

Draft Local Plan Other parts of the plan, including Duty to Cooperate issues and comments on the evidence base, site and policy suggestions, and other issues.

Summary of responses to consultation – June-August 2016

Table of contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Area Principles..... | 2 |
| Princes Risborough..... | 7 |
| Evidence Base documents..... | 14 |
| The process | 36 |
| Duty to Cooperate..... | 38 |
| Additional Policy Suggestions | 43 |
| Site Suggestions..... | 45 |
| Comments on other aspects of the draft Plan | 51 |

Area Principles

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Respondents: | <p> P Mulville (DNLP 0112) H Doust (DNLP 0125) V Tappin (DNLP 0152) R Snell (DNLP 0540) B Watson (DNLP 0554) Chiltern Railways (DNLP 0620) C Lewin (DNLP 0694) Marlow-Maidenhead Passengers Association (DNLP 0724) K Warne (DNLP 0765) R Phelps (DNLP 0894) J Anderson (DNLP 0901) D Smith (DNLP 0948) P Butler (DNLP 0956) G Markham (DNLP 1043) M Jolliffe (DNLP 1063) C Baron (DNLP 1124) Upper Hedsor Road Residents Association (DNLP 1178) P Grubnic (DNLP 1296) R Waxman (DNLP 1357) G Wells (DNLP 1364) A Hogben (DNLP 1491) E Butler (DNLP 1547) C Day (DNLP 1579) Buckinghamshire County Council (DNLP 1674) The Marlow Society (DNLP 1705) D Bain (DNLP 1755) High Wycombe Business Improvement District Company (HWBIDCo Ltd) (DNLP 1765) D Taylor (DNLP 1772) Historic England (DNLP 1798) D Barnes (DNLP 1832) S Wright (DNLP 1957) P Ellis (DNLP 2080) G Stacey (DNLP 2315) G Beams (DNLP 2391) Wooburn & Bourne End Parish Council (DNLP 2442) F Poulsen (DNLP 2481) S Wilson (DNLP 2487) Wycombe Wildlife Group (DNLP 2608) J Burnham (DNLP 2638) Turley (NWE Marlow Ltd) (DNLP 2709) Chiltern and Aylesbury Clinical Commissioning Group (DNLP 2712) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust BBOWT (DNLP 2714) Chiltern Society (DNLP 2735) Turley (Testament Trumps Ltd) (DNLP 2739) Rectory Homes Ltd (DNLP 2775) Turville Parish Council (DNLP 2797) Flackwell Heath Residents Association (DNLP 2830) Environment Agency (DNLP 2857) M Schrader & S Carter (DNLP 2881) Buckinghamshire Business First (DNLP 2882) Sport England (DNLP 2889) McGough Planning Consultants Ltd. (Lunnon Family) (DNLP 2900) </p> |
|--------------|---|

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|------------|----|----------|---|----------|----|
| | Revive the Wye Partnership (DNLP 2925) P & F Allen (DNLP 2943) R Exley (DNLP 3083) K Jamson (DNLP 2243) Penn Parish Council (DNLP 2660) M Goodall (DNLP 2667) Buckinghamshire Local Access Forum (DNLP 3090) | | | | | | |
| Number of Representations: | 60 | Objection: | 23 | Support: | 3 | Comment: | 34 |

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting:

Bourne End and Wooburn Area Principles

- Reopening of the Wycombe-Bourne End railway line is supported even if it took a different form.
- An eastern link road connecting Cores End Road and Ferry Lane is supported.

Rural Area Principles

- Proposals for safer options for walkers, cyclists, and horse riders on rural roads is supported.

General Comments

- One representation stating support for the whole Plan as presented.

Objecting:

Marlow area principles

- Marlow has already delivered its fair share of housing.

Bourne End and Wooburn Area Principles

- The proposed link road between Cores End Road and Ferry Lane would not solve the wider issue of traffic queuing at Cookham bridge. More generally, several responses to the principles and the site allocations cited congestion on the Cookham Bridge as a significant issue.
- Bourne End has already delivered its fair share of housing.
- The proposed developments will result in more flooding in the area, therefore points 1 b) and 1 d) are unattainable.
- Suggestions to improve Bourne End town centre include:
 - Multi-storey parking in the village centre.
 - Making The Parade a pedestrian zone such that cars are kept to the road (parking could be provided roadside if needed).
 - Landscaping, sculpture, fountains.
 - Electronic signs at the village entrance advising available spaces.
 - Rental incentives to ensure full retail premises.

- Better use of internet/IT to provide a village-wide retail proposition, potentially with a drop/collection point away from the high street.
- A footbridge would be great, but if this isn't practical a second pelican crossing near the new McCarthy development would help to slow traffic into the village and encourage people to cross to/from Tesco.
- Making more of the approaches to the village to create a welcoming, prosperous village: proper signage, flower beds etc.

Rural Area Principles

- Principles for rural areas are contradictory and fail to address the second home ownership issue and other issues around it.

General Comments

- A large number of responses to individual site allocations mention that the local area lacks doctors, school places etc and road infrastructure is heavily congested. These comments are captured in full with the responses to each proposed site allocation.
- The Green Belt should be left alone and all efforts should be focussed on brownfield sites until they are completely exhausted. WDC should reject central government pressure to build.
- The fundamental approach taken in the Plan is flawed and / or not sustainable.

Commenting:

High Wycombe area principles

- Suggestion of improving strategic connectivity by reopening the Wycombe-M Maidenhead line. This should be strongly supported and pursued.
- The former High Wycombe single line should be protected to allow for strategic connectivity with the proposed new station at Old Oak Common, and with it, links to Crossrail and HS2.
- It is noted that historically, little has been done with key congestion hotspots such as Hazlemere Crossroads.
- Impact on local infrastructure of the proposed junction 3A / "Access to Wycombe" is a concern particularly on roads leading from town up through Hazlemere / Tylers Green.
- Principles for disabled access could be strengthened.
- Support for the concept of changing the perception of High Wycombe town's economic role, but the suggestions reflected this should be aligned with conversations about the consequences and impact on the functionality of the town.
- Reference should be made to High Wycombe's historic environment.
- The improvement of links between High Wycombe town centre and Desborough could include a reference to extending riverside access between Desborough Park Road and Westbourne Street as opportunities arise.
- The approach to the Wye should be widened beyond simply opening up the river to also take in the enhancement of the river.
- A timeline should be provided for the opening of the river, and it should also be applied to the Wycombe Marsh Stream and Hughenden Stream.
- Some of the proposals contradict the principles stated in the plan

Infrastructure Suggestions

- Manor Road should be opened to allow access to Wycombe and/ or a road next to Hazlemere library should be opened to ease the congestion of the Hazlemere Cross Roads
- Motorists sometimes break the speed limit along Penn Road – a speed camera would stop this

Marlow Area Principles

- Reference should be made to Marlow's historic environment, and a strong emphasis placed on its conservation.
- The Thames Path National Trail should be mentioned.
- Reference should be made to protect the Thames and ecological enhancements to it and its corridor.
- Improved car parking is essential, such as through adding decks to town centre car parks etc.
- The Plan should make reference to the proposals to run two trains an hour between Marlow, Bourne End, and Maidenhead to connect to Crossrail. This will also include a need to recognise the potential to enhance Marlow (and Bourne End) stations and provide additional parking.
- Facilitating local infrastructure should also include reference to improving traffic conditions within the town and the replacement of inadequate soakaway drainage systems.
- Enhanced mooring facilities for visiting boats are desirable.
- In addition to the improvement of Higginson Park, there should be a commitment to maintaining its quality and attractiveness.
- Proposals for the improvement of transport links with Globe Park should be more precise.

Bourne End and Wooburn Area Principles

- Reference should be made to Wooburn and Bourne End's historic environment
- As noted in Marlow area principles, reference should be made to the protection and enhancement of the Thames and to the Thames Path National Trail.
- Reference should be added to point 1 c) to protecting the setting of the River Wye as well as the hillside setting of the Wye Valley.
- Pedestrian cycle infrastructure could be improved by upgrading public footpath between disused railway line bridleway and train station via Boston Drive business park, addressing lack of pavements on Kiln Lane, Hawks Hill and Hedsor Road, providing a new bridge over the Wye from Hollands Farm to the Wessex Road Industrial Estate and from there to the Recreation Road / Fulong Road recreation ground.
- While business areas should be supported, it should also be recognised that some of these areas need to be redeveloped or redesigned to make them more attractive.
- Paragraph 5.4.1 should be reworded to link back to core policy statement on how the area is seen as a collection of villages.

- Clarity needed in section 6a) whether it is Wooburn Green or Wooburn Town (or both) being referred to.
- Uncertainty to how the pledge to make improvements to Cookham Bridge that do not send additional through traffic through the villages can be achieved, as both the bridge and its toll house are listed and all traffic over the bridge goes through Cookham as a matter of course.
- Consideration should be given to alter the local infrastructure to deter large lorries from using the village as a cut through between the M4 and the M40.
- Traffic problems around barrow sunken lanes around Hawks Hill, Hedsor, and Kiln Lane etc should be mentioned.
- There is a need for a public transport route between Bourne End and Beaconsfield.
- Crossrail will make Bourne End station more desirable and therefore more parking capacity will be needed in the area.

Rural Area Principles

- Rewording of principle for safer walking, horse riding, and cycling in countryside areas is suggested to widen the scope to cover A, B, and unclassified roads where safer non-car use access is desirable.
- References should be added to key national trails (The Ridgeway and Thames Path).
- Suggestion for rewording the section relating to the character and sense of place of rural hamlets.
- Affordable housing is essential to keep people who grew up in the community living in the local area, but how would it be enforced?
- The contribution of windfall sites in villages should not be ignored.
- Flexible use of buildings in the AONB and Green Belt should not be unfettered, and should be subject to compliance with other policies relating to the designated areas.
- The Longwick-cum-Ilmer Neighbourhood Plan should be supported.
- River and stream corridors should be protected.
- Greater countryside access for those with limited mobility should be promoted, through increased emphasis on the principles of the Equality Act 2010.

General Comments

- Provision should be made in the area principles to prevent the loss of existing sports facilities (including school playing fields) and plan positively for new facilities.
- There is a noted strain on GP surgeries at current housing levels.
- Congestion issues such as London Road must be overcome before any further development takes place.
- The inclusion of fostering economic growth as an objective in each set of area principles is welcomed, but a commitment to developing sites for small or micro-businesses would be welcomed, and measures toward making sites attractive beyond simply restricting them to B1 uses should be brought forward.
- The Plan as a whole should accomplish a net gain in biodiversity.
- Greater emphasis should be placed on access and the principles of the Equality Act 2010 in urban and rural areas.
- Greater emphasis should be placed on the support the rights of way network provides to the district's tourism.

Princes Risborough

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Respondents: | R Wates (DNLP 0064) K Bambrick (DNLP 0066) J Owen (DNLP 0093) V Page (DNLP 0106) R Hockley (DNLP 0150) M Stenton (DNLP 0202) J Cleland (DNLP 0217) H Leighton (DNLP 0261) A Hussey (DNLP 0272) J Smith (DNLP 0300) A & C Poole (DNLP 0350) S & R McKenzie (DNLP 0367) F Duncan & A Thomas (DNLP 0457) J Wilkins (DNLP 0460) G Odell (DNLP 0496) D John (DNLP 0501) J Field & J McQuire (DNLP 0509) S Martin (DNLP 0538) R & S Lindsay (DNLP 0552) W Spinks (DNLP 0562) K & C Gubbins (DNLP 0568) C Tyler (DNLP 0573) P Johnston (DNLP 0587) E Sewell (DNLP 0588) M Wooster-Keyte (DNLP 0604) T Sheppard (DNLP 0617) Carter Jonas (Searle Family Trust) (DNLP 0619) P Hillier (DNLP 0638) H Edwardes-Evans (DNLP 0658) J Romaya (DNLP 0660) J Davies (DNLP 0669) T Davies (DNLP 0690) J Farnell (DNLP 0698) E Lumb (DNLP 0716) M Dodds (DNLP 0720) S Heap (DNLP 0937) R Wingrove (DNLP 0951) R Orsler (DNLP 0978) R Riley & D Jouanneau (DNLP 0984) P Brookhouse (DNLP 1025) N Willis (DNLP 1052) S Yates (DNLP 1116) D Garratt (DNLP 1160) G Nash (DNLP 1161) P & I Risk (DNLP 1163) P Bird (DNLP 1176) D Putnam (DNLP 1187) R Fickling (DNLP 1215) M Tedman (DNLP 1253) M Bambrick (DNLP 1262) |
|--------------|--|

R & V Peel (DNLP 1274)
 B Durham (DNLP 1285)
 K Mazdon (DNLP 1308)
 V Brookhouse (DNLP 1340)
 S Bailey-Kennedy (DNLP 1341)
 C Gee (DNLP 1360)
 C Loftas (DNLP 1417)
 Mr & Mrs Barnard (DNLP 1421)
 A Wynn (DNLP 1433)
 B & E Chubb (DNLP 1454)
 J & J Young (DNLP 1495)
 R Bushnell (DNLP 1512)
 P Hanlon (DNLP 1517)
 C Rudin & I Giles (DNLP 1522)
 D Pitcher (DNLP 1524)
 S & C Brownlie (DNLP 1558)
 M Williams (DNLP 1559)
 L Redrup (DNLP 1565)
 B Cotton (DNLP 1570)
 S Tucker (DNLP 1577)
 J O'Connell (DNLP1590)
 J Field (DNLP 1615)
 G Gallagher (DNLP 1636)
 J Clegg (DNLP 1661)
 Savills (Bloor Homes) (DNLP 1671)
 J Rogers (DNLP 1672)
 Buckinghamshire County Council (DNLP 1674)
 J Holmes (DNLP 1681)
 K & D Oshaughnessy (DNLP 1688)
 C Romaya (DNLP 1703)
 A Macfarlane (DNLP 1710)
 E Artus (DNLP 1720)
 M Hobbs (DNLP 1745)
 M & C Paterson (DNLP 1768)
 L Jayatillake (DNLP 1803)
 M Shaw (DNLP 1808)
 J Brunton (DNLP 1811)
 D Burns (DNLP 1829)
 M Solman (DNLP 1838)
 D Maycock (DNLP 1854)
 S Bird (DNLP 1861)
 T Molesworth (DNLP 1863)
 J Woodfield (DNLP 1870)
 A Artus (DNLP 1872)
 P & V Mussett (DNLP 1873)
 G Self (DNLP 1887)
 J & P Hart (DNLP 1893)
 S Hampton (DNLP 1910)
 Bledlow Cum Saunderton Parish Council (DNLP 1913)
 I Harrison (DNLP 1917)
 Mr & Mrs D Wyatt (DNLP 1943)
 C Campbell (DNLP 1961)
 M Cudd (DNLP 1980)
 R Dalton (DNLP 1985)
 D Griggs (DNLP 1994)

Horsenden Lawn Tennis Club (DNLP 1996)
N Beill (DNLP 2016)
A Basu & N Cope (DNLP 2022)
A Hitchcock (DNLP 2027)
G Seels (DNLP 2028)
W Harry (DNLP 2030)
A Wilkinson (DNLP 2043)
S Jeanes (DNLP 2046)
L Hastings (DNLP 2049)
J Wager (DNLP 2051)
G Birks (DNLP 2064)
L Jeanes (DNLP 2072)
Risborough Area Partnership (DNLP 2074)
T Lynch (DNLP 2077)
A & S Grout (DNLP 2079)
P & J Bartlett (DNLP 2081)
D Woodbridge (DNLP 2083)
K & B Roberts (DNLP 2085)
I & J Wright (DNLP 2089)
G Wilkinson (DNLP 2103)
N Shirley (DNLP 2106)
A Edwards (DNLP 2121)
I Lishman (DNLP 2124)
P Knight (DNLP 2126)
J Edwards (DNLP 2128)
BANG (DNLP 2129)
S Lishman (DNLP 2140)
C Lishman (DNLP 2146)
P Hunt (DNLP 2148)
S M Clark (DNLP 2161)
S Weir (DNLP 2172)
P Parkinson (DNLP 2180)
C Courtney (DNLP 2186)
A Clark (DNLP 2195)
A Smith (DNLP 2203)
G Wilkinson (DNLP 2206)
R Wall (DNLP 2212)
J Cudd (DNLP 2218)
J Bassett (DNLP 2221)
B Spittles (DNLP 2242)
A & J Smith (DNLP 2245)
R List (DNLP 2273)
L & M Davies (DNLP 2285)
T Blackburn (DNLP 2300)
C Vint & L Mowle (DNLP 2304)
S Clark (DNLP 2318)
D Buffham (DNLP 2320)
S James (DNLP 2337)
J & J Sainsbury (DNLP 2345)
M Asbury (DNLP 2354)
T Raynor (DNLP 2357)
J Martin Hall (DNLP 2373)
L Edwardes-Evans (DNLP 2392)
G Home (DNLP 2412)
T Fitch (DNLP 2415)

P Gibson (DNLP 2425)
Robin (DNLP 2435)
C Jeanes (DNLP 2439)
I Ashby (DNLP 2528)
P & H Gibson (DNLP 2530)
A Theed (DNLP 2600)
M Eccles (DNLP 2623)
D Martin (DNLP 2630)
J Mackreath (DNLP 2634)
A & A Vere (DNLP 2637)
J Burnham (DNLP 2638)
J Baker (DNLP 2646)
J Baker (DNLP 2648)
S Osborne (DNLP 2657)
M Burleigh (DNLP 2672)
S Davison (DNLP 2677)
Wake up Risborough Group (DNLP 2679)
I Douglass (DNLP 2701)
J & T Taylor (DNLP 2721)
E Nelson (DNLP 2728)
M Nelson (DNLP 2729)
K Raynor (DNLP 2741)
D Whelan (DNLP 2770)
T Hoare (DNLP 2774)
J Crockett (DNLP 2776)
I Keynes (DNLP 2781)
Gladman Developments (DNLP 2804)
A Dormer (DNLP 2812)
P Hayes (DNLP 2818)
Wilkes Head and Eve LLP (Molins PLC) (DNLP 2826)
S Taylor (DNLP 2833)
RPS Group (Halsbury Homes) (DNLP 2840)
N Whelan (DNLP 2844)
D Willis (DNLP 2845)
Environment Agency (DNLP 2857)
S & B Morgan (DNLP 2858)
A & S Eden (DNLP 2861)
S Green (DNLP 2863)
J Jones (DNLP 2872)
J Woodward (DNLP 2887)
J Wilkinson (DNLP 2888)
P Collins (DNLP 2893)
K Yates (DNLP 2896)
L & P Lunnon (DNLP 2897)
N Cook (DNLP 2902)
S Allom (DNLP 2906)
Risborough Area Residents Association (RARA) (DNLP 2908)
W Streule (DNLP 2912)
K Huckle (DNLP 2924)
J Huckle (DNLP 2927)
A Edwards (DNLP 2938)
M Hayes (DNLP 2948)
JSP Planning Law (Mr & Mrs Oates) (DNLP 2968)
K Hayes (DNLP 2976)
D Hayes (DNLP 2992)

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|------------|-----|----------|---|----------|----|
| | A Neagoe (DNLP 2998) V Wilkes (DNLP 3005) R Durkin (DNLP 3014) M Carroll (DNLP 3016) P Gidley (DNLP 3020) I Crease (DNLP 3026) C & T Plant (DNLP 3034) E Middleton (DNLP 3042) J Brearley (DNLP 3052) Highways England (DNLP 3057) A & S Kimpton (DNLP 3096) | | | | | | |
| Number of Representations: | 226 | Objection: | 126 | Support: | 6 | Comment: | 94 |

The majority of the representations repeat comments made in response to the draft Princes Risborough Town Plan. Only direct references to and statements about the content of the new Local Plan itself are summarised.

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting:

- Use of Culverton Farm is supported. Site is available development and deliverable, as well as possessing good access for public and non-vehicular transport if developed for residential.
- Commendation of work done overall in new Local Plan, with recognition that work PR element will be a significant move toward developing the town into a “balanced and thriving community.”
- Support for CP4 target set for Princes Risborough housing.
- Support for identifying Princes Risborough under Tier 2 of the Settlement Hierarchy.
- Local amenity looking forward to new business from build, requesting start date for housing build to prepare.
- Support for route that runs closer to Culverton Farm at the northern edge of the field, due to the possibility of minimising the impact on residents.
- Support for site release in area adjacent to that proposed in the Plan.
- Some support for the application of DM24 in Princes Risborough.

Objecting:

- Proposed housing development is too large for this rural location, will be detrimental to the area and is not desired by existing residents. Some suggested various alternate figures which were considered to be more proportionate to the size of the town.
- Other areas such as Marlow or Stokenchurch would be better choices to accommodate the large numbers of housing required given their proximity to the motorway and better facilities. Numbers should be spread more evenly.
- Goes against new Local Plan Objectives/ARUP Report/NPPF.

- Brownfield and in-fill sites in Princes Risborough could still help meet target without need to breach AONB/release Green Belt.
- Objections to separating Princes Risborough Town Plan and the new Local Plan. This creates issues with responding and how policies of the latter do/do not affect the former, and it makes no sense to finalise the Princes Risborough Town Plan before the new Local Plan. Several of the elements and core policies of the new Local Plan do not properly align with the Princes Risborough Town Plan, and they should be amalgamated for strategic reasons.
- Planned developments at Station and Mill Lane were to accommodate 600-800 new homes; unclear why an additional 1,500 dwellings are now needed.
- Local Plan appears to target the town in a way which will totally change the character of the community from a market town to a commuting dormitory, as there is minimal hope of generating a corresponding rise in locally-based employment. This in turn would be contrary to the Plan's low-carbon future ambitions as the lack of transport connections would drive people to their cars.
- Objections made to proposed new routes for relief road, some specifically with regard to removal of land from either Green Belt or AONB.
- Combining target number set out in CP4 with new settlement described in Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (VALP) makes it even more important that total number of houses be reduced.
- Particular criticism raised in relation to the Strategic Objective to Cherish the Chilterns.

Commenting:

- Para.4.22 under CP3 should apply to Princes Risborough as well as Marlow.
- Was consideration given to establishing a new, purpose-designed village settlement instead?
- Princes Risborough must do its part to take on new housing, but it needs to be more appropriately planned. Consider how to best integrate the new developments through planning, unlike the new estates at Chinnor and Aylesbury.
- Great concern expressed that whatever community benefits will be mandated of developers will vanish as the latter declare them to no longer be "viable". Concern that infrastructure funding, including S106 contributions, will be funnelled into the bypass/relief road project.
- Questioning decision to not continue formal discussions with residents of PR given scale of development as expressed in CP4 and unresolved issues from Princes Risborough Town Plan.
- Other agencies will need to consider the overall impact of the new Local Plan on the M40, especially junctions 4 and 5. Need to stay abreast of Plan and the developing transport evidence base.
- Good that this section is in the new Local Plan as a follow-up to the Princes Risborough Town Plan, but insufficient details on new relief road options to enable useful feedback.
- Princes Risborough Town Plan reps need to be made available in full on website, not just via summarised reports.

- Site includes land within the flood zone that will need to pass the sequential test and be included in level 2 SFRA. The more vulnerable development should be placed in the lower risk areas. Flood risk mitigation should be considered as part of any policy for this site.
- Nothing explicitly stated in CP7 & accompanying text (including Appendix F) about how waste and recycling will be managed against new Princes Risborough housing target set in CP4.
- Policy-specific suggestions received, mostly relating to infrastructure around developments needed to meet CP4 target for Princes Risborough (including traffic mitigation and school expansions).
- Section 5.5. Point 3 (b) i. & ii – uncertain as to how these can be achieved given roads around PR which will be exacerbated by traffic from new development.

Evidence Base documents

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Respondents: | <p>C Witcher (DNLP 0069) C Scott (DNLP 0091) A & P Gilman (DNLP 0102) W Tinker (DNLP 0234) W Tinkler (DNLP 0234) L Reston (DNLP 0325) M Nannery (DNLP 0363) A Watt (DNLP 0458) P Morton (DNLP 0489) P Mason (DNLP 0622) M & S Smith (DNLP 0639) M Goodall (DNLP 0667) Penn and Tylers Green Residents Society (DNLP 0696) C Royds (DNLP 0834) C Royds (DNLP 0846) I, J & J Roxburgh (DNLP 0957) P Sharman (DNLP 0958) J Sharman (DNLP 0973) C & J Doyle & R & M Pedler (DNLP 0985) Hawks Hill & Widmoor Residents Action Group (DNLP 0987) G Markham (DNLP 1043) J Hill (DNLP 1125) K Harvey (DNLP 1128) B Otter (DNLP 1134) D Chandler (DNLP 1148) B Tranter (DNLP 1173) Upper Hedsor Road Residents Association (DNLP 1178) K Slade (DNLP 1179) Little Horwood Parish Council (DNLP 1185) G van de Poll (DNLP 1191) Planning Works Ltd (L Noe) (DNLP 1234) N Henshaw (DNLP 1275) M Fraser (DNLP 1301) R & C Thorogood (DNLP 1309) E Prior (DNLP 1312) E Prior (DNLP 1313) P Credland (DNLP 1316) Little Marlow Parish Council (DNLP 1318) J Honey (DNLP 1319) S Perigo (DNLP 1320) N Draffan (DNLP 1325) A Watkins (DNLP 1326) W Byrne (DNLP 1334) M Watkins (DNLP 1339) I L Beeks Ltd (DNLP 1351) D Webb (DNLP 1355) H Harvey (DNLP 1358) N Davies (DNLP 1359) C Gee (DNLP 1360) P Braithwaite (DNLP 1362)</p> |
|--------------|---|

J Sackman (DNLP 1369)
 H Bryant (DNLP 1372)
 A Stephens (DNLP 1373)
 V Samuda (DNLP 1376)
 S Doran (DNLP 1387)
 Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390)
 D Lyons (DNLP 1406)
 C Floud (DNLP 1414)
 Richard Buxton Environmental & Public Law (Residents of Seymour
 Plain, Marlow) (DNLP 1418)
 S Bassford (DNLP 1419)
 G & J Garratt (DNLP 1453)
 L Dance (DNLP 1465)
 Hazlemere Parish Council (DNLP 1471)
 M Boggis (DNLP 1490)
 J Davis (DNLP 1504)
 B & R Whitten (DNLP 1526)
 H Bolton (DNLP 1527)
 M Mingos (DNLP 1534)
 K & W Nash (DNLP 1571)
 K Corne (DNLP 1585)
 M Bygate (DNLP 1595)
 C Leech (DNLP 1617)
 B Coombes (DNLP 1622)
 J Sherlock (DNLP 1646)
 M Walklin (DNLP 1659)
 Buckinghamshire County Council (DNLP 1674)
 G Tyack (DNLP 1686)
 J & S Seber (DNLP 1701)
 The Marlow Society (DNLP 1705)
 Progress Planning (DNLP 1714)
 C & R Forrest (DNLP1724)
 J Proctor (DNLP 1726)
 C Tyrell (DNLP 1733)
 M Shephard (DNLP 1743)
 M Powell (DNLP 1748)
 M Ward (DNLP 1749)
 B Moore (DNLP 1750)
 C Roberts-Smith (DNLP 1753)
 C Clayton (DNLP 1763)
 G Evans (DNLP 1764)
 Carter Jonas LLP (Mr J Perkins) (DNLP 1766)
 S Halms (DNLP 1787)
 J Hughes (DNLP 1788)
 M Walker (DNLP 1793)
 Historic England (DNLP 1798)
 S McCollum (DNLP 1799)
 M Cooke (DNLP 1868)
 S van den Berghe (DNLP 1897)
 S & T Reeves (DNLP 1900)
 J Cavaye & K Cooper (DNLP 1914)
 R Ward (DNLP 1916)
 Hedsor Parish Meeting (DNLP 1925)
 Don't Destroy Bourne End Group (DNLP 1929)
 L & A McRonald (DNLP 1940)

P Hardcastle (DNLP 1944)
 S Pink (DNLP 1959)
 A & J Hardy (DNLP 1972)
 R Pritchard (DNLP1978)
 R & L Hunt (DNLP 2012)
 T Harries (DNLP 2019)
 M Livings (DNLP 2021)
 P Moxon (DNLP 2095)
 G Davies (DNLP 2113)
 P Slater (DNLP 2119)
 S Cooper (DNLP 2134)
 B Burns (DNLP 2145)
 M Parkins (DNLP 2149)
 A Belgrove (DNLP 2157)
 S Belgrove (DNLP 2158)
 A Hearsey (DNLP 2165)
 D & S Dale (DNLP 2167)
 K Howell (DNLP 2183)
 A Cattaruzza (DNLP 2204)
 K Cooke (DNLP 2217)
 B Simon (DNLP 2227)
 O Moore (DNLP 2240)
 R Wise (DNLP 2246)
 P Milburn (DNLP 2247)
 B Plumbridge (DNLP 2250)
 S Barratt-Singh (DNLP 2261)
 A Cooke (DNLP 2269)
 S Cooke (DNLP 2271)
 C Mumcu (DNLP 2297)
 A & B Traynor (DNLP 2331)
 J Milburn (DNLP 2343)
 A Herrington (DNLP 2349)
 J Deung (DNLP 2370)
 N Cahuac (DNLP 2379)
 P Japp (DNLP 2380)
 K Findlay (DNLP 2386)
 K Barry (DNLP 2395)
 Future of Our Village (DNLP 2398)
 A Downie (DNLP 2399)
 K Milmer (DNLP 2426)
 E Martin (DNLP 2427)
 Persimmon Homes North London (DNLP 2433)
 L Milmer (DNLP 2436)
 Wooburn & Bourne End Parish Council (DNLP 2442)
 Armstrong Rigg Planning (Abbey Barn Holdings SA) (DNLP 2444)
 Nexus Planning (Inland Homes) (DNLP 2445)
 Land and Partners Ltd (DNLP 2452)
 M Carelss (DNLP 2462)
 S Wilson (DNLP 2487)
 J Harris (DNLP 2506)
 D Weidenbaum (DNLP 2515)
 H Murray (DNLP 2523)
 K Banner (DNLP 2527)
 M & G Fessey (DNLP 2592)
 L Anderson (DNLP 2624)

J Burnham (DNLP 2638)
 P Slator (DNLP 2651)
 J Southward (DNLP 2651)
 J Southworth (DNLP 2651)
 Natural England (DNLP 2654)
 Penn Parish Council (DNLP 2660)
 M Goodall (DNLP 2667)
 West Waddy ADP (Foam Engineers Ltd) (DNLP 2675)
 M Havelock (DNLP 2683)
 J Griffin (DNLP 2698)
 South Bucks District Council (DNLP 2698)
 G Wiseman (DNLP 2706)
 Turley (NWE Marlow Ltd) (DNLP 2709)
 P Priestley (DNLP 2715)
 Fisher German LLP (Harris and Fisher) (DNLP 2723)
 Turley (Testament Trumps Ltd) (DNLP 2739)
 A & S Barclay (DNLP 2749)
 L Cleere (DNLP 2750)
 B Fattorini (DNLP 2755)
 DP Architects Ltd (Mr & Mrs Stoddart) (DNLP 2778)
 J Clayton (DNLP 2780)
 M Mulcahy (DNLP 2788)
 Swanbourne Parish Council (DNLP 2795)
 A Garmonsway (DNLP 2802)
 Aylesbury Vale District Council (DNLP 2837)
 RPS Planning & Development (Halsbury Homes (SE) Ltd) (DNLP 2840)
 F Bennett (DNLP 2848)
 S Kempt (DNLP 2852)
 PPML Consulting Ltd (St Congar Land) (DNLP 2853)
 J Wood (DNLP 2855)
 Environment Agency (DNLP 2857)
 S Carter (DNLP 2864)
 J & M Wentworth (DNLP 2867)
 McGough Planning Consultants Ltd (Lunnon Family) (DNLP 2900)
 C Oliver (DNLP 2905)
 H Eccles (DNLP 2907)
 Risborough Area Residents Association (DNLP 2908)
 B Catchpole (DNLP 2911)
 W Streule (DNLP 2912)
 R Walklin (DNLP 2916)
 J Corcoran (DNLP 2917)
 Little Marlow Country Park Community Partnership (DNLP 2933)
 J Baker (DNLP 2944)
 Newton Longville Parish Council (DNLP 2958)
 M Smith (DNLP 2965)
 J Robinson (DNLP 2971)
 S & T Lawrence (DNLP 2974)
 N Collins (DNLP 2975)
 A Amos (DNLP 2978)
 V Richer (DNLP 2981)
 J Cable (DNLP 2984)
 J & S Cleere (DNLP 2994)
 L Ryan (DNLP 2995)
 L Milne (DNLP 3006)
 S & L Worsley (DNLP 3010)

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|------------|-----|----------|---|----------|----|
| | B Rodgers (DNLP 3051) J Brearley (DNLP 3052) Highways England (DNLP 3057) J & J Robinson (DNLP 3060) A Baker (DNLP 3078) Village Foundations Ltd (DNLP 3079) Richard Buxton Environmental & Public Law (Residents of Seymour Plain) (DNLP 3082) West Waddy ADP (Bourne End Residents Association) (DNLP 3093) Marlow Town Council (DNLP 3099) | | | | | | |
| Number of Representations: | 223 | Objection: | 123 | Support: | 8 | Comment: | 92 |

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting:

AONB sites report

- Support for the assessment drawing on the existing Landscape character assessment

Green Belt Review

- Support for the conclusions in the ARUP report for some sites
- The Green Belt assessment part 2 is supported for the development of some sites, recognising their limited visual impact and contribution to Green Belt purposes.
- A Green Belt review is necessary, and it is right that it should be conducted as part of the planning process. The results of the Green belt review are generally welcomed
- Support for ARUP's recommendation that all Green Belt Land around Marlow is strong in fulfilling the purposes of the Green Belt

Settlement Hierarchy

- The assessment of Bourne End and Wooburn as a Tier 2 settlement is supported
- The settlement Hierarchy identifies High Wycombe as the only Tier 1 settlement, and is therefore clearly the most sustainable location for growth in the district

Infrastructure Report

- Support for the cycle path connecting Bourne End, Wooburn and High Wycombe

Sustainability Appraisal - General

- The SA appears to follow national and local policy and guidance
- Support for transport issues being acknowledged
- Release of Green Belt sites is required, so option E 'Green Belt Review' is supported
- Support for the transport affects and mitigation commentaries and these address the SA appraisal criteria

- The transport comments for various site selections seems to have taken note of the Highway DM comments supplied during the production of the HELAA
- Support for the SA finding that option A of the spatial options is the most suitable option for development
- Support for comments regarding rural populations benefiting from increased populations
- The Heritage and townscape box for each option and the fact most are recognised as having an adverse impact is welcomed
- Point 2 of the environmental issues included in Table 1 is welcomed.

Sustainability Appraisal – Site specific issues

- Support for the findings in HW12, no significant effects are identified for this site
- The appraisal for BE2 in the SA is supported
- Support for the comment that quality of access can be an obstacle to development
- The SA's assessment of BE2 for Biodiversity and Diversity show a negative impact, however the Preliminary ecological assessment gives a more detailed assessment, and will inform the master plan for the site ensuring minimisation of negative impacts on biodiversity and mitigation and enhancement where possible. This is consistent with the SA's assessment for BE2

Sustainability Appraisal – Environment

- Support for the inclusion of green infrastructure, flood risk, biodiversity, groundwater issues, surface water run-off, sewerage infrastructure, water quality and groundwater quality in the Sustainability issues in the Wycombe District table
- Support for the appraisal criteria in the Biodiversity and Geodiversity SA/SEA Theme, objective 1
- Support for water resources being included as in issue in objective 4 of the SA Framework
- Support for the appraisal criteria questions in objective 4 and 6 in the SA Framework, and the appraisal criteria questions relating to climate change in objective 5

Sustainability Appraisal – Strategic options appraisals

- Support for consideration of flood risk and avoidance of development in higher risk flood zones
- Support for including impacts on biodiversity

Flooding and Water Quality

- Support for sequential tests being completed and the new climate change allowances being included

Objecting:

Density/HEDNA

- Significant numbers of objections and comments were received relating to the densities of housing allocations, that they were too low given the amount of need set

out by the OAN figures and what is being proposed elsewhere in the Bucks HMA. By increasing the density, the amount of housing being met outside the District could be reduced.

- Others expressed concern over the high level of housing density proposed, suggesting it should be reduced
- More extensive work should be done for the district to inform and provide evidence to justify the content of and density policy and specific densities in different situations
- Lack of clarity regarding the density of development in Princes Risborough.
- Concerns about the affordability of housing, given the lower density and the prospects of future growth in 2033 and beyond. The proposed densities are inconsistent between the new Local Plan and the Princes Risborough Town Plan.

HELAA

- Based on evidence from the HELAA, housing needs can be met without developing the Green Belt. Additionally, CPRE published a report showing there is capacity for 1 million homes on brownfield land.
- Only land offered by developers/ agents was considered for review – this is not robust and skews any objectivity. Also, sites excluded due to a lack of information should be reconsidered.
- There are arguments that contamination clean up should not be introduced, however, this must always be preferable to loss of Green Belt
- No indication that the HELAA methodology has followed guidance to the extent set in the PPG, and the conclusions are inconsistent with the report's content.
- Given the HELAA wasn't published alongside the local plan, the evidence supporting certain assertions made within the local plan were questioned
- Green Belt should be considered for release for development, as the HELAA suggests it unlikely housing needs will be met without doing this
- The HELAA identifies site for further investigation, which warrants further investigation
- It cannot be concluded whether WDC has robustly considered all options in the absence of an up to date HELAA
- The HELAA identifies capacity for 9,083 homes, representing a shortfall of 5,928 homes suggesting further housing sites are required
- Despite concerns over the suitability of Princes Risborough for large scale development, WDC have concluded in the HELAA the Princes Risborough is appropriate for large scale development because the area west of Princes Risborough is not Green Belt and AONB.
- A more thorough and rigorous assessment of land availability should be progressed by WDC
- A number of areas/ sites have potential to accommodate additional development, and additional land supply can be provided through; employment land, empty homes, publically owned land, and windfall allowances based on ten year trends

Commercial Sites Report

- Concern that the commercial sites report identifies three sites within the Westhorpe/Little Marlow Lakes Country Park area as having potential to be allocated for future business park development

Green Belt Review

- The report applies its own criterion to identify individual sites then incorrectly compared the sites against the requirements and ethos of the NPPF, and other government policies and guidance notes.
- The report has a bias against Green Belt, which can be seen in the tone of the assessment methodology and other sources.
- Assessments have inaccurately applied the NPPF framework, particularly around the robustness of boundaries.
- Simple facts were omitted or ignored in the Green Belt assessments.
- Unsound methodology used to conduct the Green Belt review and the justification for putting forward sites for Green Belt release lacks clarity and consistency.
- It's incorrect that only sites performing weakly have been proposed to be released for development, given there are sites proposed for release which functions strongly against the purposes of the Green Belt.
- WDC have failed to consider sites which scored 'a medium' in the Green Belt review and have omitted opportunities where Green Belt release may be more suitable.

Approach

- Inconsistencies in the approach to release of land from the Green Belt in different areas.
- Proposals to develop Green Belt are contradictory to WDC's rejections of applications on the grounds of Green Belt.
- An individual cannot ignore Green Belt regulations for planning permission requests; therefore the same must apply to corporate requests.
- WDC should rethink their approach and formulate a plan which doesn't encroach on the Greenbelt.
- The plan is incorrect in its approach to delivering housing needs by removing land from the Green Belt and should aim to retain the quality of villages and towns and not destroy them.
- The process to select sites for release from the Green Belt appears to have been carried out incorrectly compared to other districts, and focuses on predetermined sites whilst ignoring others.
- The two Green Belt reports are misleading, flawed, contradictory inaccurate, and unjustified. Arup's report and associated site visits were rushed so their report is not robust. The second report is not consistent with the first and undermines it, makes incorrect assumptions, and it is not clear if it has followed the same methodology.
- WDC produced the part 2 report, which lacks independence and objectivity, and is undermined by its inconsistencies with the ARUP report. It should have looked at more than developer proposals, taking an impartial view without prejudice, and should be consistent with the conclusions of Arup's work. It shows a lack of concern

for the seriousness of the Green Belt designation on WDC's part and does not form a sound basis for decisions.

- The Green Belt review doesn't adequately assess the impact of some site allocations on the AONB, and greater assessment is needed
- The Green Belt review part 2 is an inferior assessment to the more detailed landscape-led work done for Stokenchurch and Lane End, and a proper landscape assessment is required for sites
- The Inner Green Belt Boundary Review seems a way for local development plans in Buckinghamshire to be able to gain access to Green Belt land
- There were objections to WDC failing to consider certain sites for development or being included within the Green Belt review
- The ARUP report refers to ministerial statements and national planning practice guidance stating Green Belt land should not be removed to meet OAN, and that unmet housing needs are unlikely to constitute exceptional circumstances
- Objection to the concept of a review of the Green Belt due to the importance of the Green Belt
- A review of the Greenbelt is appropriate in terms of periodically ensuring it remains fit for purpose and when exceptional circumstances are apparent.
- The results of the council's Green Belt assessment are generally welcomed, and development of sites proposed for release from the greenbelt will be controlled with polices, to limit unacceptable impacts of change.
- Assessments have found some sites to be performing poorly in greenbelt terms, even though they fulfil all Green Belt purposes and so the council cannot justify taking them out of the greenbelt.
- Why were recommendations for areas for development in the ARUP report ignored?
- The extent of the development proposed seems to ride roughshod over the protection of the Green Belt.

Infrastructure Report - General

- The infrastructure plans are insufficient for the homes proposed. While it acknowledges many infrastructure deficiencies it does not propose satisfactory solutions
- Proposals in appendix F were considered to be troubling, particularly the impact on traffic and congestion, and this hasn't been considered and the proposals don't address this issue
- Proposals to address traffic issues in Penn and Tylers Green are inadequate.

Infrastructure Report - Penn School Proposal

- The Penn School proposal is ill thought out. It will significantly impact traffic congestion, particularly once the proposed changes to the home school transport policy are taken into account. A small school around the same physical size as the old school would be acceptable.
- Concern that such a major proposal is hidden with the appendix. This development should be part of a separate consultation process
- No information on the origin of this proposal
- No prior consultation has been held for this proposal

- The consequences of this proposal lack coordination and consultation. This approach can result in neither sensible responses nor properly weighed decisions
- No figures which justify a case for this new school
- The site of the Penn School site is isolated with poor access, an inadequate single gate which would become a safety risk at peak periods. If pupils are driven to and from the school the Penn Road will be blocked by congestion which would have a disruptive impact.
- This proposal will lead to the sense of place of the area becoming lost, both from the increased traffic and also the potential impact of traffic calming measures on the conservation area and the village.
- This proposal will cause significant on road parking
- There must be more suitable locations for this school to be built

Infrastructure Report - Education

- The infrastructure plans for schooling are insufficient
- The proposals for increased school capacity will exasperate congestion issues and increase traffic and strain on already poor road infrastructure. This is unlikely to be addressed
- The suggestion of increasing class sizes contradicts current educational strategies and schools don't have the capacity to do this

Infrastructure Report - Bourne End

- Objection to the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan proposing no infrastructure improvements to Bourne End other than enhancing an existing bridleway
- The infrastructure proposals for Bourne End and Wooburn are only designed to meet the needs of the Slate Meadow development
- Concerns about whether Schools and Surgeries will be expanded sufficiently to meet the additional demands of 700+ homes and there is no guarantee infrastructure providers will be prepared or able to deliver additional capacity
- The strategic walking and cycling route along the railway is too far from Plan proposals.

Infrastructure Report - Accessibility

- Support for work to improve accessibility from the A404 at the Westhorpe Junction, and to improve the wider operation and role of the A404 between the M40 and M4

Settlement Hierarchy

- Bourne End and Wooburn have wrongly been identified as a town and a combined Tier 2 settlement. This has incorrectly increased the allocation of houses being put on the area and has been done deliberately to mislead. They should be considered separately as Tier 3 settlements as they are separate neighbourhoods, a fact recognised in previous WDC plans.

Transport Modelling

- The impact on traffic and transportation has not been adequately considered.
- Assessments at a county level have led to conclusions that don't reflect the reality should development of the proposed scale proceed
- It is clear this report is a spreadsheet based analysis, which compares to the dynamic model WDC are using at High Wycombe. WDC must ensure that the modelling that is informing all planning decisions is of the highest quality
- It was recommended a dynamic model is prepared for Princes Risborough
- Observations in the local plan modelling report appear to be inconsistent with the SA, which may be related to the fact it doesn't reflect rising transport levels since 2013, or that the modelling approach is flawed at a local level

Sustainability Appraisal - General

- A number of requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Projections regulations 2004 haven't been adequately addressed in the SA. It therefore doesn't provide a robust assessment for identifying locations for development and further work is required
- Concern over the late release of the SA, demonstrating it has arguably been prepared retrospectively to the local plan strategy being identified, and sites chosen with no justification as to the reasonable alternatives, which is contradictory to the stated purposes of the SA.
- The SA appears to be a desktop study, where no one visited sites or read the requisite documentation prior to undertaking the appraisal
- The SA is inconsistent in regard to transport, place-making – sustainable communities, and landscape and countryside. These inconsistencies, contradictions, and incoherencies means the report doesn't provide objective, evidence-based reasons on which logical decisions can be taken
- There is no evidence the Final Scoping Report has been used anyway in the SA
- Planning guidance stating local authorities should seek advice from relevant bodies when planning for development of Greenfield/agricultural land has not been followed
- Not all 3 dimensions of sustainability (economic, social, and environmental) have been addressed in sufficient detail and some not addressed in anyway. Objectives 12 – 15 have generally been neglected
- The SA gives insufficient weight to the environmental role played in sustainable development and to Green Belt policies which prevail over sustainable development
- The SA is contradictory in several parts. Explanation for the contradictions is needed
- The SA is contradictory to the ARUP Green Belt assessment and the Green Belt part 2 assessment
- The SA doesn't present an appraisal of the draft plan
- The SA doesn't consider the effects of the sites in combination
- The quality of the SA's reasoning, argument and conclusions are of questionable value to the WDC and stakeholders
- The SA doesn't provide an assessment of all policies included in the draft plan
- There is a significant variance between the quality assessment of housing sites found in both the in SA of Strategic Options and the draft SA

- The SA is missing a qualitative assessment and background context to each of the appraisal scores
- The SA is in part produced against false prospectus
- Concern over how a reasonable SA can have been carried out in the absence necessary assessments to inform the Sa process

Sustainability Appraisal – Scoring issues

- Some of the scores given for proposals, including BE1, BE2, BE3, HW6, HW8, HW10, HW12, HW14, HW15 and RUR13 in the SA are inappropriate, unrealistic and incorrect and some categories haven't addressed, and so the grading should be reappraised
- The 'Population – Housing' category has only two options, and that is the size of the development – this doesn't have any relevance to its sustainability. This is an unfair and misleading category giving the perception bigger is better and this is a higher proportion of housing requirement being allocated to one village
- The place making component of the plan requires much more than a desk top study
- Specialist advice, further work and serious action will be required in relation to some of the suitability aspects of the proposals
- The Scoring System is over simplistic, enabling discrepancies between what is documented and reality
- Revised scoring of this site would indicate that HW16 would meet some economic objectives, but it would score poorly against transport and the ability to provide attractive strategic employment opportunities, therefore the allocation of this site contradicts the overarching strategy of the local plan regarding employment land

Sustainability Appraisal – Bourne End

- The significant effects sections for the sites in Bourne End are cursory
- No information is given as to the source of the assessment
- No information as to why other impacts such as landscape and traffic are not considered to be significant
- Concern the SA based on high level modelling which neither reflects rising transport levels since 2013, nor is sufficiently sensitive to local situations
- The view development of the Bourne End sites would have very few significant effects is inconstant with the general assessment of Bourne End, indicating a number of significant negative effects and implying a desire to develop at any cost.
- Concern the SA is wholly inconsistent in terms of the commentary and the visual diagrams which are painting a falsely optimistic picture
- The cumulative effect of proposals isn't assessed, which is likely to be different from the sites individual score, and so for some sustainability issues there isn't analysis in the SA of the potential impact of these objectives
- No discussion of the issue of coalescence in the SA, despite this issue being acknowledged in the general assessment of Bourne End, and some sites providing key gaps between settlements
- The proposals for Bourne End are don't seem to support the transport related sustainability issues and objectives

- Concern the SA fails to deliver against the SA issues and objectives, and worsens existing congestion points
- Concern the SA has insufficient mitigation plans with limited factual basis
- Concern the SA is operating with false optimism and ignores the fact several congestion points cannot be relieved by already discounted transport mitigation options (i.e widening of Cookham Bridge)

Sustainability Appraisal – BE1 – Slate Meadow, Bourne End

- The significant effects comments section for this site are limited and insufficient

Sustainability Appraisal – BE2 – Hollands Farm, Bourne End

- The WDC settlement hierarchy Boundary maps do not match those of Hollands Farm
- Item 8 on Table 1 (p14) should include the more recent floods of 2014
- The report has missed that BE2 is classified as the best quality and most versatile agriculture land
- Implying that Bourne End is a town in some parts of the plan is outrageous, and BE 2 will do more damage to the hamlet communities than is recognised by the SA.
- The proposed developments will adversely impact infrastructure
- The SA seems to accept the that the BE2 proposal will be unsustainable
- The SA says mitigation measures will be required, but it doesn't say what theses may be, and it was considered that there weren't enough mitigation measures possible in relation to this site. It is irresponsible to go ahead with this plan with this knowledge.
- The significant effects section for this site omits and disregards material problems and down plays the flood risk of the site

Sustainability Appraisal – BE3 – Land off Northern Heights, Bourne End

- It was considered the Health and Bourne End's community would be better served by the proposal not going ahead
- The significant effects and potentials measures for this site show there are significant sustainability issues and other problems with developing this site
- The SA states it is unclear whether impacts can be mitigated, however it's clear that impacts cannot be mitigated

Sustainability Appraisal – MR7 – Land North of Oak Tree Road, Marlow

- The SA contains observations on the MR7 proposal, which would inform responses, but doesn't contain an appraisal on meaningful alternatives to this site and the council's own vision is absent
- The approach of presenting options affecting Marlow in the plan and accompanying documents doesn't meet requirements to do so, and is arguable unlawful
- The SA supports the significant effects of various issues regarding MR7
- No consideration in the SA for the development of existing brownfield sites in Marlow
- The impact of appropriate mitigation measures aren't presented, so a fully informed response can't be made, so the potential mitigation section is insufficient and should be disregarded

Sustainability Appraisal – Reasonable alternatives

- Sustainability appraisals are required by law to consider all reasonable alternatives. This SA doesn't do this or identify the options that have been selected or give reasons why they have been discounted; therefore no reasons are given for the decisions reached in preparing the local plan, resulting in a flawed process and lack of transparency. This means the plan is not justified, sound, or robust and puts the plan at risk.
- The approach taken by the council suggests the entire site selection process is flawed
- Given the failure of the SA to consider reasonable alternatives, a failure of the Plan is proposing sites in an AONB which cannot satisfy the exceptional circumstances

Sustainability Appraisal – Evidence

- There is insufficient information to justify conclusions
- The SA doesn't include an environmental report, which undermines its credibility and prejudices consultation regarding scope of the report and environmental issues

Sustainability Appraisal – Housing Needs

- The SA doesn't adequately address issues regarding housing needs
- The SA states 10,000 homes are based on migration trends during the period 2001-2006. This is out of date with no attempt to acknowledge population growth during the plan, and WDC should seek to plan for full identified housing needs over the plan period

Commenting:

AONB sites Report

- It was noted the assessment was guided by national policy in seeking to exclude 'major development' in the AONB, although confirmation of the management plan policies used to shape the assessment criteria would be helpful.
- The AONB draft site assessment appears to be a relatively light touch assessment, given that the sites are within the AONB
- The evidence base for the selection of an allocated site should include a landscape and visual impact assessment based on the type of development envisaged. The additional landscape assessment work undertaken at Stokenchurch and Lane End is welcomed.
- Specialist knowledge and advice will be important to finalising the report

HEDNA

- The HEDNA process doesn't appear to have been rigorously challenged by the WDC
- Queries over when the updating of the HEDNA will be publicised
- Where is the government methodology for determining housing numbers for the WDC area documented? What determined the numbers?
- The housing needs and population projections are likely to change following Brexit, hence the number of homes suggested in the plans may no longer apply. Work on

the Local Plan should be suspended until the new numbers are known, or more work done to determine the reduction in demand and this then applied to the plan.

Flooding and Water Quality

- The draft local plan should make reference to Wycombe's SFRA
- The updated level 1 SFRA doesn't make it clear in the recommendations or conclusions if a level 2 SFRA is required
- The SFRA will need updating and a sequential test will need to be produced in order for the local plan to comply with the NPPF. This update should refer to several section 19 flood investigation reports which have been published since the completion of the level 1 SFRA.
- The level two SFRA may need to go into more detail about the possible extent of the new climate change flood outline, including a flood risk and sequential test for development sites being allocated within flood zones 2 and 3
- The new Climate change allowances need to be included in the SFRA.

Evidence Base

- The predictions upon which the draft plan is constructed are unresolved, resulting the draft plan being flawed
- In the context of unmet housing needs, the approach of only considering Green belt sites adjacent to higher tier settlements needs to be explained and justified in the evidence base

Green Belt Review

- In the Green belt review there will be areas of land within wider land parcels which have different characteristics and so make different contributions to the Green Belt
- There is scope to identify some areas as weakly performing 'sub areas' and so the Part 2 Green Belt assessment should be amended to include certain sites
- Certain sites fit the criteria for why developer promoted sites are being considered and an assessment of those sites as part of the Green Belt assessment part 2 would support their development
- The parcels of land considered in the Green Belt assessment are very large, meaning proper consideration hasn't been given to smaller areas of land
- The Green Belt review part 2 was published mid-way through the consultation process and its uncertain whether consultees will have had proper opportunity to make informed responses
- The Green Belt assessment for some sites isn't an accurate reflection of those sites
- Some sites are comprised of separate parcels of land and should be assessed separately
- The valuable analysis carried out by ARUP was noted, particularly the strong justification for retaining the Green Belt in Marlow
- Alternative sites with lower ratings in ARUP's report should be considered for development
- In relation to the Green Belt Site Assessments Development Capacity (Appendix 3), the work done by officers for Holland Farm is welcomed but more work is required before arriving at a masterplan. However there was concern that it isn't clear that this

is based on preliminary work and it should be pointed out that the layout plan is only indicative

Infrastructure Report - General

- The infrastructure report predated the local plan by 2 years, so it's unlikely to reflect the current version of the local plan given it was written so far in advance
- The depth to which the draft Infrastructure delivery plan is referenced in the Local Plan is minimal. Proper answers of how infrastructure will be put in place are needed
- There is limited planning in the infrastructure plan for Marlow to consider the additional houses and the affect they'll have on overstretched resources
- Difficulty commenting on the Infrastructure delivery plan this stage as it doesn't include sufficient information, and its important this document progresses quickly

Infrastructure Report - Penn School Proposal

- The Penn School redevelopment is beyond walking distance for pupils in Holmer Green/Hazlemere housing development area
- Queries over whether the Penn School Proposal is a realistic proposition and whether the dates are already fixed by the EFA

Infrastructure Report - Education

- The proposal to increase intake at Claytons is a good idea, but the school doesn't have sufficient capacity for this number of classes
- The proposal for 15 extra places at Claytons is inadequate to support the proposed developments
- Hazlemere C of E School has not agreed to expand so there is no firm commitment for sufficient primary school places
- Adding a single form entry in Gomm Valley may mean there are enough spaces for High Wycombe, but it does little to alleviate the situation the vicinity of Terriers Farm

Infrastructure Report - Transport

- While it may be possible to widen Kingshill Drive, the scope for updated traffic infrastructure on the A404 and Totteridge Lane appears limited
- The proposed footpath along the railway is a good idea, however it won't be enough to counteract the impact of additional homes from the Bourne End development
- The schedule doesn't include any assumptions regarding infrastructure projects on the Strategic road network
- The infrastructure report should set out any strategic road network mitigation measures required to deliver the local plan
- The infrastructure report will need to set out what infrastructure is critical for development to be delivered, including funding
- Before the congestion relief package is implemented there needs to be a reconfiguration of London Road, as without this many of the proposals within the local plan won't work

Infrastructure Report - Health

- The GP provision in Hazelmere won't be accessible without car or public transport and doesn't compensate for the increased population
- There is insufficient health infrastructure to offset the increased demand as a result on BE2
- The two doctors surgeries in Bourne End are considering rationalising into one clinic with increased capacity, but no premises has been found and if the Bourne End proposals went ahead it should be a requirement that a new medical facility be built

Infrastructure Report - Bourne End

- The Draft infrastructure plan doesn't include the road between Cores End and Ferry Lane
- Flood prevention schemes at Marlow and Maidenhead will push water downstream towards Bourne End - have the implications of these schemes, on Bourne End and Wooburn Green been studied?
- Until sufficient information is available on how 500 homes will be accessed, any statements on network impacts should not be relied upon to inform decision making. The conclusions are misleading, as they state that Bourne End will not suffer from additional delays, when the consultant report reports states main roads in Bourne End and Cookham will experience significant congestion. Additional local modelling needs to be carried out.

Infrastructure Report - Sewage

- Upgrades to Little Marlow Sewage Treatment should start now and should include an early public consultation exercise. They should not be postponed until the next business period and should coincide with the development of sites. They should also be carried out to a high standard and the work should be completed by the time the new housing is occupied

Transport Modelling

- Concern that where the Countywide model overlaps with the Wycombe and Princes Risborough models the latter would take precedence, as there are inconsistencies between the growth and development assumptions between the different models, and also between each of the models and the draft local plan
- The Countywide Model doesn't meet the criteria for model validation and there is concern the model may be under representing congestion
- Validation statistics specifically on the strategic road network (SRN) are not provided so it's not possible to determine the level of validation along the SRN
- There are inconsistencies between growth assumptions tested in the Countywide Model and those presented in the Draft Local Plan
- The countywide model highlights increased travel times on the M40 but the report notes the model is unsuitable for assessing the two major junctions, and the report further questions the models suitability for assessing development impacts on the highway network in Marlow and along the A4 corridor

- The High Wycombe Highway Assignment Model focuses on the urban area of High Wycombe only and cannot be used to assess the impact of development proposals outside of this study area
- Concerns over the validation at M40 Handy Cross junction and along the M40
- The options assessed are not considered representative of the likely future traffic conditions as a result of the proposals in the Draft Plan.
- The Princes Risborough Model doesn't include any links or junctions on the SRN and so this model cannot be used to assess the impact on the SRN
- The spreadsheet model cannot forecast traffic re-assignment from one route to another when congestion arises
- Due to the limitations of the models there is insufficient evidence to determine the impact of the local plan on the SRN and it is recommended the models should be updated, reviewed and amended

Landscape Assessment of Strategic sites

- Support for the assertion that residential development would be acceptable
- Support for the recommendation development of the Terriers Farm reserve housing development be focused towards the existing settlement and that density should reduce to the east of the site
- The landscape assessment provides clear rationale for higher density within the Southern area of the proposed development and a lower density within the Eastern area
- The fields to the east of the Terriers site which the landscape assessment considered a key characteristic will provide adequate green space for local and future residents

Sustainability Appraisal - General

- A site not assessed in the SA should have been assessed, and it would have been found to have performed well which would have led to a site allocation in the Local Plan.

Sustainability Appraisal – Scoring issues

- Some of the scores given for proposals in the SA are appropriate, for BE1, BE2, BE3, HW6, HW15 and RUR13

Sustainability Appraisal – HW6 – Gomm Valley and Ashwells

- The SA shows that if development on this site were maximised, it would have a very negative impact on heritage and townscape, however with other options this effect is reduced to negative and is therefore preferable and lends support to the proposed approach of HW6 and an extension of the landscape buffer to the northern edge of the site was requested

Sustainability Appraisal – HW8 – Land off Amersham Road including Tralee Farm, Hazlemere

- The appraisal refers only to the local impact from traffic. Further analysis will need to be made on the impact of this development

Sustainability Appraisal – HW12 – Land off Penn Road, Hazlemere

- This site doesn't score any worse than other sites that the council is proposing to allocate within the draft plan

Sustainability Appraisal – HW14 – Former Bassetsbury Allotments

- Mitigation for the impact on heritage of this site should be included through a requirement to protect the setting of the conservation area and listed buildings

Sustainability Appraisal – HW16 – Land adjoining High Heavens

- The SA assessed three options for the airpark, concluding option A would be the only option with a lesser transport impact

Sustainability Appraisal – HW19 – Land at Queensway, Hazlemere

- The SA ignores the loss of this site's current recreational use
- The vague reference to access issues needs to be more fully explained, to make meaningful comments. Further consultation on this issue is needed

Sustainability Appraisal – Table 1

- Table 1 lacks mention of biodiversity. Another biodiversity issue should be included
- Point 8 should refer to the 2014 floods and associated investigations
- Point 7 should refer to the Buckinghamshire Green Infrastructure Strategy 2009, and any supplementary updates. New developments should conform to it

Sustainability Appraisal – Environment

- More emphasis should be put on improving and creating wildlife habitats
- It shouldn't be assumed all brownfield sites have poor diversity, and this is concerning due to the lack of specialist ecological advice.
- River corridors and other water resources should be recognised as part of the environmental context for the SA
- There should be climate change questions in the appraisal criteria for the Water and Flooding objective and Biodiversity and Geodiversity objective
- The criteria appraisal question relating to Green Infrastructure in objective 11 should link up with the environmental appraisal criteria in the Biodiversity and Geodiversity objective
- Climate change should be included in the points about biodiversity and flood risk in table 1
- Support for the protection of groundwater being included as an environmental issue, but this should include source protection zones 2 and 3 and principle and secondary aquifers. Pollution prevention of surface water should also be included in this section

Sustainability Appraisal – Water and Flooding

- The sustainability frame work indicator for flooding and water quality 'not to increase development in flood zones 2 and 3' should also refer to areas at risk to medium to high surface water risk, and groundwater flooding

Sustainability Appraisal – Heritage and Townscape

- Concern some implications of some options for this section of the options are recorded as unknown
- The council might look to growth to improve townscape, and therefore look to it to have an impact, but heritage should be protected as it can be negatively impacted by growth
- Concern that the focus of the methodology in Appendix B of the revised sustainability appraisal has been limited to a criteria that can be used without specialist advice
- Planning reforms will render sites in local and neighbourhood plans as having permission in principle, making point 2 in table 1 very important along with a strongly worded policy in the local plan

Sustainability Appraisal – Green Belt/ AONB

- Any exceptional circumstances are negated by WDC own assessment that environmental impacts are potentially significant
- It's important small villages are not consumed into a large conurbation and remain separate
- The SA mentions the importance of enhancing the AONB, but how will adding 2,600 homes in the Risborough area on the boundary of the AONB enhance this asset? This contrasts to the rejection of other proposals because of the effects of view on the AONB
- The assumption coalescence directly impacts community cohesion and identity was questioned. Potential coalescence can be mitigated against and is not sufficient to restrict development
- Regard should be had to the nature of existing settlement within the AONB when assessing a development's impact.

Sustainability Appraisal – Spatial distribution

- Settlements shouldn't be ruled out as unsustainable based only on current service/facility provision, and greater emphasis should be put on how settlements can be made sustainable
- The SA should consider the role development can have in enhancing rural villages and market towns, and the SA doesn't consider relevant research on this
- Not all rural areas have a lack of access to non-car modes of transport and services
- Option B refers to rural areas only in terms on Brownfield development and considers rural areas as having poor access to non-car modes causing adverse effects, but these adverse effects aren't fully considered in terms of sustainability as new methods of mitigation are becoming possible for the adverse effects of car use
- Housing needs should be met in the location in which it arises
- More emphasis should be placed on the sustainability benefits of housing growth in rural areas
- No assessment of the proposal to transfer unmet housing needs of Aylesbury Vale compared to meeting needs within Wycombe District

Sustainability Appraisal – Housing Mix

- Consideration should be given to what type of homes should be provided before making a judgement on the sustainability of individual sites or communities
- Smaller development shouldn't be ruled out based on the assumption development is of the same form whether in a larger or smaller settlements

Sustainability Appraisal – Environmental report

- Concern that delays or failure to present an environmental report then its costs for the council taxpayers may be increased

Sustainability Appraisal – Lack of repor/timings

- There is no SA assessment relating to the DNLP
- The evidence base supporting the DNLP refers to an initial SA of February 2014 to a previous exercise and scoping document of 2013
- Without an SA for the DNLP, the SA/SEA process won't have been conducted satisfactorily, and such a document will need to be subject to consultation
- The late publication of the SA means it is doubtful if it has informed the draft plan, which would be contrary to the NPPF. There was little warning or notification of the publication, so there was a lack of opportunity to make informed responses, and the manner of the publication was prejudicial to a fair and transparent consultation process.
- The consultation period should have been extended to account for the late publication of the SA.
- The Local Plan cannot proceed until the SA has been finalised and the two documents aligned and subject the further consultation

Sustainability Appraisal – Alternatives

- There should be the opportunity to review options B – D, as only details of scenario A i.e the local plan, are given, out of the 6 cited alternatives scenarios

Sustainability Appraisal – Employment

- Scenarios are given for increasing employment, but these lack explanation on how this will be done, and clarification on the methodology is needed
- Given the uncertainty in meeting employment targets, could industrial sites be set aside for housing?
- The SA doesn't include consideration of tourism potential, and such consideration could include identification of further employment opportunities

Sustainability Appraisal – Transport

- The appraisal comments the A4010 will be a hindrance due to congestion but no suggestion is made to improve these issues
- Emphasis in 'warehousing' to generate employment poses transport sustainability issues not discussed

- Whilst transport is considered, the SA does not draw conclusions about possible impacts on the strategic road network of each option and/or the level of mitigation required
- The Risborough area has the same hierarchal development rating as Marlow, despite superior transport links. The conditions of this hierarchical status seem limited, and not reflect the reality, and outlying areas of Wycombe being given a status of 5 is hard to understand

Sustainability Appraisal – Housing Needs

- The SA doesn't provide a specific and evidence based rationale as to why higher levels of provision than in option A for housing levels could not be accommodated
- Option A for the level of housing provision has fewer negative impacts, but the rest have more positives.
- The SA considers major expansion of the transport network, and potential growth at Kimble, Saunderton and Stokenchurch. There is land available at little Kimble, close to the rail station, outside the AONB and this option should assessed and the potential for development at this site warrant further consideration.
- The conclusion the Terrick/ Ellesborough option isn't realistic for a potential new settlement is welcomed.
- Further testing of development options warrants further consideration.

The process

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|------------|----|----------|---|----------|---|
| Respondents: | A Vaughan (DNLP 0872) G Markham (DNLP 1043) J Gibbings (DNLP 1051) G Kenward (DNLP 1089) M & J King (DNLP 1175) S D'Alton (DNLP 1332) S Jones (DNLP 1405) F Wadman (DNLP 1467) L Meakes (DNLP 1609) Multronics Ltd. (DNLP 1643) C Chan (DNLP 1678) C Padley (DNLP 1692) J & S Seber (DNLP 1701) A Stevenson (DNLP 1781) S & P Rawbone (DNLP 1791) P Bowen (DNLP 2151) M Crowther (DNLP 2210) Mr & Mrs J Anderson (DNLP 2216) M Ashford (DNLP 2233) A Bowers (DNLP 2260) S Chappell & A Scott (DNLP 2298) Wooburn & Bourne End Parish Council (DNLP 2442) R Green (DNLP 2451) S Wood (DNLP 2475) J Rowe (DNLP 2476) J Burnham (DNLP 2638) J Southworth & Residents (DNLP 2651) Penn Parish Council (DNLP 2660) M Goodall (DNLP 2667) J Hayden (DNLP 2685) Turley (Testament Trumps Ltd) (DNLP 2739) E Stoelker (DNLP 2766) N Cook (DNLP 2902) S Allom (DNLP 2906) M Hayes (DNLP 2948) S Watkin (DNLP 2973) Valley Plus (DNLP 2810) R Whitnall (DNLP 1785) P O'Brien (DNLP 1982) D Chapman (DNLP 2065) I Howe (DNLP 2281) P Slator (DNLP 2119) M Careless (DNLP 2462) | | | | | | |
| Number of Representations: | 43 | Objection: | 42 | Support: | 1 | Comment: | 0 |

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting:

- The website is good and easy to use.

Objecting:

- Consultation took place over a holiday period when people were away.
- Website was down for maintenance during the end of the consultation period.
- Time period given to respond was too short. It should have been longer than the legal minimum of six weeks given the nature of the proposals.
- There was not enough advance notice of the public meetings.
- Meetings were not informative / staff did not provide the desired answers. No representation by the Princes Risborough steering group at the Princes Risborough meetings.
- There were too few public notices of the proposals.
- Not everybody received a leaflet notifying them of the proposals. Or those that did receive the leaflet had too little time to produce a properly reasoned response.
- Residents of Chiltern District who were near to two of the proposed allocations were not notified. Residents of Bourne End near to the development sites were not notified.
- The Plan's consultation period is not in line with Chiltern DC's therefore there is a lack of joined up approach to public engagement.
- Local councillors / parish councils / residents associations were not involved in the process early enough.
- The Sustainability Appraisal should have been published with the main Local Plan at the start of the consultation period.
- The responses to the Princes Risborough Town Plan should have been published before the start of the consultation period.
- A Neighbourhood Plan is being prepared for the Wooburn and Bourne End parish. Development of the Local Plan should be suspended until the Neighbourhood Plan process is concluded.
- Concern that the draft Plan has literally been thrown together with little ground-roots research, empathy and local knowledge.
- WDC has failed to provide sufficient publically available information on the process
- WDC have deliberately made responding the local plan complicated and difficult

Commenting:

- Desire to see the evidence that all the necessary investigations and studies into feasibility are carried out before building is even contemplated.

Duty to Cooperate

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Respondents: | Oxfordshire County Council (DNLP 1282) 'pdbpoet' (DNLP 1519) B Bradford (DNLP 1072) D Lyons (DNLP 1406) S Bassfordn (DNLP 1419) C Clayton (DNLP 1763) N Draffan (DNLP 1325) C Floud (DNLP 1414) P Braithwaite (DNLP 1362) V Brookhouse (DNLP 1340) J Dowson (DNLP 2548) M Watkins (DNLP 1339) C & R Forrest (DNLP 1724) H Bryant (DNLP 1372) M McPartlan (DNLP 1053) V Otter (DNLP 1013) C Matthews (DNLP 1677) O Belgrove (DNLP 2170) C Dodds (DNLP 1754) C Oswald (DNLP 1094) J Proctor (DNLP 1726) J Stevens (DNLP 1345) A Smith (DNLP 1694) E Tyrrell (DNLP 1060) M Walker (DNLP 1793) C Tyrell (DNLP 1733) C Oswald (DNLP 1095) J Hughes (DNLP 1788) C Roberts-Smith (DNLP 1753) M Richmond (DNLP 1023) A Watkins (DNLP 1326) J Harvey (DNLP 1516) J & B Warner (DNLP 1514) L Eldred (DNLP 2689) S Harrison (DNLP 2003) A & S Kimpton (DNLP 3096) A Nicholls (DNLP 2627) R & C Thorogood (DNLP 1309) J & M Wentworth (DNLP 2867) J Corcoran (DNLP 2917) T Cawte (DNLP 2880) I Rodger (DNLP 2038) R Reeves (DNLP 1269) S & J O'Sullivan (DNLP 1540) K Slade (DNLP 1179) Little Horwood Parish Council (DNLP 1185) R Barrie (DNLP 2010) I & S Harper (DNLP 2254) P Brown (DNLP 2899) M Glanfield (DNLP 2631) |
|--------------|--|

G Van de Poll (DNLP 1191)
 G Bowe (DNLP 2270)
 K Harvey (DNLP 1128)
 S Gomm (DNLP 2296)
 J Bernard (DNLP 1530)
 Mr & Mrs S Kempt (DNLP 2852)
 J Brandis (DNLP 2209)
 J Hill (DNLP 1125)
 D Chandler (DNLP 1148)
 J Wood (DNLP 2855)
 Mr & Mrs M Scully (DNLP 2856)
 P Harvey (DNLP 2659)
 B Otter (DNLP 1134)
 E Van De Poll (DNLP 2266)
 P Kneafsey (DNLP 2268)
 Winslow Town Council (DNLP 2836)
 M Sadler (DNLP 1658)
 S Busler (DNLP 1252)
 Bidwells (Careys New Homes)(DNLP 1747)
 Future of Our Village (DNLP 2398)
 R Floud (DNLP 1682)
 H Eccles (DNLP 2907)
 S Sharp (DNLP 1423)
 R Kendall (DNLP 2673)
 G Tyack (DNLP 1686)
 G Markham (DNLP 1043)
 T Shaw (DNLP 2999)
 P Jeffery (DNLP 2997)
 C & S Longman (DNLP 1304)
 Aylesbury Vale District Council (DNLP 2837)
 H Harvey (DNLP 1358)
 N Davies (DNLP 1359)
 P Tracy (DNLP 1028)
 South Oxfordshire District Council (DNLP 3088)
 M Powell (DNLP 1748)
 G Richmond (DNLP 1016)
 Chiltern & South Bucks District Council (DNLP 2698)
 B Moore (DNLP 1750)
 Home Builders Federation Ltd (DNLP 2850)
 PPML Consulting Ltd (St Congar Land) (DNLP 2853)
 J Milburn (DNLP 2343)
 Gladman Developments (DNLP 2804)
 Upper Hedsor Road Residents Association (DNLP 1178)
 P Milburn (DNLP 2247)
 M Eldred (DNLP 1264)
 Hambleton Parish Council (DNLP 0331)
 W Streule (DNLP 2912)
 I L Beeks Ltd (DNLP 1351)
 Wokingham Borough Council (DNLP 3066)
 S Watts (DNLP 0643)
 L & E Hosking (DNLP 2283)
 R Sadler (DNLP 2282)
 Bracknell Forest Council (DNLP 3076)
 S James (DNLP 2525)
 J Baker (DNLP 2944)

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Hart & East Hamps District Council (DNLP 0087)</p> <p>J Gower (DNLP 2970)</p> <p>N Davies (DNLP 2602)</p> <p>M Hosking (DNLP 1809)</p> <p>S & P Rawbone (DNLP 1791)</p> <p>I Brooke (DNLP 2603)</p> <p>A McRonald (DNLP 2609)</p> <p>R Spurrell (DNLP 2961)</p> <p>R Belgrove (DNLP 2607)</p> <p>J & S Keane (DNLP 2302)</p> <p>M Garlick (DNLP 1241)</p> <p>D Garlick (DNLP 1237)</p> <p>P Ffello (DNLP 2617)</p> <p>S Brown (DNLP 0076)</p> <p>J Nicholson (DNLP 1865)</p> <p>J McNeil (DNLP 3024)</p> <p>A Matthews (DNLP 1599)</p> <p>M Taylor (DNLP 1276)</p> <p>G Batchelor (DNLP 3072)</p> <p>I Holmes (DNLP 1822)</p> <p>S Devas (DNLP 1890)</p> <p>Paul Dickinson & Associates (Mr & Mrs Capp) (DNLP 2847)</p> <p>M Mingos (DNLP 1534)</p> <p>J & J Robinson (DNLP 3060)</p> <p>Newton Longville Parish Council (DNLP 2958)</p> <p>J O'Hare (DNLP 2223)</p> <p>T Hosking (DNLP 2374)</p> <p>Whaddon Parish Council (DNLP 2817)</p> <p>R Jackson (DNLP 1288)</p> <p>W Peel (DNLP 1813)</p> <p>R Moore (DNLP 1551)</p> <p>F Gemmell (DNLP 1856)</p> <p>J Blagden (DNLP 2808)</p> <p>D Roberts (DNLP 2362)</p> <p>Mr & Mrs P Mostyn (DNLP 2078)</p> <p>T Curtis (DNLP 1589)</p> <p>L Sadler (DNLP 2264)</p> <p>G Culverhouse (DNLP 1582)</p> <p>R Landells (DNLP 2090)</p> <p>G Grover (DNLP 1591)</p> <p>M Bygate (DNLP 1595)</p> <p>Haddenham Parish Council (DNLP 2819)</p> <p>Great Horwood Parish Council (DNLP 1580)</p> <p>P Land (DNLP 2087)</p> <p>K Kelly (DNLP 2259)</p> <p>C Pusey (DNLP 1564)</p> <p>B Whitnall (DNLP 1545)</p> <p>J Dowson (DNLP 3064)</p> <p>M & E Holt (DNLP 1596)</p> <p>M Staff (DNLP 1247)</p> <p>Hawks Hill & Widmoor Resident's Group (DNLP 0987)</p> <p>F Kelly (DNLP 0986)</p> <p>S & T Reeves (DNLP 1900)</p> <p>Hedsor Parish Meeting (DNLP 1925)</p> <p>L & A McRonald (1940)</p> |
|--|--|

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|------------|-----|----------|---|----------|----|
| | P Hardcastle (1944) | | | | | | |
| Number of Representations: | 161 | Objection: | 131 | Support: | 3 | Comment: | 27 |

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting:

- Joint-working within the Buckinghamshire authorities to meet unmet need through the Duty to Cooperate is supported.
- Passing unmet needs to neighbouring authorities through the duty to cooperate resulting in the protection of landscape designations is supported.
- Engagement over cross-boundary issues through the duty to cooperate is supported.
- Up until the date of this Plan, WDC have successfully met the duty to cooperate with some neighbouring authorities.

Objecting:

- Housing need should be met within the District's own administrative boundary.
- Objection to WDC passing unmet need to neighbouring authorities through the duty to cooperate, whilst having allocations with very low densities.
- WDC have not successfully demonstrated that they cannot meet all their need within their District.
- Passing unmet needs to neighbouring districts will result in inappropriate development to accommodate extra houses.
- Plan process is abusing the duty to cooperate to evade responsibility of meeting all housing need.
- Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty landscape designations do not excuse passing unmet need to neighbouring authorities.
- It is not fair for High Wycombe to propose 10% growth whilst neighbouring authorities are proposing 45% growth to accommodate unmet needs.
- In its current form, the draft Plan has not met the Duty to Cooperate.
- There is insufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with the Duty to Cooperate.

Commenting:

- Duty to Cooperate process should be more engaged with the public, rather than between organizations.
- If other neighbouring authorities have demonstrated a reduction in their housing need, WDC must use the duty to cooperate to pass over additional unmet need to prevent removal of Green Belt land which may be detrimental to areas of the District.
- With sites that are adjoining a District boundary, there must be firm cooperation between the neighbouring authority to comprehensively examine and deliver the site.
- WDC must demonstrate an open dialogue with neighbouring HMAs and FEMAs under duty to cooperate, as there are links to neighbouring areas such as Reading, Slough, Windsor and Maidenhead, Greater London, and South Bucks.

- WDC must actively engage with neighbouring authorities on cross-boundary impacts of development in order to successfully meet the duty to cooperate.
- Currently established Memorandums of Understanding will need to be altered in light of the change in plan period.
- A firm agreement to agree the meeting of unmet need but be established as soon as possible.
- Whilst Wycombe's view is that the infrastructure requirements of these large developments do not appear to impact on neighbouring districts, this is something the councils will need to explore further.
- Agreement on housing figures and unmet need must be certain before agreeing for neighbouring authorities to meet it.
- Concerns over the impact of public opposition and the duty to cooperate.
- When passing unmet need to a neighbouring authority it is important that they are able to meet their own need also.
- Knock-on effect of passing unmet needs must be addressed.
- Unmet employment needs as well as housing needs need to be addressed.
- List of Duty to Cooperate bodies needs to be reviewed.
- In order to ensure that this Plan does not fail, the duty to cooperate must be effectively demonstrated.
- Meeting unmet need through the duty to cooperate is not a reliant solution.
- More sharing with neighbouring authorities should be pursued

NB – Many of the objections were additionally logged under Core Policy: CP2 - Spatial Strategy

Additional Policy Suggestions

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|------------|---|----------|---|----------|----|
| Respondents: | <p>N & M Harrison (DNLP 0557) J & J Russell (DNLP 0897) Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council (DNLP 1297) Chilterns Conservation Board (DNLP 1390) N Walklin (DNLP 1437) R Moore (DNLP 1492) C Walklin (DNLP 1584) M Walklin (DNLP 1659) Buckinghamshire County Council (DNLP 1674) E Bowman (DNLP 1717) J Munro (DNLP 1732) Historic England (DNLP 1798) M Oliver (DNLP 1818) V Summerlin (DNLP 2026) J Mornement (DNLP 2031) J Summerlin (DNLP 2039) J Gatfield (DNLP 2111) A Moore (DNLP 2301) G Crichton (DNLP 2338) Future of Our Village (DNLP 2398) S Wilson (DNLP 2487) P Platt (DNLP 2494) C White (DNLP 2495) L Anderson (DNLP 2624) J Southworth & Residents (DNLP 2651) N Donkin (DNLP 2668) Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682) M Anderson (DNLP 2703) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust BBOWT (DNLP 2714) L Cleere (DNLP 2750) P Clements (DNLP 2753) M Mulcahy (DNLP 2788) Phillips Planning Services Ltd (Cherrilow Ltd) (DNLP 2811) C Lane (DNLP 2824) Environment Agency (DNLP 2857) S Carter (DNLP 2864) J Drayton (DNLP 2870) High Wycombe Society (DNLP 2877) M Holmes (DNLP 2909) R Walklin (DNLP 2916) F Moss (DNLP 2919) J & S Cleere (DNLP 2994) M Overall (DNLP 3044) Fair Ridge, Spinney and Foxleigh Resident's Association (DNLP 3067) F Kelly (DNLP 0986)</p> | | | | | | |
| Number of Representations: | 45 | Objection: | 0 | Support: | 0 | Comment: | 45 |

Summary of issues/comments:

The following additional policies were suggested:

- Policy C16 of the Local Plan should be retained.
- Core Strategy policy CS20 should either be retained or its eight key points incorporated into policy DM32.
- A policy setting out a strong stance on water and sewerage infrastructure is needed, either using point 8 of existing Core Strategy policy CS20 or similar wording.
- A policy (or policies) on archaeology and the historic environment should be included within the Plan, positively worded in accordance with the NPPF.
- A policy safeguarding an area in the north-west of the district for a potential Upper Thames Reservoir site should be included.
- Either a policy is needed to ensure net gains in biodiversity are achieved, or otherwise a modification of policy DM33 to achieve the same ends.
- A policy recognising and encouraging the conservation of Fawley Court should be added.
- Either a policy in the style of CF7 in respect of recognising different types of burials is needed within the Local Plan, or policy HW19 needs to be adjusted to accommodate the same.
- A policy protected the quality of the River Thames valley corridor should be considered.
- A policy should be added to protect the water environment in the style of policies CS4 and CS17.
- Further green spaces were put forward for consideration of protection under the existing green space policy.
- Add a policy for protecting dark skies in rural areas, as shown in the PRTP.

Site Suggestions

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Respondents: | <p> SL8 5TP (DNLP 0002) C Havelock (DNLP 0035) J Evans (DNLP 0051) D Stone (DNLP 0115) L Cornish (DNLP 0141) N Cornish (DNLP 0157) D Holloway (DNLP 0183) N Hutchinson & L Lowe (DNLP 0243) A Gray (DNLP 0252) M Cowan (DNLP 0268) B Pearce (DNLP 0326) R Lewis (DNLP 0336) J Gill (DNLP 0346) P Bacon (DNLP 0351) Strutt & Parker LLP (Whitepit Lane) (DNLP 0405) P Simpson (DNLP 0425) L Whitnall (DNLP 0455) I Benfell (DNLP 0543) P Batey (DNLP 0545) G & H Glynn (DNLP 0583) A Eden (DNLP 0653) M Simons (DNLP 0801) D Hallett (DNLP 0808) J Large (DNLP 0961) G Greenhous (DNLP 0991) J Saint (DNLP 0993) H Budd (DNLP 0995) B Tilley (DNLP 1024) E Bullimore (DNLP 1055) E Collingwood (DNLP 1096) C Roberts (DNLP 1162) A Dawes (DNLP 1165) P Tripp (DNLP 1263) Storage King (DNLP 1420) Savills (Marlow Football Club & Flackwell Heath Football Club) (DNLP 1507) N Dormand (DNLP 1531) L Parkins (DNLP 1546) C Taplin (DNLP 1603) Rackham Planning (Residents of Lammas Way Lane End) (DNLP 1680) Tim Russ & Company (Mr & Mrs Hebbourne) (DNLP 1696) Progress Planning (DNLP 1714) R Deed (DNLP 1729) Bidwells (Careys New Homes) (DNLP 1747) Carter Jonas LLP (J Perkins) (DNLP 1766) Scottwood Homes (DNLP 1794) R Reynolds (DNLP 1850) Nexus Planning (Inland Homes) (DNLP 2445) Land and Partners Ltd (DNLP 2452) Shanly Homes Ltd (DNLP 2453) Mr & Mrs P Suchowierchi (DNLP 2467) Pimms Action Group (DNLP 2680) DP Architects Ltd (Mr & Mrs Redgrove) (DNLP 2693) </p> |
|--------------|---|

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--------------|------------|---|----------|----|
| | <p>Turley (NWE Marlow Ltd) (DNLP 2709) DWD LLP (Costco Wholesale UK Ltd) (DNLP 2716) Turley (Testament Trump Ltd) (DNLP 2739) Strutt & Parker LLP (Land off Park Lane Lane End) (DNLP 2761) Carter Jonas (The Wycliffe Centre) (DNLP 2764) DP Architects Ltd (Mr & Mrs Stoddard) (DNLP 2778) PJ Planning (DNLP 2783) Kemp & Kemp (Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd) (DNLP 2785) J Hotson (DNLP 2796) Gladman Developments (DNLP 2804) Savills (Mr Giles & Mr Emmett) (DNLP 2805) Phillips Planning Services Ltd (Cherrilow Ltd) (DNLP 2811) Iceni Projects (EA Strategic Land LLP) (DNLP 2820) Wilks Head & Eve LLP (Molins PLC) (DNLP 2826) RPS Group (Halsbury Homes) (DNLP 2840) Paul Dickinson & Associates (Mr & Mrs Capp) (DNLP 2847) PPML Consulting Ltd (St Congar Land) (DNLP 2853) Armstrong Rigg Planning (Janson's West London & Thames Valley Ltd) (DNLP 2859) West Waddy ADP (R J & S Styles) (DNLP 2875) JSB Planning (Mr I Middleton) (DNLP 2951) Pritchett Planning Consultancy (BAM Glory Park Ltd) (DNLP 2977) JSB Planning Law (Mr A Digby-Hunt) (DNLP 3047) JSB Planning Law (Mr & Mrs G Pond) (DNLP 3048) J Brearley (DNLP 3052) Village Foundations Ltd. (DNLP 3079) Lane End Parish Council (DNLP 0005) S Parmoor (DNLP 3100) A Fitch (DNLP 3001) Bell Cornwell LLP (Folbro Y Limited) (DNLP 2652) D Chapman (DNLP 2065) J Slack (DNLP 2147) C Bartier (DNLP 2188) M Parkins (DNLP 2149) R Dennis (DNLP 2174) P Sears (DNLP 2773) J Dusterville (DNLP 2482) M Parkins (DNLP 2149) R Dennis (DNLP 2147) C Hunter (DNLP 2288) S Kemp (DNLP 2292) Mr & Mrs Brennan (DNLP 2383) C White (DNLP 2495) J Harris (DNLP 2542) M Eldin (DNLP 2674) K Huckle (DNLP 2924) J Huckle (DNLP 2927)</p> | | | | | |
| Number of Representations: | 98 | Objection: 0 | Support: 0 | 0 | Comment: | 98 |

Summary of sites suggested:

Additions to proposed site allocations

- Common Wood House and Land adjacent to Penn Road, Hazlemere - Suggested as an additional parcel to accompany HW12 Land off Penn Road, Hazlemere
- Former Hillside Centre and Albany House, Leigh Street area, High Wycombe - Suggested as an additional parcel to accompany HW13 Leigh Street, Desborough area, High Wycombe
- Land to the rear of Horns Lane, Booker - Suggested as an additional parcel to accompany HW11 Horns Lane, Booker
- Little Studdridge, Stokenchurch - Suggested as an additional parcel to accompany RUR12 land south of Mill Road, Stokenchurch
- Southern section of Gomm Valley, High Wycombe - Suggested as an additional parcel to accompany HW6 Gomm Valley and Ashwells, High Wycombe
- Former Newtown Pit, Fieldhouse Lane, Marlow – Suggested as additional car parking to MR8 Globe Park and RUR6 Little Marlow Lakes Country Park

Suggestions for additional sites to be allocated in the Plan

- Booker Airpark, High Wycombe
- Burleighfield House, London Road, Loudwater
- Flackwell Heath Football Club grounds
- Furze Farm, Marlow Bottom
- Heath End Farm, Flackwell Heath
- Land at 108 Wycombe Road and Land at Poppy Road, Princes Risborough
- Land at Bledlow road, Saunderton
- Land at Chapman Lane, Bourne End
- Land at Cressex Island, High Wycombe (for mixed retail / residential development)
- Land at Fawley Court, Fawley (for conservation / restoration. Minimal housing suggested)
- Land at Grange Road, Widmer End
- Land at Holtspur Avenue, Wooburn Green
- Land at The Swilley, Wash Hill, Bourne End
- Land east of Church Road, Lane End
- Land off Park Lane, Lane End
- Land at Westhorpe Park, Marlow
- Land off Whitepit Lane, Wooburn
- Land South of Marlow Road, Well End
- Land to the rear of 1-5 Lammas Way, Lane End
- Land to the south east of Grove Lane, Little Kimble
- Land West of Kingsley Drive, Marlow Bottom
- Lane End playing fields
- Marlow Football Club grounds
- Molins Sports Ground, Princes Risborough
- Old Moor Lane, High Wycombe
- Park Mill Farm, Princes Risborough

- The Paddock, New Road, Stokenchurch
- Woodland adjacent to Fieldhead Gardens, Bourne End
- Wycliffe Centre, Horsleys Green
- Blind Lane Grassy Area, Bourne End
- Wabourne Road Council Estate

Sites suggested as alternatives to Green Belt / AONB development

- Highbury Works, Hazlemere - previously developed land / existing employment land
- Land at Grafton Street, High Wycombe - previously developed land / existing employment land
- former Marlow gravel pits
- Land at Wharf Lane Business Centre, Bourne End - previously developed land / existing employment land
- Land North of Hughenden Avenue / Southern De La Rue premises, Coates Lane, High Wycombe - previously developed land / existing employment land
- Land off Lower Icknield Way / north of Mill Lane Princes Risborough - Greenfield site located outside the Green Belt / AONB
- Land off Mill Lane, Princes Risborough - Greenfield site located outside the Green Belt / AONB
- Marlow trading estate - previously developed land / existing employment land. Suggested as an alternative to MR6 Seymour Court Road, Marlow, and MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Molins Site, Saunderton - previously developed land / existing employment land
- Remainder of Glory Park, Wooburn Green - previously developed land / existing employment land
- Unused industrial sites in Bourne End and Wooburn - previously developed land / existing employment land. Suggested as an alternative to BE1 Slate Meadow, Bourne End, BE2 Hollands Farm, Bourne End, and BE3 Northern Heights, Bourne End
- Sappers Field, Harvest Hill – Suggested as an alternative to sites within the Green Belt.

Sites proposed as alternatives to site allocations

- Adjacent to Marlow Bypass (A4155 junction), Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Allotment Gardens, Berwick Road, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Allotment Gardens, Dedmere Rise, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Berwick Road/Mundaydean Lane, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Globe Park, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Hanging Hill Allotments, Prospect Road, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Harleyford Golf Club, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Heavens Above, 16 High Heavens Wood, Marlow Bottom - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow

- Land beyond Beechwood Drive, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Land near Spadeoak, Bourne End - Suggested as an alternative site to BE1 Slate Meadow, Bourne End, BE2 Hollands Farm, Bourne End, and BE3 Northern Heights, Bourne End
- Extension of mobile home park at Westhorpe Park, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Near Marlow Common, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- North and West of Spinfield School (aka Kings Estate Forty Green), Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- North of Beechwood Drive, West of Spinfield Mount & Highfield Park, East of Hooks Lane proceeding out of Marlow on the A4155 towards Danesfield, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- OS Parcel 3545 Mundaydean Lane, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow, to come forward alongside MR6 Seymour Court Road
- Recreation Ground, Seymour Park Road, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Site to the left of Tralee Farm, Hazlemere - Suggested as an alternative site to HW8 Tralee Farm, Hazlemere
- Spinfield School playing field, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Land bordered by A404, Wycombe Road, Pump Lane North, A4155, and Wiltshire Road, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Tralee Farm, Hazlemere - Suggested allocation as a cemetery instead of HW19 land at Queensway, Hazlemere.
- Western side of Lane End Road, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Westward expansion of Chiltern Road, Marlow - Suggested as an alternative site to MR6 Seymour Court Road, Marlow, and MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow
- Wood Farm, Stokenchurch - Suggested as an addition or alternative to RUR12 Mill Road, Stokenchurch
- Westhorpe Farm and other areas of Marlow Bottom/Little Marlow – Suggested as an alternative site to BE1 Slate Meadow, BE2 Hollands Farm and BE3 Northern Heights.
- Site adjoining Westhorpe Lane and recreation ground – Suggested as an alternative site to BE1 Slate Meadow.
- Soho Mills Industrial Estate – Suggested as an alternative site to BE1 Slate Meadow
- Well End area of Bourne End – Suggested as an alternative development area to BE1 Slate Meadow, BE2 Hollands Farm, and BE3 Northern Heights.
- Land by Holtspur Hill, A40 and Broad Lane – Suggested as alternative site to BE1 Slate Meadow.
- Bassetsbury Manor Allotments – Suggested as an alternative site for a cemetery instead of HW19 Queensway, Hazlemere.
- Sands recreational area off West Wycombe Road & Mill End Road - Suggested as an alternative site for a cemetery instead of HW19 Queensway, Hazlemere.

- New settlement should be built a few fields away from Marlow to create green space between Marlow and new houses – Suggested as an alternative proposal to MR7 Oak Tree Road, Marlow.
- The old High Wycombe Leisure Centre – Suggested as an alternative site to MR7
- The site next to Sunny Bank – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- Marlow Football Club grounds – Suggested as an alternative site to MR7
- Flackwell Heath Football Club grounds – Suggested as an alternative site to MR7
- Marlow and Forty Green Allotments – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- The site of the proposed travel lodge – Suggested as an alternative to MR 7
- The area adjacent to Marlow Railway station – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- High Wycombe – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- The area RUR 6 – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- Land at Westhorpe Park – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- Land between Marlow and Lane end, or Land between Marlow and Henley – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- The fields to the South of the A4155 near to the new running track off Pump Lane – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- Land by Station Approach and Fieldhouse way – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- The area west of Marlow along Henley Road – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- Land Adjoining the A404 by the Bourne End roundabout – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- Seymour Court Recreation Grounds – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- Housing at RAF Medmenham – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- RAF Houses off Henley Road – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- The Road from Marlow to Handy Cross – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- Development East and West of Marlow and in neighbouring towns – suggested as an alternative to MR7
- The field between Seymour court road and Berwick Road – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- Oak Tree Road Allotments – suggested as an alternative to MR7
- Brownfield sites in the Cressex Industrial area – Suggested as an alternative to HW8
- Commercial areas along Desborough Avenue/Green Street area – suggested as an alternative to HW8
- The undeveloped Hillside land along Marlow Hill – Suggested as an alternative to HW8
- Council maintain parkland areas on the Shelley Road estate, the Rye, Fryers Lane, Castlefield Wood, Kings Wood from Baring road to Amersham – Suggested as an alternative to HW8
- Land at Dedmere Road/ Station Road – Suggested as an alternative to MR7
- Land by the M40 services at Beaconsfield – Suggested as an alternative to BE1 and BE2
- Dormant business parks in Bourne End – Suggested as an alternative to BE1 and BE2
- The allotments in Naphill and Walters Ash – Suggested as an alternative to RUR11
- Land alongside the Risborough to Aylesbury Railway – Suggested as an alternative to the Princes Risborough Expansion Plan

Comments on other aspects of the draft Plan

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|--|------------|----|----------|---|----------|----|
| Respondents: | E Ley & V Cano (DNLP 0120) JPPC Chartered Town Planners (DNLP 0361) M Heys (DNLP 0625) J Heys (DNLP 0627) Penn and Tylers Green Residents Society (DNLP 0696) P Putman (DNLP 0697) R Heaton (DNLP 0748) J Curry (DNLP 0877) G Markham (DNLP 1043) J & I Kenny (DNLP 1182) R Alabaster (DNLP 1188) M40 Chilterns Environmental Group (DNLP 1193) Mr & Mrs G Mansfield (DNLP 1201) J Vincent (DNLP 1350) C Wilson (DNLP 1449) I & M Barber (DNLP 1456) J & J Harrison (DNLP 1539) T & G Barlow (DNLP 1700) J Alabaster (DNLP 1757) A Blakeborough (DNLP 1783) R Farmer (DNLP 1960) L Parsons (DNLP 1997) C Barlow (DNLP 2093) B Harding (DNLP 2127) B Bull (DNLP 2524) K Banner (DNLP 2527) M Goodall (DNLP 2667) Savills (Thames Water) (DNLP 2682) P Morris (DNLP 2740) Turville Parish Council (DNLP 2797) V West (DNLP 2957) B & R Whitten (DNLP 1526) P Duffy (DNLP 0265) | | | | | | |
| Number of Representations: | 33 | Objection: | 17 | Support: | 2 | Comment: | 14 |

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting:

Junction 3A

- Limited support was received for the concept of an additional motorway junction along the lines of previous proposals for a "junction 3A".

Objecting:

Appendices

- Sites included in appendix D should be removed as they are no longer in employment use / commercially viable for employment use.
- Objections were also received for the deletion of Local Plan policy C16 (Appendix H), which were accompanied by a request to reinstate the policy. These are captured in the “policy suggestions” summary.
- Objections were received in respect of sites not being included in the list of housing allocations in appendix B. These objections are summarised in the summary of policy DM21.
- Objections and comments in respect of sites for travellers are recorded in the summary of policy DM26.

Junction 3A

- Objections were received in respect of the proposals for a new motorway junction, “junction 3A”, originally mooted in 2014 but not included in this draft of the Local Plan. Objections included allegations of a lack of proper consideration, and traffic impact on the local road network, particularly traffic moving up Cock Lane / Hammersley Lane / the proposed Gomm Valley spine road.

Commenting:

Appendices

- Omissions from the list of villages in the Settlement Hierarchy in appendix A
- No mention of expanding GP provision in Marlow in the infrastructure schedule in appendix F.
- Comments were also received suggesting additional sites be added to the list of housing allocations in appendix B. These are summarised in the “site suggestions” summary.

The UK’s vote to leave the EU (“Brexit”)

- Brexit will change farming practices and farmland is an important asset. As much farmland as possible will be need as the future requirement for farmlands is unknown.
- Following Brexit, the environment and conservation will suffer due to loss of European legislation, so WDC should consider very carefully any plans to develop Green Belt, defending the Green Belt effectively and scaling back on new builds.
- Concern over commitment to infrastructure as governments funds are reducing as following Brexit.
- House Prices are already suffering due to Brexit and developing on AONB/ Green Belt land will reduce prices further.
- Brexit has demonstrated the concern over strain on local services. This message should be considered when assessing proposals.
- Following Brexit, the country is now in a position where it can make its own decisions and there is the opportunity to enhance the quality of life for people who live here, but

this can't be done by destroying Green Belt and causing congestion and stress to those who live in the area.

Junction 3A

- Some comments were received questioning the absence of junction 3A from the draft Local Plan.