1.
- Vehicular access at north end of New Road will be of a suitable width, a footpath can also be provided.
- Any development-related traffic has the potential to use different routes to destinations beyond Bourne End, so any traffic impact will be therefore minimal.
- The site has the potential to improve non-car modes of transport.
- There are no in-principle highways reasons why the site should not be allocated.

## Suitability

- The site is 'deliverable' and can contribute to the five year supply.
- The site is a highly sustainable location and it has been demonstrated that it does not have any constraints that could prevent the delivery of housing.
- Site is well-screened from public viewpoints.

## Objecting

### Green Belt/AONB

- Site meets Green Belt purposes and should not be removed from the Green Belt.
- Site does not have exceptional circumstances for removal from Green Belt.
- BE3 combined with BE1 & 2 constitutes a large area of Green Belt if all sites are removed.
- Non-Green Belt sites are capable of meeting WDC's housing needs without using the proposed sites in Bourne End.
- It is uncertain whether WDC have utilised brownfield sites and existing commercial areas.
- It is uncertain whether WDC have conducted a thorough review of alternative sites to ones proposed.
- Development on the site would ignore established standards and safeguards.
- Developing site would merge Wooburn Green, Flackwell Heath and Bourne End.
- Bourne End is classified by WDC as lacking sufficient Open Space, developing this site is therefore detrimental to wider health policy.
- The area is being considered for AONB status, and a decision on any lifting of the Green Belt should be held back until after the next review.

### Biodiversity/ecology

- Development of site would harm existing wildlife, including:
  - deer (roe and muntjac)
  - hedgehogs
  - foxes
  - badgers
  - bats
  - squirrels
  - owls
  - woodpeckers
  - red kites
  - garden birds
  - wrens
  - partridges
  - pheasants

- grouse
- Flora and fauna will disappear if development goes ahead.
- Some trees on the bridleway have a Tree Preservation Order and screen homes from Ufton Court and Ufton Court Yard.
- Removal of the copse on the southern side would devastate the wildlife and their habitat.

#### Infrastructure

- Current village infrastructure cannot cope with this current demands, let alone expansion workloads from additional populace in new developments.
- Local schools and GP surgeries have already experienced inability to solve staffing issues through housing due to new development homes pricing them out.
- The area is losing services that a bigger Bourne End might need.
- Increasing infrastructure capacity would still be insufficient to meet additional needs; congestion and traffic issues need to be addressed in this part of Bourne End first.
- Infrastructure proposals do not relate to this site.
- Water provider needs to coincide with new housing developments for both improvements and new proposals.
- WDC needs to do much more to demonstrate that facilities are capable of coping with the extra demand in light of their recent performance.
- There needs to be more pedestrian crossings in this area following resident injuries.
- Restriction to developable area: site is dissected by a reservoir feed water main that cannot be built over or built within a corridor of 6-10 metres.
- The developed site would constitute a cul-de-sac that exceeds the maximum permitted length for Emergency vehicles.
- Any expansion of Bourne end must address infrastructure improvements.
- Access to the site would add to existing congestion issues in the surrounding roads.
- Traffic volumes on an already overcrowded New Road will be significantly increased raising safety issues for nearby schools.

#### Flooding

- Development of the site will contribute to Bourne End's surface water problems.
- Site currently provides soak away for excess water during heavy rainfall. New development could cause flooding elsewhere.
- When the drains are full the water runs down to Cores End Road, which already floods in certain places in heavy rain.

#### Housing Mix

- Developing this site will not improve the availability of type of housing that needed locally
- Development will create housing for investment opportunities and those looking to move out of London.
- Development is unlikely to include affordable housing given average local house prices.
- Restrictive covenants apply regarding type of house that can be erected on the site.
- High Wycombe has the infrastructure to support this scale of development, so this new housing should be directed to sites in that area instead.

#### Transport

- There is no current up-to-date transport evidence to support the proposed site.
- Development would inevitably add significant vehicle movements by both residents and service vehicles to the existing roads.
- Public transport is strained and cannot handle additional users.

- Currently takes a long time to turn right at bottom of Blind Lane onto A4155.
- Blind Lane is not suitable as large vehicles have to reverse along Northern Heights.
- New Road is clearly not working now it could not cope with traffic generated by the new development.
- Northern Heights is privately maintained and is not fit to serve this quantum of development.
- Northern Heights would require a footway that the existing carriageway cannot accommodate.
- Access to the development via Brantridge Lane is impractical.
- If the proposed development is to be accessed from New Road and the unmade Brantridge Lane, it will mean the loss of a well-used bridleway.
- Restrictive covenants apply regarding access.
- The site promoters have not demonstrated that they have sufficient land under their control to provide a suitable access in to the site.
- Considerable concern regarding impact to Cookham Bridge from nearby developments.

#### Other

- A development of this size will change the character of the immediate location in surrounding Northern Heights, West Ridge, and Brantridge Lane creating a disproportionate and questionable gain to the area.
- WDC should deliver housing in Bourne End through a Neighbourhood Plan rather than proposed allocations.
- The Local Parish Plan is still being drawn up, and any decision regarding allocations should be deferred until this completes and is adopted.
- Glory Mill appeal suggest a lack of consistent WDC policy regarding housing in Bourne End.
- Development of this site is unfair on the neighbouring property owners.

### Commenting

#### Infrastructure

- Common land near the proposed entrance to the site has been encroached by neighbouring properties, WDC will have to investigate this.
- Before considering removing sites from the Green Belt, WDC should put forward their plans to overcome the local traffic and parking situation
- During the building process any vehicles accessing the site will need to be carefully policed.
- A width and footway extension of New Road could conceivably be used to satisfactorily serve the development.
- Access to the site needs to be from a point as far south as possible on New Road to minimise urbanisation of the bridleway and damage to trees.
- WDC should consider placing traffic lights at the bottom of Blind Lane
- Part of Northern Heights is an unmade, unadopted track which would need to be made to adoptable standards.
- Creating a 5m wide access road will require third party land.
- Policy should be emphasise no access is to be taken from Northern Heights.

#### Biodiversity/ecology

- The proposal seems to encompass the copse which runs the full length of the southern edge of the plot between Northern Heights and Brantridge Lane. This would form a natural barrier between existing residents and the new development.

- The fear is that whilst the plan references outline principles of environmental impact, unless specific plans are laid to identify and preserve the habitats of wildlife such as this then they will slowly disappear as Green Belt is built on.
- An existing buffer strip behind West Ridge should be maintained for wildlife access.
- Existing trees/woodland areas may contain some valuable biodiversity features which should be retained.
- There is no wording in the policy that looks to protect the copse on the southern edge.

#### Conservation

- No designated heritage assets on this site.
- The Historic Environment Record and the Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment should be consulted for non-designated assets, and the Councils Conservation and Archaeological advisors should be consulted for their comments.

#### Other

- Site has been rejected as a development proposition on several occasions and also at a Public Inquiry, it is questioned why it is now proposed for allocation.
- BE3 is the least suitable site in the Bourne End proposals, with development on only two sides.
- Given the size of the proposal, the development disruption will be immense, there is little confidence in professional delivery.

## Site Policy: RUR1 – Land South of Finings Road, Lane End

Respondents:	Land and Partners Ltd (DNLP 2452) Woodland Trust (DNLP 2777) P Rose (DNLP 2696) S Wheatley (DNLP 1875) The Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) K Gaska (DNLP 1255) M Anderson (DNLP 2703) M Wright (DNLP 0512) Lane End Parish Council (DNLP 0005) S Pink (DNLP 1959) T Grout-Smith (DNLP 2084) J Grey (DNLP 1038) Anon (DNLP 2291) E Twitchen (DNLP 2498) H Horth (DNLP 2866) Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390) M Smith (DNLP 1509) T Lipinski (DNLP 0426) A Duncan (DNLP 2253) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714) Mr Harold (DNLP 1000) J & T Savage (DNLP 2384) J Donacite (DNLP 1641)						
Number of Representations:	23	Objection:	14	Support:	2	Comment:	7

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

##### Infrastructure

- Access is easily available off Finings Road to the proposed site.
- Site would have good access to services and facilities.

##### Sense of Place

- The land is well enclosed and screened from wider views in the village.
- The land is outside the Green Belt.

##### Green Infrastructure

- A buffer will be incorporated into the design and the land to the southern end of the field will be landscaped to complement the neighbouring woodland.

##### Conservation

- A generous buffer will be provided to White Gable Cottage to preserve the setting of the listed building.

- The design will respond to the neighbouring Conservation Area and the wider village's particular characterises.

#### General

- This site allocation was considered to be thoughtful.

#### **Objecting:**

#### Housing Allocation

- Lane End has suffered from incremental development over recent years.

#### Drainage

- Properties adjacent are lower than the proposed development and will suffer from significant water run-off issues.

#### Highways

- The site entrance, on a bend in the B482, is poorly positioned as this is a fast dangerous road. Visibility is also reduced at this point.
- The new development would place additional pressure upon local road network which is already close to saturation.
- The newly established Oakwood Place exit is close to the proposed exit for the new development, and combined the two junctions will have a significant impact on local congestion.
- It is believed the access is over common land, Bolter End Common, and as such will require the permission of the Secretary of State.

#### Infrastructure

- Lane End lacks the key infrastructure to support the development Finings Road. There is no capacity for expansion at local schools or at Lane End GP's, which are all oversubscribed.
- Lane End has a large proportion of under 16 year olds, however is lacking in recreational facilities. The issue is exacerbated by the poor public transport links to the sport and leisure facilities at Handy Cross making it difficult for young residents.
- Shortage of parking in Lane End will be exacerbated by increased development.

#### Sense of Place

- The site is agricultural AONB land which is important to retaining a rural village environment.

#### Conservation

- The development will have a negative effect on nearby listed buildings, such as White Gables, as it is on high, sloping ground and will therefore be visible from a great distance.

## Ecology

- The site is an interesting and unspoiled area of heath land used as meadow for grazing cattle and is a habitat for much wildlife, including the protected Natterjack Toads.
- The 15m proposed buffer is inadequate for the Ancient Woodland.

## **Commenting:**

### Green Infrastructure

- Greater flexibility could be allowed in terms of the precise location of open space and housing.
- The buffer between the development and the area of ancient woodland should be a minimum of 50m and made up of semi-natural habitat.
- Any development should only be permitted if measures are introduced to ensure no negative impact on them from changes in hydrology, air quality, light or noise pollution, recreation or any other reason.
- A full site ecological survey should be carried out to determine the botanical quality of the grassland habitat which the site is to be built upon.
- Compensation should be carried out by conserving the best areas of grassland and implementing a management plan in perpetuity to maintain and enhance the species-richness of this grassland.

### Conservation

- The site is adjacent to the Lane End Conservation Area and Grade II listed Star Cottage. The policy should protect the setting of the conservation area and listed buildings as part of the positive and clear strategy for the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment as required by the NPPF.

### Other

- The geological strata of the area consist of unevenly distributed seams of clay and sand which have in places been excavated for brick making and building work and then backfilled. This has led to subsidence issues in the local area as houses were built on these unmapped sites.
- The proposed site at Finings Lane is adjacent to a number of sites which have suffered from subsidence issues or which have had to have extensive soil stabilisation works undertaken in order to make the land safe to build on.

## Site Policy: RUR2 – Land between Chalky Field and Marlow Road, Lane End

Respondents:	Lane End Parish Council (DNLP 0005) A Goodright (DNLP 2355) J Stallwood (DNLP 2396) C Caine (DNLP 2371) B Harold (DNLP 0403) J Bowley (DNLP 0422) N Ahmed (DNLP 1473) C Milner (DNLP 3074) K Jones and K Willis (DNLP 3013) Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390) M Gonzalez Rodriguez (DNLP 1474) C Jones (DNLP 23440) Mr and Mrs La Roche (DNLP 2107) J Sharp (DNLP 2928) C Horth (DNLP 2839) P Rose (DNLP 2696) P Baldwin (DNLP 1070) I Sharp (DNLP 2966) L Smith (DNLP 0100) C Jones (DNLP 1704) P Polwin (DNLP 1049) I Harris (DNLP 1427) Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682) Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) Historic England (DNLP 1798) J Donacite (DNLP 1641)						
Number of Representations:	26	Objection:	21	Support:	2	Comment:	3

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

##### General

- Accept that some areas of Green Belt need to be released.

##### Infrastructure

- Potentially suitable for housing as it is a linear extension of the village

#### Objecting:

##### General

- Development will lower property prices in the area.
- If development is not “affordable” local people will not be able to afford market prices.
- There are better alternative sites, closer to town centres.



- Development will result in an increase in the crime rate.
- Development will threaten the vitality and viability of the village.
- No assessment has been carried out as to whether the proposal amounts to major development within the AONB.
- It is not clear that other “brown field” sites are not available.
- Development is contrary to the Human Rights Act which specifies that people have a right to enjoy a safe, quiet residential environment.

#### Infrastructure

- Inadequate local services exist at present i.e. Doctors, sports and leisure facilities, particularly for under 16 year olds.
- Inadequate public transport at present to provide convenient access to larger towns with more facilities.
- Development is too large for the village of Lane End.
- Development will threaten the existing Public Right of Way

#### Sense of Place

- Significant loss of privacy and views to residents of Chalky Field.
- Significant loss of light to No. 1-4 Chalky Field.
- Increase level of light pollution due to additional street lights, which will disturb residents sleep.
- Development is incompatible with design of existing buildings and there is no guarantee that new buildings will suit the location.
- Loss of a village character and urban encroachment.
- Lane End has suffered from incremental development over recent years.
- Development will result in a loss of a wider view towards the site.

#### Green Infrastructure

- Development will result in a loss of trees and hedgerows.
- The existing green space will be spoilt.
- Development will result in a loss of public access to open fields and woodlands.
- Development will provide insufficient garden and amenity space for residents.
- Development is inappropriate in and will cause harm to the AONB and Green Belt.
- The proposed development neither preserves nor enhances the attractive pasture.
- There is a lack of a defensible boundary.
- Development will result in the loss of high quality agricultural land.
- AONB should be shown to be “washed over” Lane End in the Local Plan.

#### Ecology

- Development will have an adverse effect upon the eco-system and will be detrimental to the plants and the habitats of wildlife, including bats, owls and Red Kites.
- Air quality will suffer as a result of further cars and pollution.
- More pressure will be brought on to local residents to upkeep the existing hedgerows.
- Development will threaten the existing geological features of this site.

## Drainage

- The land often floods, particularly after heavy rain, and is therefore not suitable for development.
- The existing sewers are inadequate and further development will exacerbate this problem.

## Highways

- Parking in Chalky Field is inadequate at present. More dwellings will exacerbate the problem.
- Cars park in the existing turning head. This will be lost as a result of the development, reducing the amount of on street car parking available.
- Chalky Field has no footpath and therefore more cars will result in a danger to pedestrians.
- Chalky Field is a quiet residential road where children play on street. More cars will be a danger to children.
- Additional cars will result in an increase in noise and disturbance to local residents, including disturbance from headlights.
- Existing junction to Chalky Field is dangerous due to cars on the main road failing to slow down from 60mph to 30mph as they enter the village. More cars at this junction will exacerbate the loss of highway safety. The existing access from Marlow Road, used by the farmer should be considered instead.
- Emergency vehicles and refuse trucks will have trouble accessing the site.
- Construction vehicles will be dangerous to residents and will result in a further loss of highway safety by leaving mud and mess on the roads.
- The road is not suitable for additional traffic

## **Commenting:**

### General

- New houses should be affordable as Chalky Field was only permitted as a rural exception site.

### Infrastructure

- The urgent need for houses is recognised but WDC needs to be mindful of the significant amount of development that has already taken place in Lane End.
- Network Flow and Road Survey for any development over 50 dwellings is required.

### Sense of Place

- Views into the site from the south west and south will need to be assessed.
- Boundary of the site will need to be clearly defined to prevent further development.

### Green Infrastructure

- Boundary hedges and the pond should be retained and enhanced.
- Landscape and screening will need to be strengthened.

## Conservation

- No designated heritage assets on this site but the Historic Environment Record and Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment should be consulted for non-designated assets.
- The Council's Conservation and Archaeological Advisers should also be consulted for their comments.

## Site Policy: RUR3 – Land off Ellis Way, Lane End

Respondents:	Lane End Parish Council (DNLP 0005) A Campbell (DNLP 2828) Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390) Mr & Mrs La Roche (DNLP 2107) J North (DNLP 1625) R Hazlem (DNLP 0813) P Green (DNLP 1170) D Wenn (DNLP 1463) Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) D Campbell (DNLP 2793) A Fishlock (DNLP 0831) P Baldwin (DNLP 1070) K Newsome (DNLP 0616) J Donacite (DNLP 1641) L Dawson (DNLP 1651) A & C George (DNLP 0011) M Yate (DNLP 1652) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (DNLP 2714) Historic England (DNLP 1798) J & S Hughes (DNLP 0567) R Dawson (DNLP 2466) B Fisher (DNLP 0375) Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682)						
Number of Representations:	23	Objection:	19	Support:	2	Comment:	2

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

##### General

- It is accepted that some areas of Green Belt need to be released.

##### Infrastructure

- Potentially suitable site for housing as it will involve infilling behind existing houses in Marlow Road and infilling between Framers Court and Chalky Fields.

#### Objecting:

##### General

- There are better alternative sites closer to the town centre.
- Development will result in an increase in the crime rate.
- Provision of affordable houses will lower the existing house prices.
- Development will affect the rural economy and community.

## Infrastructure

- Inadequate local services at present i.e. Doctors and schools.
- Inadequate public transport to service site and village.
- Development will threaten existing Public Right of Way.

## Sense of Place

- Lane End has suffered from incremental development over the years.
- Increased noise and disturbance from an increase in traffic.
- Loss of visual value.
- There is no justification for more houses in Lane End.
- Further development will result in the loss of a village.
- Development will result in a loss of views.
- The development will breach the settlement boundary.
- Development will result in light pollution due to new street lights.
- Development conflicts with the character of the Conservation Area.

## Green Infrastructure

- Development will result in a significant loss of mature TPO trees, woodland, hedges and plants.
- Insufficient garden and amenity space for developments.
- Loss of public access to woodland and open fields.
- Loss of high quality agricultural land and field patterns.
- Development is inappropriate in the Green Belt and AONB.
- Loss of rural character in the AONB.
- Inadequate assessment of sites to examine if allocations would involve major development in the AONB.
- Green Belt and AONB land should not be built on.
- Will impact upon TPO trees and woodland listed on the Priority Habitat Inventory: Traditional Orchard and Deciduous Woodland.
- The land should be restored to a village community orchard instead of being developed.

## Ecology

- Development will destroy wildlife and wildlife habitats.
- Development will result in a significant ecological and arboricultural impact from development. An interim TPO needs to be put in place to protect the trees.
- A full ecological survey needs to be undertaken to determine the quality of the habitats. It is likely that significant levels of compensation will be required to compensate for the detrimental impact on the wildlife.
- The land has been cleared before any ecological report has been undertaken. Therefore there has been insufficient time to consider the proposal fully.
- Land should not be considered for development until it has been assessed using a biodiversity accounting metric.
- The best areas of habitat should be conserved and a management plan put in place.

- Measures need to be taken to ensure no negative impacts on habitats from changes in hydrology, air quality, light or noise pollution, recreation or any other reason.

#### Drainage

- Development will result in the risk of flooding.

#### Highways

- Access off Ellis Way will be dangerous, due to lack of visibility at junction.
- Insufficient space in Ellis Way to accommodate more traffic.
- Existing on-street car parking restricts road width at present. Further cars will exacerbate the problem.
- Increase in construction traffic will be detrimental to highway safety.
- Further development will increase traffic on the roads.

#### **Commenting:**

##### General

- Proposals will require an increase of the treatment capacity of Little Marlow Sewage Treatment Works in the medium term.

##### Conservation

- It is unclear if any historic asset will be affected by this proposal. If any asset is found, it should be protected through policy.

## Site Policy: RUR4 – Land Adjoining Sidney House, Lane End

Respondents:	Lane End Parish Council (DNLP 0005) Historic England (DNLP 1798) Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714) M40 Chilterns Environmental Group (DNLP 1193) Bucks County Council (DNLP 1674)						
Number of Representations:	5	Objection:	0	Support:	2	Comment:	3

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

Delivering Homes

- Little local resistance to this development.

#### Objecting:

- No objections were received for this proposal.

#### Commenting:

Sense of Place

- Site is very close to M40, and therefore significant work would have to be put in place to limit noise, air and light pollution from the motorway.

Conservation

- No designated heritage assets on this site but the Historic Environment Record and Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment should be consulted for non-designated assets.
- Council's Conservation and Archaeological Advisers should also be consulted for their comments.

Green Infrastructure

- The site includes woodland habitat. Development must not be permitted on this habitat, the habitat must be well buffered by semi-natural habitat from any development.
- Measures must be taken to ensure no negative impacts on the habitat from changes in hydrology, air quality, light or noise pollution, recreation or any other reason.
- A full site ecological survey should be carried out to determine the botanical quality of the grassland habitats.

## Site Policy: RUR5 – Land off Simmons Way, Lane End

Respondents:	Lane End Parish Council (DNLP 0005) Paul Dickinson and associates (Ashill Land Ltd) (DNLP 2876) V, T & M Bowden (DNLP 0028) Historic England (DNLP 1798) Mr & Mrs La Roche (DNLP 2107)						
Number of Representations:	5	Objection:	2	Support:	1	Comment:	2

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

- This is the most suitable of the suggested locations and the principle of residential development on this site is supported.
- The site is already the subject of a planning application for residential development and it is likely this will be approved before the Local Plan comes into place.
- Support the Council's conclusion there's no prospect of the site being put to an employment use and as it's a previously development site it should come forward for residential development.
- The proposal is in line with the sustainable development policy objectives given the site's proximity to the village centre, school etc. and would be consistent with the residential character around the site.
- The proposal for 19 dwellings is consistent with the estimated capacity in the Plan.
- The site is fully serviced and immediately available for development and so can contribute to the housing targets at the earliest stages of the Plan period.

#### Objecting:

- The 'rat-run' down Simmons Way then down to Beech Avenue which has become single track due to on road parking has become a dangerous route.
- Double yellow lines along this road would help, and not building more houses in that vicinity.

#### Commenting:

- Absence of a map specifying the precise location of the proposal means it cannot be checked if any heritage assets would be affected. The council should undertake this search and protect any heritage assets through policy.
- The Historic Environment Record should be consulted for non-designated assets and the Council's Conservation and Archaeological Advisors should be consulted for their comments
- If there's no market for employment in this area then why are more houses needed? A number of developments have been built or are in progress, a number of which remain unsold.



## Site Policy: RUR6 – Little Marlow Lakes Country Park

Respondents:	D Egmore (DNLP 0452) Little Marlow Parish Council (DNLP 1318) Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390) Buckinghamshire County Council (DNLP 1674) The Marlow Society (DNLP 1705) Historic England (DNLP 1798) G Carter (DNLP 2159) C Gunn (DNLP 2248) Bell Cornwell LLP (Folbro Y Limited) (DNLP 2652) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust BBOWT (DNLP 2714) Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) The Environment Agency (DNLP 2857) Little Marlow Country Park Community Partnership (DNLP 2933) V West (DNLP 2957) M Overall (DNLP 3044)						
Number of Representations:	15	Objection:	0	Support:	5	Comment:	10

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

- Support for development of Little Marlow Lakes country park as a space of outdoor recreation and enjoyment of the countryside by the public, and generally the inclusion of the policy in the plan.
- The reaffirmation of some of the key elements of the Supplementary Planning Guidance outlined in this policy is welcomed
- Support for the retention of land to the east of the A404 by-pass as part of the Little Marlow Lakes country park
- Support the requirement that development must respect and enhance the setting and amenities of Little Marlow and Abbotsbrook conservation areas, although Figure 31 washes over the Little Marlow conservation area rather than being adjoining
- Support for the local plan recognising the Little Marlow Lakes country park and the key points of this policy need to be followed and align with the strategic objective to 'Cherish the Chilterns'. The spirit of this shouldn't be lost as the site has been under attack from development

#### Objecting:

- Objection to the removal of land from the Green Belt in the areas which has been allocated for outdoor recreation
- Concern that the commercial sites report identifies three sites in the Westhorpe area of the country park as having potential to be allocated for future business development. Land within the country park shouldn't be allocated for business parks development or similar development incompatible with its Green Belt status

- Sites identified in the commercial sites report for the potential for office development will have the effect of sterilising development of the country park in those areas throughout the plan period
- Objection to any development of 'site 1' which has been identified for potential commercial development, and given the robustness of this policy background, 'site 1' option of should be eliminated from future consideration, and similar arguments apply to site 2 and 3

### **Commenting:**

- Support for the Little Marlow Country parks areas having been acknowledged to be safeguarded against development and used for recreation, however, there were objections to the possibility of Globe Park expanding onto the Westhorpe area
- RUR 6 gives insufficient weight to the ecological value and future potential of the country park. In point 2, environmental improvement should include ecological enhancement
- In point 3, the amenities and setting of the lakes, watercourses and wet woodlands should be protected
- A key feature of the park is the open landscape of its north-west and no intrusive development affecting near or long distance views should be permitted in that area, or affecting the conservation area or its setting. This should be reflected in the draft plan.
- A requirement to protect, and if possible enhance, the important biodiversity value of this site needs to be explicitly include in RUR6, subjected to this amendment the policy is supported
- Development of this recreation area should include access via public transport, in order to minimise the impact on congestion
- Reference should be made to the site adjoining the AONB and to biodiversity
- Consideration of the river Thames in this policy is pleasing, however an ecological buffer is needed in this policy to be in line with DM 15
- A point should be made regarding no land raising within the Flood Zone, and if this is proposed this will be required to be compensated for
- The scope of RUR6 seems unambitious, given the desire to 'get Wycombe moving'
- Improved access to this area can be provided in conjunction with a dedicated business car park for Globe Park, which could partly serve the Country Park
- The area west of the Crown Plaza hotel could accommodate development related to leisure and recreation compatible with a country park designation and enhanced facilities for water sports

## Site Policy: RUR7 – Land at Thame Road/Off Bar Lane, Longwick

Respondents:	C & R Staples (DNLP 2772) Mr & Mrs B W Butler (DNLP 0727) O Belgrove (DNLP 2170) V Tappin (DNLP 0152) M Babb (DNLP 0733) Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council (DNLP 1297) P & B Priestley (DNLP 1174) Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682) Historic England (DNLP 1798) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust BBOWT (DNLP 2714) S Styles (DNLP 0649) D & L Smart (DNLP 1292) Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735)						
Number of Representations:	13	Objection:	7	Support:	1	Comment:	5

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

- Support for the site in the withdrawn draft Neighbourhood Plan, therefore the allocation of RUR7 is also supported.

#### Objecting:

##### General

- The increase in dwellings will ruin the village's character.
- The proposed site allocations do not represent the principle of working with local communities.
- Boxer Road site was allowed at appeal, and presumption when the Neighbourhood Plan was prepared was that the dispersed growth presented there should have been an alternative to Boxer Road, not in addition to it. Boxer Road alone should be the village's contribution to Wycombe's needs in the Plan period.
- Approach taken in the plan is flawed, it is not top-down numbers-led nor does it reflect the village's form and character.
- A policy on housing densities that can adapt to reflect local context is needed.
- Density levels or numbers of potential homes are not given.
- A large increase will change the character of Longwick. Concern of coalescence with Princes Risborough.
- Wishes of the people of Longwick as embodied by the Neighbourhood Plan have been ignored. Neighbourhood Plan should be reinstated as originally proposed instead of current proposals.

## Infrastructure

- Longwick has insufficient infrastructure to take the level of expansion which is proposed, which is more than what was proposed by the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Longwick School has limited capacity for additional students and little room to grow to accommodate more.
- Doubling the size of the village could not guarantee the necessary level of funding to operate a good quality long term bus service. Link with increased service provision in respect of the Princes Risborough expansion is unclear.
- No provision is being made for how the wider impact on utilities and drainage capacity throughout the village will be addressed.

## Flooding

- Increased development may cause flooding.
- Surface water flooding concerns are not addressed.

## **Commenting:**

### General

- Brownfield sites should be exhausted before building on green sites
- Can new properties be limited to local people?
- Site could provide an additional recreation area.
- Barn Road / Boxer Road site should be developed first before other developments are implemented.

## Infrastructure

- Infrastructure (sewerage, electricity, roads) will need improving.
- Transport will need to be considered in light of limited local employment opportunities.
- Consider improvements to walking / cycle routes in the village and with Princes Risborough.
- Water supply is close to capacity in the area and the development represents a significant additional demand. Developer will need to work with water provider to carry out an impact study.

## Highways

- Road junction will need to be improved significantly to handle the extra traffic.
- Public transport should be provided.
- Change the highway design (road narrowing) and reduce speed limits through the village.
- Access to the A4129 will need careful planning for the access junction.

## Environment

- Existing fields and trees should be protected, and more trees should be planted.

- Protected species are known to live on the farmland in the Longwick area, such as crested newts and long ear brown bats.
- It is unclear what level of ecological assessment has been carried out with respect to the site. An assessment should be taken to inform the allocation of the site to determine whether the allocation is appropriate in biodiversity terms.
- Two of the three fields in the allocation appear to be ridge and furrow grassland and therefore may be ancient grassland. Site will need a thorough assessment and considerable compensation would be required for even a small development.
- Site is visible from Whiteleaf Cross therefore structural screening planting on the south-east boundary will be important particularly where existing screening cannot be guaranteed to be retained.

#### Flooding

- Site is known for flooding. Intensive drainage will be necessary.
- Improve public transport links with Princes Risborough.

## Site Policy: RUR8 – Land at Rose Farm, Longwick

Respondents:	C & R Staples (DNLP 2772) Frampton Town Planning (DNLP 1501) Keith Smith (DNLP 0999) B Butler (DNLP 0727) B Edwards (DNLP 2832) M Babb (DNLP 0733) P Priestley (DNLP 1174) C Tyler (DNLP 0573) Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council (DNLP 1297) D & L Smart (DNLP 1292) H Westropp (DNLP 0235) J Gummer (DNLP 2873) Environment Agency (DNLP 2857) Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) V & I McPherson (DNLP 2330) I Hazleton (DNLP 2096) Historic England (DNLP 1798) C Beetlestone (DNLP 0089) S Styles (DNLP 0649) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714) N Brooks (DNLP 0529)						
Number of Representations:	21	Objection:	10	Support:	2	Comment:	9

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

##### General:

- Support in principle for Plan at Longwick, although issues need to be addressed before permission can be granted
- Larger site boundary for RUR8 should be allocated for housing

##### Suitability

- Site is relatively contained by existing built development and/or landscaping in a sustainable location within the centre of the village
- Development should be in line with existing buildings including the green 'gap' referenced in the Tibbalds report, and would maintain the linear character of the village
- Related well to the centre of the village and key services

##### Landscape/Conservation

- The sites containment means there are no significant outward views to countryside or inward views from Whiteleaf Cross
- No detrimental impact on designated properties or areas
- Would provide public open space

## Flooding/drainage

- Proposal will provide a sustainable drainage system and safeguard a surface water flooding area, resulting in no increase in residual flood risk. There is low surface water flooding across site and it is not in an area particularly susceptible to groundwater flooding.

## Highways/Infrastructure

- Suitable access can be achieved, impact on local roads will not be severe. Development would provide improves linkages, footpath and cycling between Walnut Tree Lane/Primary School/Public Bridleway

## **Objecting:**

### General:

- Site was not included in the Neighbourhood Plan, and therefore should not be included in the New Local Plan
- Particular objection to the inclusion of the fields to the rear of Mistlethrust and Crabtree Barns, as these fields are newt and bat habitats and contribute to surface water and groundwater drainage.
- Site suffers from flooding in the middle section
- Development will double the size of the village and ruin its character.
- Proposed developments in Plan may merge Longwick with Princes Risborough
- Longwick is not a sustainable place for development – lack of employment opportunities and infrastructure improvements
- Site has been wrongly considered greenfield with no consideration to the brownfield element of the agricultural buildings.
- Sustainability Appraisal for the site is flawed, and needs to be re-assessed

### Scale:

- Would result in too much development if taken forward with other plan proposals.
- Boxer Road/Barn Road development already is over-proportionate to Longwick, the rest of the developments should be refused.
- Further development in Longwick should be paused to allow 160 homes at Barn Road/Boxer Road to integrate.

## Environment/Conservation

- Concern over trees surrounding site that may house rare species of birds
- Extending Rose Farm to the railway line would be more visible from Whiteleaf Cross.
- Field is of good quality farm land and is used for productive animal grazing. It is wrongly categorised as 3a in the supporting evidence, where it is 3b with limited 3a. Concerns that the land is potentially ancient grassland of the ridge and furrow type, which may house rich flora and fauna. Such areas should be excluded from the development area and retained.

## Highways

- Existing issues over exiting Rose Farm onto Thame Road
- Speed at which people travel through the village is a concern
- Road junctions are dangerous and would require major modification to handle the extra traffic from the Barn Road development

## Infrastructure:

- New walk/cycleway is not felt to be a compelling reason to allocate the land for housing and is a poor substitute for making Thame Road more pedestrianised. The walk/cycleway will require land to be taken out of an adjacent field which is in use for arable purposes, and will block the only access the current tenant farmer has to the field, which could seriously affect the viability of the field.
- Walnut Tree Lane and its suitability as a traffic free route to Princes Risborough and beyond has not been effectively tested.
- Longwick School cannot cope with additional residents, catchment area would have to reduce
- CIL will be unlikely to cover the costs of infrastructure needed for new development
- Issues with parking would be exasperated with additional development
- Development would add further strain to sewage capacity, which is already a problem in Longwick
- Other facilities will also need to be improved such as dentists, doctors, and electricity network

## Commenting:

### General:

- Planning application currently being determined by WDC
- Consultation leaflets misleading as Rose Farm was excluded from Policies map without thorough explanation.
- Development for Longwick would be better suited by reinstating the Neighbourhood Plan rather than allocation in the New Local Plan
- Site is previously developed land/brownfield due to previous change of use from SG (Agricultural) to B1/B8 for previous 10 years
- If the whole site is not developed, the existing agricultural barns could be redeveloped in isolation

### Scale:

- Difficult to comment on proposals as no densities/housing numbers proposed
- According to the Longwick Capacity Study, enough growth has been provided by the Barn Road/Boxer Road development. Some smaller development on the other Neighbourhood Plan sites would be accepted, but should be restricted to a smaller scale.
- Development would allow further infill further into the Plan period and subsequent planning applications.



#### Water:

- As there is a watercourse running across the site, any development should remove the culvert and have the open channel reinstated and enhanced with an ecological buffer zone on either side in line with policy DM15

#### Design:

- Existing 35 metre setback from existing houses in the Neighbourhood Plan should be maintained for Rose Farm

#### Environment:

- Development will remove *Leylandii* trees within the existing frontage of the site boundary, which the capacity study states do not relate to the landscape character of the village

#### Public Transport:

- Development should ensure transport improvements are delivered between Longwick, Princes Risborough and Thame.
- Segregated cycle lanes should be provided between towns and train stations.

#### Heritage/Conservation

- No designated heritage assets recorded on the site, but the appropriate resources and expert advice should be consulted as a matter of course.

## Site Policy: RUR9 – Land off Thame Road, South of Chestnut Way Junction, Longwick

Respondents:	Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682) B Butler (DNLP 0727) The Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) Frampton Town Planning (J Walker and Sons (Farm) Ltd) (DNLP 1501) Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council (DNLP 1297) P Priestley (DNLP 1174) J Scott (DNLP 1840) Historic England (DNLP 1798) D and L Smart (DNLP 1292) C & R Staples (DNLP 2772) S Styles (DNLP 0649)						
Number of Representations:	11	Objection:	4	Support:	1	Comment:	6

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

- Support the proposal, with the caveat that the village infrastructure including sewerage, electricity, and roads will need improving.

#### Objecting:

- Development proposed for Longwick is excessive, levels of development put forward in the Neighbourhood Plan as originally submitted (140 dwellings according to the Longwick Capacity Study) should be reinstated.
- Village neighbourhood plan was meant to be an alternative to the scheme recently permitted at appeal at Boxer Road, not in addition to it. The Boxer Road scheme alone should be taken as Longwick's contribution to Wycombe's housing numbers, or at the least, it should be built out before any other schemes come forward.
- Unclear on the proposed housing density per hectare, it should be 12-20 dph as it was in the withdrawn Neighbourhood Plan to reflect local density levels.
- Proposal constitutes encroachment into the countryside and would reduce the gap between Longwick and Princes Risborough.
- Site is visible in long-range views including from Whiteleaf Cross, a key site in the AONB.
- Loss of the original rural character of the village through the scale of the proposed expansion.
- Village infrastructure and services such as roads, transport, sewerage, and school will not be able to cope.
- Village suffers from flooding due to a high water table and further development will exacerbate the issue. The site has poor SuDs potential.

**Commenting:**

- An application for this parcel of land is currently being considered and technical objections have been raised by Bucks County Council.
- It is considered that this site will be isolated from the centre of the village.
- There will be limited opportunities for local employment.
- The site could be developed more to accommodate more residents, as it has a limited effect on the current residents.
- Infrastructure improvement will be needed to accommodate new residents, including public transport links, walking and cycling routes to Princes Risborough, traffic management and safety improvements at main junctions.
- The Historic Environment Record and Buckinghamshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment should be consulted to confirm there are no undesignated heritage assets in the area.
- Development represents a significant extra demand on water supplies, which are approaching capacity.
- Proposed new housing should add quality to the local environment.
- All new builds should be energy efficient.
- Do not assume Thame has infrastructure to support the wider impact of the expansion proposals.

## Site Policy: RUR10 – Land at RAF Walters Ash

Respondents:	B Catchpole (DNLP 2911) D Wright (DNLP 0227) N Rock (DNLP 1756) R Hewitt (DNLP 2533) S Carter (DNLP 2864) P & J Jordan (DNLP 2904) M & P Hunter (DNLP 1416) Bradenham Parish Council (DNLP 2722) C Dolan & A Roberts (DNLP 2806) Mr & Mrs Orr (DNLP 0941) G Robinson (DNLP 1311) H & J Pearson (DNLP 1401) Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390) J & B Burrows (DNLP 0944) A Idle (DNLP 0602) J Sherlock (DNLP 1646) S Fisher (DNLP 1300) K Blagbrough (DNLP 1739) C Teare (DNLP 0094) J Idle (DNLP 1923) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust BBOWT (DNLP 2714) Historic England (DNLP 1798) M Stenning (DNLP 2460) Hughenden Parish Council (DNLP 2628)						
Number of Representations:	24	Objection:	8	Support:	4	Comment:	12

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

##### Green Belt

- Support for Green Belt removal as site is brownfield and already occupied

##### General

- Allocation is acceptable as long as adequate provision for schools, health care and general infrastructure is provided as part of plans

#### Objecting:

##### Green Belt/AONB

- Objection to land being removed from the Green Belt, particularly as no exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated.
- In comparison with Uplands, this site would be major development in the AONB
- Site is within AONB and is unsuitable for large-scale residential development, or could harm AONB through increased traffic into North Dean Valley

- Brexit needs to trigger a re-evaluation of the OAN, potentially reducing the amount of land being taken out the Green Belt
- Brownfield sites should be chosen over Green Belt removal

#### Conservation/Heritage

- Site includes a section of Buckinghamshire's Grim's Ditch scheduled monument, Green Belt status offers protection so removal could be harmful

#### Suitability

- Danger of site falling out of use as RAF base, then redeveloped for residential
- Should be preserved for future military needs
- Other sites available that are not constrained

#### Infrastructure

- Current infrastructure cannot cope

#### **Commenting:**

#### Conservation/heritage

- Habitats Regulation Assessment would need to be undertaken to assess the effects on the adjacent Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation.
- Concerns over adjacent Ancient Woodland and SSSI (Bradenham Woods, Park Wood & The Coppice SSSI) and negative impact development could have
- If development was to go ahead an exceptionally large buffer of semi-natural habitat would be needed (100m or more).

#### Infrastructure/Highways:

- If permitted, access should be allowed onto the wider road from the rest of Naphill
- Extra development will generate extra foul water/sewage, the capacity of which would require upgrading before any development could be permitted.

#### General:

- RAF is under MoD crown property legislation and so can upgrade or downgrade its activities without the need for Green Belt removal
- Correct Government agencies must be consulted for this site.
- Empty houses at RAF base should be converted to market housing.

## Site Policy: RUR11 – Land off Clappins Lane, Naphill

Respondents:	<p> D Wright (DNLP 0227)  Dandara Ltd (DNLP 2618)  Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735)  P Mark (DNLP 1129)  Anonymous (DNLP 0947)  J Varney (DNLP 1415)  P &amp; J Jordan (DNLP 2904)  J Ginger (DNLP 1218)  C Jones (DNLP 0596)  M Dean (DNLP 0938)  N &amp; S Rolfe (DNLP 0939)  A &amp; J Cook (DNLP 0940)  Mr &amp; Mrs Orr (DNLP 0941)  J &amp; C Waters (DNLP 0942)  J &amp; B Burrows (DNLP 0944)  B &amp; K Wright (DNLP 0943)  R Hewitt (DNLP 2533)  H Perry (DNLP 1752)  P Travers (DNLP 1270)  J Storey (DNLP 0680)  N Rock (DNLP 1756)  G Leflaive (DNLP 3039)  G &amp; S Murdoch (DNLP 1283)  H &amp; J Pearson (DNLP 1401)  R Field (DNLP 0989)  R Smith (DNLP 1142)  J Wren (DNLP 1149)  M Wren (DNLP 1150)  C Jones (DNLP 0597)  J Wren (DNLP 152)  S Bendell (DNLP 0284)  A &amp; C Lewis (DNLP 0981)  K, P &amp; P Coleman (DNLP 0982)  M Dell (DNLP 1503)  G Robinson (DNLP 1300)  R Wren (DNLP 1151)  K Prashar (DNLP 1824)  M Ayres (DNLP 1782)  D Tandy (DNLP 1412)  N Henshaw (DNLP 1275)  H Storey (DNLP 0254)  C Jones (DNLP 0599)  V Prashar (DNLP 1864)  E Conran (DNLP 2104)  D Brown (DNLP 0569)  Anonymous (DNLP 1411)  J Bendell (DNLP 0282)  Mr &amp; Mrs Hathaway (DNLP 1101)  R Jones (DNLP 0598)  S Shimmin (DNLP 0111)  A Draper (DNLP 2681)  P Thornton (DNLP 1232) </p>
--------------	--

	M Robinson (DNLP 2423) J Fincher (DNLP 1435) C Teare (DNLP 0094) K Caine (DNLP 2416) N McMinn (DNLP 1004) J Draper (DNLP 2686) C Underwood (DNLP 1728) K Hill (DNLP 0110) D Ratcliffe (DNLP 0109) M & S Rudd (DNLP 0807) N Smith (DNLP 0105) A Smith (DNLP 2738) C Scott (DNLP 0091) A Ceurovorst (DNLP 1666) C, D & A Roberts (DNLP 2806) A Cobb (DNLP 1660) Naphill and Walters Ash Residents Association (DNLP 1573) K Blagbrough (DNLP 1739) M Stenning (DNLP 2460) D & C Peters (DNLP 2514) D Assirati (DNLP 0077) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714) B Catchpole (DNLP 2911) P Thornton (DNLP 1232) J Shard (DNLP 2990) G Whyte (DNLP 0016) Hughenden Parish Council (DNLP 2628) A Idle (DNLP 0602) Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390) Historic England (DNLP 1798) N & S Rolfe (DNLP 0939) T & P Pool (DNLP 0637) R Prashar (DNLP 2274)						
Number of Representations:	85	Objection:	68	Support:	4	Comment:	13

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

##### Infrastructure:

- Plan acceptable provided adequate provision is made for schooling, health care and general infrastructure.
- Site is well situated for sustainable transport, being served by the 300 high frequency bus route.

##### Sense of Place:

- Site suited to residential development, being already developed on three sides and due to being relatively contained.

- Development at Clappins Lane would not have a significant adverse impact on the AONB nor represent a major development in the AONB.

Affordable Housing:

- Naphill and Walters Ash have a shortage of affordable housing and the development of Clappins Lane will help to address the issue.

**Objecting:**

Green Belt and AONB:

- The land of Clappins Lane is in AONB, building on this land will set a dangerous precedent of removing land from AONB for residential development.
- The land is currently used for agriculture and building on it would be unsustainable.
- At 50 units, the proposed development is far bigger than the sort of infill usually allowed in Green Belt areas. It would change the character of the village through the urbanisation of the edge of the village.

Infrastructure:

- Clappins Lane is a small, single track road. Access is limited and development may lead to significant traffic congestion. Its junction with Main Road is narrow and views in each direction are limited.
- There is no pavement down Clappins Lane, meaning pedestrians have to walk in the narrow road itself.
- Clappins Lane particularly difficult to navigate in winter after snow/ice.
- Local GP/schools already oversubscribed.

Ecology:

- A significant amount of local wildlife use the site and it is a vital habitat.
- Site bounded by a number of mature trees and hedges, as is the site access.
- No Habitat Regulations Assessment appears to have been done to assess the effects of the plan's proposals on the Special Area of Conservation, the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC (a European level biodiversity designations) close by to the west of Naphill and Walters Ash.

Affordable Housing:

- Any houses of size or quality here would be priced at such a premium so as to take them out of reach of local people.

Other:

- Development at Clappins Lane will devalue neighbouring properties.



## **Commenting:**

### Housing Allocation:

- Providing 40-50 homes on the site is overly conservative and a higher density could be achieved, helping WDC meet its housing needs.
- The RAF has recently sold 48 houses in Woodcock Avenue to a developer who is currently refurbishing the properties. These should reduce the overall housing need in the local area.

### Infrastructure:

- There are no crossing facilities along the main road past Clappins Lane. A crossing place would reduce the risk to pedestrians, particularly children on their way to/home from school.
- Access to the site would be better from Woodcock rather than Clappins Lane.
- The Sewage system along the ridge line is close to maximum capacity. Any increased development along the ridgeline would also require an extensive overhaul of the waste water management system.

### Green Infrastructure:

- The proposed site is on a steep gradient, meaning that any development would be highly visible to a significant distance. Trees and/or hedges should be planted to screen the development from neighbouring countryside.

### Ecology:

- A full site ecological survey should be carried out. If the site is developed significant levels of on-site compensation would be needed to compensate for impacts on wildlife.

### Conservation:

- The appropriate historic records and experts should be consulted.

## Site Policy: RUR12 – Land south of Mill Road, Stokenchurch

Respondents:	<p> M Chadwick (DNLP 2734)  Stokenchurch Community Action Forum (DNLP 2733)  I Phillips (DNLP 0338)  J &amp; J Harrison (DNLP 1539)  Land and Partners Ltd (DNLP 2452)  D Roberts (DNLP 0345)  Ibstone Parish Council (DNLP 2794)  P Harding (DNLP 0549)  P Rose (DNLP 2696)  Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735)  L Browne (DNLP 1103)  I Shurrock (DNLP 2115)  C Kenworthy (DNLP 0342)  A Williams (DNLP 2045)  H Harding (DNLP 0526)  L Osborne (DNLP 0850)  E Butler (DNLP 0994)  A Saint (DNLP 0993)  D Pace (DNLP 2041)  T Burnham (DNLP 1548)  A &amp; R Whitworth (DNLP 3025)  P Williams (DNLP 3022)  L &amp; D Smith (DNLP 2308)  Y Adesina (DNLP 2050)  S Clarke (DNLP 0059)  J Campbell (DNLP 0062)  A Saint (DNLP 0993)  G Hollis-Dunse (DNLP 0853)  M Shurrock (DNLP 1637)  R Green (DNLP 2505)  E Morgans (DNLP 2504)  P Sears (DNLP 2473)  C Allen (DNLP 0934)  M Taylor (DNLP 0936)  L Crump (DNLP 2463)  A Saunders (DNLP 2437)  J Barber (DNLP 2428)  M Nannery (DNLP 0363)  S Brant (DNLP 2846)  E Glyde-Coleman (DNLP 1937)  R Cox (DNLP 1272)  R Keeble (DNLP 2544)  N Williams (DNLP 0370)  C Batey (DNLP 2636)  N Entwisle (DNLP 0012)  A Mallalieu (DNLP 0008)  Anonymous (DNLP 1780)  Turville Parish Council (DNLP 2797)  Historic England (DNLP 1798)  C Allen (DNLP 0934)  A Everill (DNLP 0145)  Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390) </p>
--------------	---

	D White (DNLP 2996) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DNLP 2714) M40 Chilterns Environmental Group (DNLP 1193) S Galloway (DNLP 0797) D Darby (DNLP 0063) P Reed (DNLP 0378) J Allen (DNLP 0103) P Williams (DNLP 2985) S Green (DNLP 1626) D Hills (DNLP 1642) R Green (DNLP 2451) S Smith & A Metcalfe (DNLP 2635) K Poole (DNLP 0007)						
Number of Representations:	65	Objection:	39	Support:	5	Comment:	21

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

- Park Lane and Mill Road can easily accommodate sustainable growth, and Stokenchurch on the whole should be able to absorb increased development.
- Stokenchurch has sustainable transport links, being situated close to junction 5 on the M40, and a wide range of facilities for the village and surrounding settlements.
- Stokenchurch is a rural service centre with a wide range of facilities which supply the village as well as a range of small settlements around it.
- Significant support for housing earmarked for local need.

#### Objecting:

##### AONB:

- Building at this site would count as a major development in the AONB, and there appears to be little evidence of exceptional circumstances required to disregard this fact.

##### Local character:

- It would be out of character for Stokenchurch as a rural village to have a development in this size.
- The development proposed is too great for the space available.
- The development would have a detrimental effect on the natural beauty and the character of the landscape.

##### Infrastructure:

- The provision of car parking within Stokenchurch is insufficient.
- The development would place additional pressure on already overstretched facilities such as locals and GP's surgeries.

- The wastewater and sewage system in Stokenchurch is already at capacity with frequent backups and blockages.
- There is no mains gas on the south side of the motorway in Stokenchurch.
- The proposed development is likely to impact on water supply and pressure for existing homes. Water is currently pumped from Radnage and there are concerns as to whether the reservoir is big enough to supply the proposed number of additional dwellings.

#### Highways:

- Mill Road / Ibstone Road is very narrow, so additional traffic would cause significant congestion. The junction on Mill Road onto Ibstone Road has poor visibility and is already an accident blackspot. Additional traffic will only increase this. Reducing the speed limit to 30mph could ease help to ease pressure.

#### Other:

- Development here would lead to a significant reduction in property values for local residents.
- The British Geological Survey has assessed the area to the south of Mill Road to have moderate potential for natural ground instability. Development at Mill Road may cause subsidence problems for new and existing properties.
- Noise and air pollution levels at the site will be unacceptably high due to its proximity to the M40. The area adjoining the motorway should be left undeveloped as a buffer.
- A restrictive covenant exists on the parcel of land adjoining Mill House, Green Lane, which restricts building on that land without prior written consent.

#### **Commenting:**

##### Infrastructure:

- Bus services along Ibstone Road need improvement.
- Improvements to infrastructure could be made to help support these changes
- Mill Road is cut off from the rest of the village by the M40. Increased connectivity is required, particularly for pedestrians. The bridge over the motorway is poorly surfaced and badly lit making it dangerous to cross at night.

##### Highways:

- Additional access points onto Mill Road would be required.

##### Conservation:

- The proposed development will be within the boundaries of the Stokenchurch Conservation area. The appropriate studies and expert advice should be consulted.

Ecology:

- Site is an important area for migrating birds in winter. Detailed breeding bird surveys should be undertaken.
- The amount of green space allocated within the development area does not appear to be large enough to compensate for the likely ecological impacts of any development. Significant on-site biodiversity compensation will be needed.

Other:

- Site suitable for development providing it respects and retains the character of the conservation area and retains important mature trees already on the site.
- Increase the proportion of self-build plots in Stokenchurch. There is demand for self-build plots in the village, looking at village infill and conversion of brownfield sites.
- The site lacks a boundary to the east to prevent future pressure for development.

## Site Policy: RUR13 – Land to the rear of Stokenchurch Business Park

Respondents:	K Poole (DNLP 0007) S Clarke (DNLP 0059) H Harding (DNLP 0526) P Harding (DNLP 0549) M40 Chilterns Environmental Group (DNLP 1193) Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390) Buckinghamshire County Council (DNLP 1674) Historic England (DNLP 1798) Turley (NWE Marlow Ltd) (DNLP 2709) Stokenchurch Community Action Forum (DNLP 2733) M Chadwick (DNLP 2734) Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) Ibstone Parish Council (DNLP 2794)						
Number of Representations:	13	Objection:	2	Support:	2	Comment:	9

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Supporting:

- Support for the need for improved public transport provision to the Business Park. This will increase the viability of the service and the provision of a suitable turning point for the bus service is key

#### Objecting:

- The site is too large
- The site will overload the Motorway junction and the A40, causing safety issues
- The development will damage the local landscape and the AONB and will be an irreversible loss to greenfield and agricultural land
- Not every industrial building is being used, so this development is unnecessary
- This proposal, along with proposed housing will double the size of Stokenchurch

#### Commenting:

- An assessment should be undertaken of whether this proposal constitutes major development in an AONB and if so, whether there are exceptional circumstances and if this scheme is in the public interest
- B8 uses should be removed from this policy
- The speed limit along the Ibstone road should be changed to 30mph
- Bus Services along Ibstone Road need improvement
- The connectivity of the area to Stokenchurch village needs improving
- Access along the footbridge is poor, and the footpath along the edge of the site needs protection

- Views into the site must be screened appropriately and the building set back from the boundaries
- Access should not be through the rural green lane and footpath
- The triangle of farmland north of the track should be removed from the allocation
- The design and layout should protect certain existing features
- There are no designated heritage assets on this site, but the relevant historic environment records should be consulted and expert advice sought.
- The site is affected by motorway noise which should be identified in the plan to ensure noise reduction is undertaken as part of the development
- Improvements to infrastructure could be made to support these changes
- This would constitute major development in an AONB, which is inappropriate when alternatives are available
- Development at Stokenchurch would only meet local demand as oppose to the strategic demands of the district
- The site has limited scope to accommodate employment development due to its location in an AONB
- The landscape character of this site is more strongly related to the surrounding countryside
- The site provides visual containment on account of neighbouring development and boundary development vegetation
- The economy study and employment land review doesn't support development of this site unless it is matched by similarly large scale housing development
- The site has good access to strategic and national road networks
- Special attention is needed for sustainable travel to the site, but there is good access to bus stops on Ibstone Road

## Site Policy: RUR14 – Uplands Conference Centre

Respondents:	Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) Historic England (DNLP 1798)						
Number of Representations:	2	Objection:	0	Support:	0	Comment:	2

### Summary of issues/comments:

#### Commenting:

- Recently planning permission has been granted for an excellent scheme for this site (which complied with the principles set out) and this may preclude the need for this Policy.
- Uplands is Grade II listed and should be retained in a sympathetic use. Support for the requirement within the policy requiring the retention and reuse of the Listed Building, but with a suggestion of alternate wording.