


Statement of Consultation - Appendix 5

**Wycombe District Local Plan
New Local Plan Options Consultation –
Events feedback – initial summary report
(July 2014)**



Wycombe District Council

New Local Plan Options Consultation – Events feedback – initial summary report

July 2014

Contents

| | Page |
|---|------|
| 1. Executive Summary | 3 |
| 2. Background | 3 |
| 3. Programme and format of meetings | 4 |
| 4. South West Chiltern - 26 February 2014, Stokenchurch | 8 |
| 5. North West Chiltern - 27 February 2014, Hughenden Valley. | 10 |
| 6. Marlow - 4th March 2014, Marlow | 15 |
| 7. High Wycombe – 6th March 2014, High Wycombe | 25 |
| 8. Chepping Wye Valley - 10 th March 2014 and 24 th March 2014, Bourne End. | 36 |
| 9. Princes Risborough - - 17 th March, Princes Risborough | 46 |
| 10. Event organisation feedback | 54 |
| Appendix 1 Legacy Comments | 56 |

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. Wycombe District Council consulted on the New Local Plan options consultation document between 3rd February and 21st April 2014.
- 1.2. This document summarises the issues and questions that were raised at the public meetings and workshops that were organised as part of the consultation. The views and issues raised are based on questions asked at the meetings as well as notes taken by members of staff.
- 1.3. This document does not contain a summary of the written responses that were submitted to the Council in response to the consultation, these will be included in a formal consultation report that will be produced by the Council in the autumn. That report will also incorporate the feedback from the events and other feedback received.
- 1.4. Over 2000 people attended the consultation events. Participants included ward members, representatives from parish and town councils, members of local amenity groups and residents.
- 1.5. The District Council wishes to thank all those who attended these events.

2. Background

- 2.1. The Council began work on the New Wycombe District Local Plan in late 2012. The new Local Plan will set out strategic policies and allocate sites to meet local needs in terms of housing, employment and infrastructure and a range of other issues.
- 2.2. It will replace the remaining saved policies in our current Local Plan as well as the Core Strategy, and sit alongside the Delivery and Site Allocations Plan which was adopted on the 16th July 2013.
- 2.3. The Council is committed to engaging with communities in the preparation of its plans. The Wycombe Revised Statement of Community Involvement (2012)¹ sets out the general principles for involvement in plan making. There

¹ <http://www.wycombe.gov.uk/council-services/planning-and-buildings/planning-policy/wycombe-development-framework/community-involvement.aspx>

are a number of stages when the community will be able to get involved in the preparation of the new Local Plan (see section 3.).

2.4. The purpose of the Options consultation stage was to share the issues and strategic options for the District's future growth with local communities, and discuss where and how it should happen.

3. Programme and format of meetings

3.1. Six evening meetings were organised across the District, during February / March 2014. They generally followed a day time exhibition, where the public had the opportunity to discuss the consultation materials with planning officers.

3.2. The poster below summarises the Council's events schedule.

Wycombe District Local Plan Options consultation

3 February to 4 April 2014

South West Chiltern 26 February

Longburrow Hall (Stokenchurch)

- 9.30am to 5.30pm: staffed exhibition
- 7pm to 9pm: evening workshop

North West Chiltern 2 dates

27 February: Naphill Village Hall

- 9.30am to 4:45pm: staffed exhibition

5 March: Hughenden Primary School

- 7pm to 9pm: evening workshop

Marlow 4 March

Court Garden

- 9.30am to 5.30pm: staffed exhibition (Leisure Complex reception area)
- 7pm to 9pm: evening workshop (Shelley Theatre)

High Wycombe 6 March

High Wycombe Library

- 9.30am to 5pm: staffed exhibition

John Hampden School

- 7pm to 9pm: evening workshop

Chepping Wye Valley 10 March

Bourne End Library

- 9.30am to 5.30pm: staffed exhibition
- 7pm to 9pm: evening workshop

Princes Risborough 17 March

Information Centre

- 9.30am to 4.30pm: staffed exhibition

Princes Centre

- 7pm to 9pm: evening workshop

To register for an evening workshop please contact 01494 421277 or newlocalplan@wycombe.gov.uk



Central exhibition
11 February until 15 March 2014

High Wycombe Library (during opening times)

Staffed days:

- Thursday 6 March 9.30am to 5pm
- Saturday 15 March 9.30am to 5pm



Get involved in the new Local Plan.

A summary leaflet, our Options consultation document and response form are available in our main offices, in libraries and at Marlow and Princes Risborough information centres and on our website www.wycombe.gov.uk/newlocalplan where you can find more information about the new Local Plan.

 Join the conversation
[@wycombedcnp](https://twitter.com/wycombedcnp) [#wycombedcnp](https://twitter.com/wycombedcnp)

- 3.3.** Due to the high level of interest in the Chepping Wye Valley event, a second meeting was organised on 24 March at Wye Valley School.
- 3.4.** The standard format of each event was a presentation from Wycombe District Council Planning Officers, followed by a workshop session, where the attendees formed smaller discussion groups around tables.
- 3.5.** The geographical areas for the different meetings were defined, broadly following Bucks County Council Local Community Area boundaries. For the purposes of this stage, the towns of Marlow and Princes Risborough were considered separately from their original Local Community Area.
- 3.6.** Each meeting began with context setting presentations given by WDC planning officers outlining the issues and challenges raised by the need to meet objectively assessed needs.
- 3.7.** During the second part of the meeting, attendees gathered around workshop tables, facilitated by WDC planning officers², to discuss in smaller groups the issues in their specific areas. Attendees were also asked to think about potential planning / development solutions to those issues. Area profiles were made available on each table, as well as detailed maps of the area.
- 3.8.** Feedback was then given to the room on the key points of discussion. A WDC officer then explained how the Council was going to progress the work on the local plan, and the chairman concluded the session.
- 3.9.** The format of the meetings varied depending on the number of attendees at the meeting – the Chepping Wye Valley and Princes Risborough events were held as question and answer sessions.

3.10. Other meetings

3.11. Council officers also attended the following public meetings arranged by parishes/ town councils or local residents associations, the Council gave presentations at these meetings and took questions no notes were taken by the Council officers attending these meetings.

- WDC Stakeholders briefing
- WDC Rural Forum

² At the High Wycombe events, facilitators also included members of the High Wycombe Society, due to higher numbers than expected.

- Wooburn and Bourne End Parish
- Little Marlow Parish Council
- Longwick Parish Council
- Princes Risborough Town Council
- Pimms Actions Group
- Marlow Bottom Parish Council
- Hazlemere Parish Council
- Bledlow cum Saunderton Parish Council
- Buckmasters Residents meeting
- Penn and Tylers Green Residents Association

4. South West Chiltern - 26 February 2014, at Longburrow Hall, Stokenchurch

General discussion points

- There was debate about the projected growth figures, and the balance of needs versus constraints.
- There was a general acceptance of need for development in the South East England.
- The capacity for town centre empty / unused offices buildings to be converted to housing was mentioned.
- There was some discussion around feasibility/ desirability of building on floodplain.

Local discussion points – around Lane End, Air Park, Turville, Stokenchurch

Lane End

- A number of potential sites were discussed.
- There was a debate around the Chilterns AONB constraint.
- Need for affordable housing and dialogue with Red Kite Housing Trust Motorway and resolving the noise issue could make more land available for development.
- Well-designed small scale developments similar to Framers Court were encouraged.
- Design of a scheme/ area helps community needs - connectivity between existing and new developments in villages e.g. Lane End.
- Facilities for people with children with special needs / disabilities.
- Parking and transport issues (notably bus services) were also raised.

Air Park

- Support In favour of enabling some development (high tech business, stadium?)
- Noise impacts form use of the airpark
- The need for an air park?

Turville

- Concerns raised over loss of sense of community (2nd or 3rd homes) having negative knock on effects on service provision, such as transport.

Stokenchurch

- Capacity of small scale growth to support services (infill, expansion)
- Few potential sites were identified due to local constraints (AONB in particular).
- Some opposition to using local employment land for housing.
- Various areas of development were put forward: west of junction 5, Wallace Hill Farm, near motorway (noise attenuation techniques) eastern edge of village, use of allotments.
- Infrastructure limitations on what could be built were also discussed e.g. drainage issues in Ibstone Road area.

5. North West Chiltern - 27 February 2014, at Hughenden Primary School, Hughenden Valley.

General discussion points

Objectively assessed needs

- Many participants appreciated the need for development.
- The South East Plan was seen as a more rational approach.
- The objectively assessed needs being based on significant migration, concerns were raised over the need to accommodate migration from London
- The difference between the core strategy targets and the new local plan was challenged.
- Concern that the new plan was a way of generating income for the Council
- Some felt that other areas (SE / London) were better suited for development and should be targeted by developers.

Thriving villages

- Villages should maintain sustainable community infrastructure: shops, pubs, meeting places, social areas for all ages and suitable work places.
- Importance of good design that was in keeping with local character.
- The area should maintain a rural ambiance, feeling and appearance.
- There is a role for individual villages in securing development; it has to be the right type of development with the right infrastructure.

Housing mix

- There should be a mix of housing to maintain vibrant communities.
- A mix of market housing for downsizing and affordable housing for young people is needed in the area (views were split on the provision of affordable homes); this may mean building at higher density.
- The affordability of housing was a concern.
- The following were suggested more rural exception schemes, self-build, and social housing built by the council.
- Concerns over the location of travellers sites were raised.

Sustainable development / Location of housing

- There was concern over the creation of dormitory towns with increased commuting and damage to the environment.
- Homes should be built in sustainable locations, close to jobs.
- In terms of where to develop, a proportionate increase of villages was put forward, as well as the use of back gardens.

Infrastructure capacity

- There were concerns over the ability of the local infrastructure to cope with further development: groundwater flooding, hospital, schools, and sewers.
- Current infrastructure is already inadequate and needs maintaining / upgrading: roads, sewers, schools, public transport, doctor's surgeries, shops.
- Infrastructure should come first if development is put forward; local communities would be more supportive in that case.
- There is a need better parking in villages, particularly at schools, better public transport and cycle routes.

Transport issues

- Key discussion points included the integration of local infrastructure with areas outside of the District, the north- south road traffic patterns, and the increased issues of local road traffic management
- Getting through High Wycombe was seen as a concern due to congestion – there was fear that development on the Handy Cross Sports Centre would make congestion worse

Jobs

- The importance of stimulating/promoting local businesses (to support local employment and reduce commuting) was discussed.
- The loss of employment land towards housing was opposed

Countryside, Green Belt and AONB

- There was a general opposition to building in the AONB and Green Belt, and the undeveloped countryside.
- It was also suggested that the government rules on development in the AONB should be challenged.
- Concerns were raised over the impact of development on wildlife, walking, ability to enjoy the environment or historical assets.

Farming /Forestry

- Many felt uncertain towards the future use of agricultural land.
- There was a strong view that farming / agricultural land should be protected from development.
- It was suggested that we should build on hillsides around the north of High Wycombe rather than build on farmland in Princes Risborough.
- Farming diversification and local food production/distribution should be supported.
- Woodlands, especially ancients, should be protected. However concerns were raised over the current viability of the wood economy.

Local discussion points

Terriers Farm

- There were many dissenting views on Terriers Farm, one of the District's reserve sites.
- Concerns were expressed in relation to
 - increased traffic
 - development overspill,
 - loss of countryside,
 - strain on local infrastructure and community facilities, and
 - loss of green separation between High Wycombe and Hazlemere
- Neighbouring site of Wellesbourne was mentioned, some praising its quality; other questioned its design and wanted reassurance on future planning gain at Terriers (need for a community centre, tennis court, shop).
- The Park and Ride suggestion was not supported.

High Wycombe town

- Many supported greater use of the town's brownfield sites (in particular empty offices) to make full use of the town's potential (green surroundings, pedestrian friendly).
- Higher density development could be achieved, with more mixed housing / employment / retail development and community facilities which help create a more vibrant community.
- The regeneration of Frogmoor was seen as a key challenge to revitalise the town centre.
- There should be a focus on the hospital and university to generate and attract jobs.
- There could be more development in Desborough.

Hughenden Valley

- General issues included the school's capacity (including parking), the effect of buses going to Pipers School, groundwater, and the need to preserve agriculture and the woodland economy.
- Rural exception schemes could be considered.
- Uplands Conference centre: there was a strong objection to the loss of this facility to housing (impact on AONB, wildlife, loss of a community facility); alternative uses include school or cemetery.
- Other sites put forward included
 - Clappings Lane
 - Boss Lane
 - Wrights Yard
 - Pumping station

Naphill/ Walters Ash and Lacey Green

- These villages are in the AONB and have little scope for expansion. Adequate road infrastructure would be key to any expansion.

Princes Risborough

- A medium expansion was preferred (1000 homes), linked to the railway station.
- Concerns were raised over the cumulative effect of growth (Aylesbury + Risborough) and the imbalance of homes and jobs (in the south).

6. Marlow - 4th March 2014, at Shelley Theatre, Marlow.

General discussion points

Objectively assessed needs

- There was debate around the District's objectively assessed needs, some viewing it as what we have to deliver, some on the contrary who contested this need, as based on a self-fulfilling scenario.
- In particular, there were concerns over:
 - The consequences of meeting such needs on our ability to maintain the quality of the environment.
 - The role of migration
 - A national requirement being imposed on a very constrained District.
- Many felt we should be refusing to accommodate this requirement, in particular if it meant reviewing the Green Belt.

Planning positively

- A participant recognised that the Council being under strict rules to deliver development, it was good to retain local control.
- The need to cooperate with our neighbours to understand the links we have with them was also noted.

Strategic options

- Increasing building density (by building mid-rise town houses/ apartments and businesses) was seen as a solution to accommodating needs.
- Back garden developments were not favoured.
- Some felt that development opportunities in Marlow was limited as opposed to green field sites, village expansion, and Princes Risborough expansion
- Any development should not be piecemeal but contribute to necessary infrastructure.
- The challenge of how to meet the housing targets whilst maintaining the Green Belt and ensuring this area is a place where people want to live was raised.

Balance of homes and jobs

- The need for local jobs and homes in the town was expressed.
- There were concerns about the apparent mismatch between places where housing is proposed and where business is – e.g. Housing in Princes Risborough and business Park in Little Marlow.
- Many felt that there should be a better spatial distribution of homes and jobs i.e. Fewer commuters.
- However many also expressed doubts about this, mainly due to the unaffordability of the Marlow area: people can't afford to live locally for work.
- There was also concern that creating new jobs would mean creating more demand for housing.
- Some suggested to convert offices/industrial units into houses in the town centre.

Housing provision

- Many recognised there is an affordability issue across the District, and in Marlow in particular.
- There were some questions about affordable housing, what it means, how it is calculated etc.
- There was some debate around the current policy approach, some wanting to abolish it, others wanting it to apply to all developments.
- There was a view that small sites could go to affordable housing only, and that affordable housing should be on main bus routes on the edge of town.
- Many expressed the need for smaller dwellings, to allow for demographic changes (e.g. Elderly accommodation) whilst retaining some flexibility in the local housing mix.
- Building at higher densities on brownfield sites was preferred to redeveloping existing residential sites at higher densities.
- The quality affordable housing was also raised.
- Many raised the quality issue: some advocated for the use of high quality materials, others for mid-rise apartment blocks on the continental

(Scandinavian) style within adequate landscaped areas. Tall buildings were not favoured.

Employment

- Employment was perceived as a greater issue to plan for than housing.
- People recognised that Wycombe is losing jobs to surrounding areas.
- Concerns were expressed over the assumptions regarding future jobs and location for such jobs in Marlow.
- In particular, there seemed to be a lack of consideration for
 - Increase in working from home.
 - Changes in ways to do business in 21st century; e.g. Business pods at Bourne End.
 - Reduced need for people as manufacturing becomes more automated.
 - Other employment opportunities elsewhere in the District and in Maidenhead.
- Emphasis was placed on regenerating older vacant employment stock to meet differing needs of modern employment (e.g. Replace warehouses with offices), before building new employment sites.
- There is a demand for small office premises in Marlow - could employ younger people: leisure, personal training, service industry, computing
- There was some discussion about whether the new jobs would be for local people or in-commuters.
- Some concern was expressed over high retail rents.
- It was considered that there should be a Marlow-focused employment study.

Road infrastructure

- Concerns were raised about the current road infrastructure, in particular the roads linking residential and industrial areas, and the traffic issues at exits and entrances to Marlow. Someone suggested a comprehensive one way system.
- It was felt that there needs to be a better integrated strategic transport package to deliver improvements to the station/roads and business parks, even if older roads and older properties make improvements difficult.

- The need for a Marlow focused transport study (transport analysis / parking) was also expressed.
- A query was made about how to address the traffic problem at Bisham Roundabout, in a way that doesn't displace the problems elsewhere on the network.
- One person viewed on street parking as a positive means to slow down traffic and restrict road use.
- Some concern was raised over increased traffic on the A404 junction if further development were to go ahead.

Public Transport

- Public transport in Marlow needs to be accessible and affordable, in particular for elderly and disabled people.
- New developments should be built near local transport hubs / bus interchanges (e.g. New retail parks).
- There is a need to consider access to facilities and services, as well as employment.
- The existing cycling paths network should be upgraded and better connected to encourage greater uptake.

Other infrastructure

- There were overwhelming concerns about the local infrastructure's capacity to cope with existing needs.
- People felt that the area needs larger surgeries, more doctors, more schools places, and more car parking.
- Future developments would impose an even greater strain on infrastructure and local amenities.
- Sewage was a particular issue raised, in the light of the recent flooding events:
 - Concerns were raised regarding Little Marlow sewage treatment works capacity

- Concerns were raised regarding the failure of the pumping station, which worsened the recent flooding in the Marlow riverside areas (pipes are not wide enough / backing up)
- The whole sewage system must be upgraded

Flooding

- There were major concerns over the risk of over overdevelopment on floodplain.
- Many felt that further development on the floodplain should be restricted.
- The need to improve flood defences was expressed.

River Thames

- There should be cross boundary negotiation / consultation between the Thames riparian authorities to jointly reinstate the south east plan “River Thames Corridor policy to protect the landscape of the Thames corridor.

Green Belt review

- There was great concern / opposition over the loss of Green Belt / open countryside to accommodate growth, and the view that the Council should protect it.
- Clear settlement separation in particular was seen as a high priority.
- Developments in towns and villages were preferred (town houses and apartments).
- There was some concern that the development of the Athletics track, encroaching on the Green Belt, may invite further development.
- Green Belt release around villages, where all amenities are already in place, to meet housing needs was also suggested.
- There was a view that the review of Green Belt should not be confined to Wycombe District – needs to include the Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead and South Bucks District Councils.

AONB

- The general view was that the AONB should be protected and development next to the AONB should be restricted.
- There was a view that the AONB should be extended between A404 Marlow to Bourne End from the current AONB boundary to the Thames.
- It was also raised that there is scope for some development in the AONB.

Green Spaces

- Developing on green spaces would have negative impacts on the town.

Engagement process

- Concerns were raised over the overall planning / engagement process.
- Some people feared that we don't listen to the public.
- Some people challenged the way their input would be fed back into the plan, and ultimately the decision making process.
- There was some concern over the lack of input from young people.
- There was concern about the lack of input from the chamber of commerce.
- More positively, some participants called for active local personalities and for a neighbourhood strategic planning.

Local discussion points (area specific)

Westhorpe area

- Many viewed a business park at Westhorpe as unacceptable development in the Green Belt.
- Some concerns were raised over the lack of very special circumstances and the lack of evidence underpinning the proposal.
- This proposal was also perceived as incompatible with / threatening to the Little Marlow Country Park proposals.
- Many felt that, rather than developing a new business park, focus should be on addressing the high under occupancy levels in Marlow existing business parks, in particular Globe Park.
- Some viewed the Gravel Pits as a sensible location for development, but views were split due to traffic implications on A404 junction.

- Some concern was also raised about the history of waste at Westhorpe.
- Westhorpe house was suggested for housing but there was some confusion / uncertainty as to how it would work with the business proposal.

Little Marlow Gravel Pits

- The need for open space/tranquil space for recreation was advocated. A quality countryside park between Marlow and Bourne End would help fulfil this need.
- Many felt that the Westhorpe Area proposed Country Park is being threatened by the business proposal and by the athletics track.
- A better structured policy is needed for the Little Marlow Gravel Pits area as a whole to incorporate development and so the whole concept of the Green Belt as a lung between Marlow and Bourne End can be kept. Otherwise there will be piecemeal development until only the floodplain is left.

Globe Park

- There was a view that Globe Park should be kept for employment.
- Under occupancy and site appearance and access issues should be addressed, by adding offices, hotel and housing (flats for small households) before starting on a new business park or housing on green field sites.

Marlow Bottom

- There is a need for more affordable housing in the area. Local people want their children to be able to afford housing in the area rather than being forced out of the area.
- Marlow Bottom has good links to major road networks. It was felt that there is some scope of expansion (depending on topography), to the North and East (away from Marlow itself).
- Many participants advocated the need for a roundabout at the entrance to Marlow Bottom Valley, to prevent the queues of traffic at peak and school leaving times. It could also help the Farm to expand the trading estate and bring more jobs to the area.

- Burford school traffic could be alleviated by improving the access to playing fields car park, used by over 100 cars twice a day.

Portlands

- Participants requested some clarification regarding the future of the Portlands site, now allocated in the Council's Delivery and Site Allocations Plan.
- Many felt that the site could deliver high density residential housing, including affordable housing.
- Some suggested that the current small scale Waitrose shop could provide several low costs apartments.

Old railway yard

- Many felt that this area of the town should change.
- There were some concerns relating to the old railway yard redevelopment.
- It was felt that the current proposals were a quick fix and did not address environmental considerations and the need to be sensitive to an existing residential area. The area requires an overall scheme including with the proposed hotel development in station approach, biodiversity, safety of access for young people to train etc.
- The site is also in the flood plain.

Marlow town

- Marlow is known as the Jewel in the town of the Thames
- It is the principal heritage / visitor attraction in Wycombe District – great care must be taken to protect and enhance that valuable asset.
- Concerns were raised over the danger of losing the character of the town if there was more growth. There was a view that the sprawl going out eastwards – and northwards – out of Marlow had already ruined the beauty of the town.
- Some participants felt that there could be further development, including to the north of the current built up area.
- Others advocated the redevelopment of vacant sites (e.g. Back of Spittal Street).

- With regards to recent developments, some were complimentary of the new development along Little Marlow road :
 - The care home has good design and looks good
 - The estate didn't turn out too bad
 - More tree planting sought in front of the ex-council houses
- There was some discussion on Marlow's future economy. The role of the emerging BIDCO in providing a vision for the town was discussed
- Some felt that Marlow should be a residential place. Employment could go elsewhere. There was hope that new development in the town could give a better mix of housing.
- Some questioned how the High street would cope with the rise in population.
- There was a view that Marlow should retain a supermarket of quality (Waitrose).
- Transport issues raised included the need to encourage more use of the railway, access issues to business parks, parking capacity issues.
- It was suggested that additional parking could be provided under a restored Riley Park.

Other sites

The following sites were suggested as being potential housing site:

- Comland site
- Foxes Piece Allotments and South Part of Hanging Hill allotments
- Marlow Football ground
- Chalkpit Lane (business)

Forty Green

- There were fears that development at Forty Green may be considered under a Green Belt review.
- Many expressed concerns about potential housing development, stating that it would result in Bovingdon Green coalescing with Marlow, impact negatively on the landscape (skyline site), and reinforce issues around infrastructure capacity (school, sewage treatment work, surgery), poor road access (single track lane), and sinkholes.

Slate Meadow

- Development of Slate Meadow in Bourne End was opposed on the grounds of flooding / lack of infrastructure (schools etc.), coalescence, traffic issues and proximity to Green Belt and AONB.
- Alternative options for housing included the use of under occupied commercial parks especially between Loudwater and Bourne End.

Junction 3A

- There was some concern over the impact of Junction 3A on Little Marlow road infrastructure.

7. High Wycombe – 6th March 2014, at John Hampden School, High Wycombe.

General discussion points

Objectively assessed needs

- The validity of the housing needs figures were queried as being too high. Housing statistics must be justifiable and sourced from a reliable source, with clarity and justification.
- There was fear that the plan would exceed actual requirements
- The new targets are difficult to achieve.
- Many felt that High Wycombe cannot accommodate more growth
- Some feared that population growth could become a self-fulfilling prophecy by building houses people will come in to occupy them.
- The issue of migration was raised in terms of stopping migration would reduce the need.

Strategic planning / Duty to cooperate

- It was recognised that the District is facing a challenge and that major changes could have major impacts on communities.
- Some clarification was given regarding the plan process: what happens if the plan proposes low figures and is rejected at examination? Is there a danger of a higher target?
- How can we expect other areas to accommodate growth we feel is not viable for Wycombe District? The lack of visibility of potential negotiation options was criticised.
- The role of the authority as a landowner was also discussed.
- There was concern that the higher housing figures were motivated by the Council wishing to collect more council tax.

Housing provision / housing mix

- Participants felt that
 - There should be more family sized housing

- There should be room for working from home.
 - New development should be of high density.
 - There should be enough affordable housing.
 - Some limited housing intensification could be allowed (for students) (although views diverged on this point).
 - Some of the council's own stock could be redeveloped to higher density.
- There was consensus on the fact that we should build on brownfield first (both in High Wycombe and in the countryside).
 - It was suggested that where owners of vacant brownfield sites are unhelpful, details of the sites should be made public.
 - Provision for housing could also be made by expanding smaller villages and by infilling.
 - It was felt that conversions of homes into bedsits / small flats puts pressure on infrastructure such as on-street parking.
 - Some people felt we should spread the growth around the District, but others were concerned that this would not provide new infrastructure but further stretch existing schools.
 - A more radical view proposed to provide 10,000 new homes at Junction 3A and 3,000 to 4,000 new homes Princes Risborough.

Design

- Concerns were raised over the poor quality of recent developments.
- Design was seen as a key element to deliver higher density in towns and villages and even in the Green Belt or AONB according to some.
- In villages the design should mirror the existing rather than clashing with it.
- Design solutions for successful and attractive developments could include adequate underground car parking, bike, laundry and refuse areas, large external balconies in apartments and high quality landscaping.

Balance of homes and jobs

- Many supported a balanced distribution of homes and jobs across the District.
- It was felt that a mixed use developments would work best.

- However, some felt that there could be a concentration of house building in High Wycombe where employment is falling.
- There seems to be a reluctance of business people to come to High Wycombe because of congestion.
- There was a view that being a dormitory town may not be an issue.
- Many were concerned by the impact of the Risborough expansion on the balance of homes and jobs (the jobs being presumably in High Wycombe and Thames Valley rather than north in Aylesbury) and the increased pressure this would put on the A4010.

Employment

- Sufficient high quality jobs should be planned to accompany housing growth.
- A greater understanding of employment issues was advocated, in particular:
 - To understand what local jobs are available for local people.
 - To understand commute patterns.
 - The proportion of home working.
 - An indication of what new businesses are attracted into High Wycombe.
- In terms of employment land, empty office space should be reused prior to building new ones.

Transport

- Concerns raised over current traffic management and levels of congestion in the town, in particular on Marlow Hill and London Road, but also Handy Cross, Booker, Cressex.
- The resilience of the road network especially at rush hour and in severe weather was also a key concern.
- There were also concerns that further development would only make this worse and that the local road infrastructure would not cope (particularly the London Road / Abbey Barn Area).
- Some felt that the removal of the flyover and re-routing and slowing of through traffic would increase congestion and pollution.

- People were also concerned about extra traffic generation around / along A4010, and the need for improvements.
- Many were concerned by the appalling state of footpaths in many areas, particularly in Sands i.e. Chapel Lane, Mill End Road, Dashwood Avenue, Pinewood Road etc. Is appalling - Current resurfacing of roads in general is very poor and does not last: how will this be addressed?
- Additional house building would also result in huge amounts of construction traffic.
- Issue of planning housing and traffic issues together was also raised.

Public transport

- Some felt that due to the topography of High Wycombe, accessing public transport was difficult.
- To support an increased density of population, improvements to the quality of footpaths should be made, as well as providing safe cycle ways / car routes to and from schools.
- The re-opening of the High Wycombe to Bourne End railway line (to link High Wycombe and Maidenhead) as a light rail was also raised and the potential to link 3 major rail networks Chiltern Railways, First Great Western and Crossrail with access to national and international (Heathrow) networks.

Parking

- Car parking provision was raised as an issue in the town, as overdevelopment of offices and homes with minimal parking means that the parking capacity is not adequate for those buildings.

Infrastructure

- There was a general consensus that current infrastructure is already at capacity (Schools and GP Surgeries in particular).
- Participants questioned what research had been done to establish the effect of the development on the infrastructure – what additional facilities, sewage capacity, parking facilities, open space will be required and where will they be built?

- Many expressed concern that sufficient infrastructure to accompany growth would be provided, and on time. Examples were given of sites where it was felt improvements in infrastructure did not happen e.g. Wycombe Marsh, G Plan and Ercol.
- Many questioned the funding mechanisms used to deliver the required infrastructure: who would pay for it.

AONB

- Some felt that the Chilterns AONB should to be retained and protected
- Concerns were expressed over the impact of potential development on sensitive parts of the AONB.
- There was a view that development should not reach the AONB boundary; there should be a buffer zone.

Green Belt

- Many were concerned by development in the Green Belt.
- Developments should minimise the loss of Green Belt, avoiding elevated sites in particular as far as possible.
- There was a fear that development in the Green Belt would lead to the coalescence of High Wycombe and Flackwell Heath.
- There was some support for a small scale Green Belt review, but others expressed distrust in the review process.

Climate change

- One participant felt that greater attention should be given to tackling CO2 emissions and promoting sustainability.

Biodiversity / Green Spaces/ Landscape

- Participants were split between a desire to protect the green spaces (gardens, open spaces) and build in the countryside versus protecting the countryside and building more in High Wycombe, including by building on green spaces.

- Many were concerned by the potential loss of important green spaces (including reserve sites) on the urban fringe / loss of green lungs within the town.
- There was a view that biodiversity (green infrastructure) should be maintained / increased within housing areas.
- It was felt to be important to retain green areas and woodland on the valley sides and the views from areas such as Amersham Hill or Marlow Hill.
- The quality of the environment created in new development is seen as key.

Young people

- Concern was raised about there not being enough opportunities for teenagers and youngsters.

Engagement process

- Some people criticised the way the workshop was set up, and found that Q&A and open debate was too limited.
- There was a feeling that the sequence of development did not matter, as it was felt it would all happen anyway by 2031.

Local discussion points

Reserve sites

- Many participants were concerned by the potential development of reserve sites, which seemed a 'given' as brownfield sites have been used.
- Many feared that by building on all the reserve sites the whole character of the town and its surroundings would be lost.
- The fact that development on the reserve sites would use existing congested roads was another key concern.

Wycombe Air Park

- Wycombe Air Park generated divided opinions.
- There were some trust issues in relation to the Council linked to past proposed development of the Stadium.

- Some felt that there should be no development at the Air Park.
- Many felt that the Council should recognise the Air Park as a valuable asset, and aviation as a vibrant sector, an opportunity rather than an impediment: the Air Park homes 200 skilled workers, and active sport flying gliding to international standards.
- Some welcomed the expansion of jobs at the Air Park on the existing brownfield area and but felt it should be limited to aviation-related activities. Others were opened to introducing more flexibility: they would welcome high tech, engineering activities, but not warehouses.
- Many agreed that an expansion at the air park outside the existing built up area should not be considered, as it would jeopardise the viability of the air park.
- Others accepted that high tech engineering and maintenance facilities would be appropriate, but queried the on-going use as a flying school which was seen as an environmental nuisance to the AONB (noise issue).
- Some criticised the Council's management of the Air Park (as landowner), sharing concerns about uncertainties around the lease renewal. They doubted any future investment in facilities at the Air Park in this context.
- There was a view that the Air Park was not suitable for more housing due to the poor road network.
- There was some concern about wider impacts of future development on other businesses in the locality.
- Another point of discussion was the redevelopment of the council depot site, which might involve moving the depot to the High Heavens site.

High Heavens

- Many concerns were raised over the development of the High Heavens waste facility (paper compaction) and the subsequent heavy lorry movements.
- People felt that the roads in the area could not sustain the increased HGV use without much more regular resurfacing and repair work.
- There were also concerns about worsening traffic conditions in the area and on Lane End Road.

Cressex Island

- Traffic management around Cressex was seen as a key issue.
- There were fears that Cressex Island development (and Buckmaster and Air Park) will generate considerable additional traffic on a road system that already gets congested with traffic from Handy Cross on A4010, John Lewis, Asda and Adams Park. People were concerned that the road system would not be able to accommodate the generated traffic as well as the existing traffic.
- In the light of those concerns, the SLINK west transport proposal was seen as a good idea, as it would take up the heavy traffic off the Cressex Area.
- The retail proposals on Cressex Island were also raised as it was felt that there was no need for more retail.
- The need for improvements to Sport Facilities access, such as Cressex / Buckmaster, was also mentioned.

Buckmaster Playing Fields

- Many feared that developing Buckmaster Playing fields– especially for business – would cause additional strain on the local roads, increasing congestion dramatically at peak hours.
- The loss of the playing fields would also remove a valuable open space.

Handy Cross

- Traffic at Handy cross hub was a major concern.
- It was felt that the roads would be unable to cope with additional traffic.
- It was suggested that better connecting the junction down Marlow Hill should be looked at.
- Sufficient car parking was also seen as a key issue.

Gomm Valley

- Concerns were raised over the Gomm Valley development and the impact on the local road system (especially on the congested London Road).
- Many concerns were raised in particular over Cock Lane.

- The road capacity is already stretched.
- The single track height restricted bridge doesn't allow for HGV.
- It would be unsuitable for construction vehicles.
- The road could not stand 800+ vehicles every day.
- It would become a rat run.
- It was suggested that Cock Lane could be made a two lane road through to Tylers Green, and a link road to Hammersley Lane to allow traffic to go to Hazlemere cross roads and down Amersham Hill to High Wycombe.

Terriers

- Many feared that development at Terriers would cause further traffic issues on already congested (badly maintained) roads and junctions.
- Similarly other reserved sites not suitable for intensive development due to poor road infrastructure.

Verco

- Clarification was requested regarding the extent of development planned at Verco and whether it would be for housing or industrial use.
- Good design was seen as very important to make this development (and similar sites) work.

Bassetsbury Allotments

- Someone queried the level of contamination of Bassetsbury Allotments, considering the filtration provided by the chalk stream running through it.

Junction 3A

- Some queried where business would go.
- Some were opposed to the junction, saying that the Highways Agency had already ruled against it.

High Wycombe Town Centre

- The decline of the high street driven by new retail developments in other locations e.g. Handy Cross / Cressex (out of town) and Eden was a key point of discussion.
- Many agreed there was a need for more residential development in the town centre, and for a reduction of traffic.
- Some felt that empty commercial space could be reused for housing (flats); for example in Green Street.
- A participant suggested the Council should use compulsory purchase powers to buy land in the town centre to redevelop it.
- It was suggested that Abbey Way flyover could be made a bus route and more attractive.
- Additional park and ride facilities were also proposed.
- It was suggested that the market could move from the High Street to Desborough or Frogmoor, allowing more café culture in the High Street.
- A participant felt that there was a need for more variety in eateries in High Wycombe for theatre goers.

Princes Risborough

- Some participants felt that Princes Risborough would be a better option for housing provision, whilst others were concerned about the major growth option, and the resulting congestion on the A4010.
- Priority should be given to strategies that would make the new developments work without spoiling Princes Risborough town centre.

Lane End and Marlow

- Some felt that building around Lane End and Marlow would be impractical for due to the amount of infrastructure that is present.
- Others felt that there could be some redevelopment at Lane End (reuse of empty shops, use of part of Dashwood estate, land along Lane End Road).

New settlement between Marlow and High Wycombe

- One view advocated for a new “Marlow Bottom” between Marlow and Wycombe

8. Chepping Wye Valley - 10th March 2014 at Bourne End library and 24th March 2014, at Wye Valley School, Bourne End.

The notes below are based on 24th March event; the agenda for this event was based on the issues raised at the meeting held on 10th March. There was also a small workshop for attendees who did not want to discuss the Slate Meadow site in Bourne End.

General issues

Challenging the government - Localism

- Questions were raised over the risks of not doing a plan. Some people felt that the council should challenge the government's requirements, directing growth to other area (garden cities).
- The role of a neighbourhood plan was raised and how it fitted in with the Council's plan. There was concern about the system and what was driving the need for the plan.
- The duty to cooperate with neighbouring authorities was also discussed.

Location of development

- Many felt that more brownfield sites could be found (near Loudwater, Railko site, for example).
- There were views that empty offices should go to housing/ be redeveloped as well as the negative impact this could have.
- The restriction on building in the Chilterns AONB was raised by some; the AONB restriction on development should be challenged: it was argued that where there is good existing infrastructure opportunity, consideration should be given to building in the AONB – e.g. Stokenchurch.
- Someone asked why there is only one site option for Bourne End.
- Alternative sites to Slate Meadow should be considered

Green Belt

- The importance of the Green Belt in preventing coalescence was raised especially for villages around High Wycombe, such as Flackwell Heath, Loudwater, Wooburn and Bourne End.
- When planning for new development, preventing this coalescence will be important.
- The circumstances around when it was acceptable to build in the Green Belt were also discussed.

Housing density

In relation to higher densities

- For some participants, there was a feeling that Bourne End was full and could not accommodate more development.
- The idea of building at higher density was put forward, as it would use less land.
- However some expressed concerns over major foundations problems taller buildings may engender.
- There was a query regarding an application to build a road on the old railway line.

Housing Mix

- The need for a mix of housing was discussed.
- More affordable homes /starter homes of the right size are needed for local people.
- Queries were made in relation to the required levels of affordable housing required by the plans in place (30 to 40%), and the means of ensuring its delivery whilst taking into account viability issues.
- There is also need to assess different house sizes and types of homes for the elderly.
- It was confirmed that a decision on the McCarthy and Stone development would be made shortly.

Retail

- Some felt there were too many convenience stores being built in the area.
- The permission of the recent Tesco development was not favourably seen in Bourne End. The site has access and parking issues.

Infrastructure

- There were many concerns over infrastructure capacity (see Slate Meadow).

Roads

- Cookham bridge capacity was raised as an issue
- congestion in the area was seen as a key issue

Public transport

- Better buses are needed to Marlow and Beaconsfield, especially for school travel.

Parking

- Parking capacity was also raised as an issue.
- Concerns were raised over the insufficient parking provided in some of the recent developments.

Employment

- Concerns were raised about the balance of homes and jobs in the area (in Bourne End but also Marlow), and the feasibility of employment creation
- People were questioning where the new residents would work.
- There was a view that Flackwell Heath and Bourne End are dormitory settlements: managers / highly skilled professionals – and that people commute to London.
- Working from home is now current practice, and changes the need for office space requirements.
- Many advocated the use of commercial empty units in the area (40% according to a participant) for residential development. This is already happening, but care must be taken in keeping successful employment land (e.g. Glory Park) for the long term.

- Some felt that employment would be better located at Stokenchurch.
- A query was also raised with regards to the former Compair site which is to be redeveloped to provide student and retirement homes, as well as new offices and industrial units.
- The changes to permitted development allowing conversion of offices to residential uses were also raised.

Sustainability

- The need to put the ecology and the environment at the heart of everything we do was reaffirmed.

Flooding

- Flooding was a major concern.
- There were concerns that the building on slopes in High Wycombe causes the Wye to overflow in the Bourne End area.
- There were also concerns over the risks of flooding on Cores End road and Millboard road. This is a concern for local businesses in the long term.
- Flackwell Heath also has groundwater water issues

Sewage and drainage

- Concerns were raised over the Little Marlow Sewage Treatment Works which has had recent operational issues.
- The closure of the High Wycombe treatment works was criticised.
- A suggestion was made to build a treatment works on the Rye

Process Issues

- There were several criticisms on the consultation process (lack of publicity, lack of events)
- A participant felt that Bourne End had been actively discouraged by WDC from making a Neighbourhood Plan

Local issues (site specific)

Slate Meadow

Most of the meeting focused on the Slate Meadow reserve site.

Ownership of Slate Meadow

- Land ownership was raised and any proposals made by developers
 - WDC – village green
 - Croudace has outright ownership of western part
 - Avanti homes (formerly known as Gladedale Homes) have an option on Eastern side
- Clarification was given over the history of Slate Meadow
 - It was given Green Belt status in 1972,
 - It was taken out of the Green Belt in 1989
 - Since then it is a site reserved for long term development in the successive adopted Local Plans.

Flooding (Slate Meadow)

- Flooding issues were an overwhelming concern, in light of the recent events.
- Many were concerned by the impact of flooding on existing neighbouring roads and properties (houses and businesses), and feared this situation would be aggravated by developing Slate Meadow,
- There were also concerns over impact on ground water levels, sewage and drainage
- Some wanted protection guarantees against future flooding
- Concerns were also raised over insurance issues
- Many felt that Slate Meadow should not be a reserve site as it acts as an area that soaks up rain water preventing flooding in the surrounding area
- Many were opposed to building on the floodplain in general, despite potential mitigation measures.
- It was noted that a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment is currently being undertaken for the whole District – further Flood Risk Assessment of the site will need to be undertaken by the developer at a later stage.

- A particular concern raised was the saturation of the meadow ground, which adds to surface flooding issues.
- It was noted that it is not the remit of the plan to change flood zones as they are drawn by the EA (who was criticised by some); WDC work within that framework.

Traffic (Slate Meadow)

- Many concerns were raised over the negative impacts a future development would have on adjacent streets (Cores End Road, Orchard Drive, Frank Lunnon Close, Jubilee Walk, Willows Road, Stratford Drive). These are already accident black spots, there is an existing on-street parking problem in Stratford Drive, and there are existing problems due to HGV movements.
- There were concerns over the Stratford Drive / St Paul's school drop off.

Access to the site (Slate Meadow)

- The proposed bus route through Willow road and through the site was criticised as impractical
- There are already parking problems on Frank Lunnon close.
- Many felt that the roads to access Slate Meadow were too narrow; any widening would affect existing properties and have a negative impact on the character of the area.
- Emergency access to Slate Meadow was also seen as an issue

Infrastructure (Slate Meadow)

- Many concerns were raised over the existing infrastructure's ability to cope with further developments especially.
 - Both schools in the area are at capacity
 - GP surgeries and hospitals are inadequate

Green Space (Slate Meadow)

- Many were concerned by the loss of recreation space if development were to go ahead, as the meadow is currently used by dog walkers, children, cyclists, and wildlife watchers.

- The rear of Slate Meadow near the railway line is seen as a particular safe route.
- There was some discussion around the lack of publicly available Green Spaces in the area and the potential of Slate Meadow to fulfil that role.
- There was a view that the Ecology Survey needed an update as new species have been noticed. Dominic Grieve (MP) has been contacted in respect to designating Slate Meadow a wetland.
- There was a proposal from an attendee to develop a committee of sustainable development to find alternatives to the plan as proposed.

Coalescence (Slate Meadow)

- Many feared that the development of Slate Meadow would result in the coalescence of Bourne End and Wooburn, and the loss of their respective identities.
- This separation role should be made clearer by WDC (as done for Gomm Valley in the consultation document).

Affordable housing (Slate Meadow)

- There was a query regarding the proportion of affordable housing that would be provided

Timing (Slate Meadow)

- There was a query about the timing of development, if it were to go ahead.
- A broader question was also raised about what happens after 2031 (the end of the plan period).

Junction 3A

- Junction 3A and the associated business and homes was another key discussion topic.
- It was noted that two options are being considered to link the junction:
 - One from Spring Lane to London Road
 - Abbey Barn Lane – Abbey Road connection
- Many questioned the reasons behind the proposal.

- Some questioned the need for new business space when vacant units are available.

Chepping Wye Valley - 10th March 2014 - Non- Slate Meadow Workshop

Brownfield land

- It was agreed that this option was important to meet housing needs.
- Increasing densities was suggested as a way of increasing numbers of homes on brownfield sites, but it was also recognised that this would have impacts on open space needs and views from the valley sides if high rise.
- The quality of design would also be important.
- The role of Cressex Business Park was also raised and whether it was in need of modernisation.

Reserve locations

- It was agreed if they were developed best use should be made of them.
- It was suggested that high density on reserve locations was better than large incursions into the green belt.
- It was also raised that it was important to consider links to services and any constraints on sites as well.

Princes Risborough expansion

- If this happened it should be high quality with better links to provide commercial development e.g. to South Oxfordshire
- Ercol as an example of people non commuting
- It was raised that in some locations it was not necessary have to have jobs with houses
- Think big, it's our last chance

Villages

- It was felt that was scope to build in villages but unlikely to be more than a 10% increase in homes and subject to the design of new developments

Green Belt Review

- It was acknowledged that there was a need for a review but it should be done strategically.
- There would still be a need for a buffer.

- Clarity about the timing was also raised to prevent speculative land sales.
- Local plan should plan for longer time period to allow for longer terms protection of the green belt
- National question in terms of development in the South East of England

Infrastructure

- Noise and visual impact on infrastructure – wider issues than just traffic should be looked at by more experts (wider expertise) than just transport officers at BCC
- Sewer capacity existing main pipeline has issues and suffered from blockages and overflowing
- Concerns over the impact on quality of life
- Concerns over how local feedback used.

Economic needs in the long term

- There should be increased employment at Stokenchurch
- Issue of vacant space on existing business parks e.g. Globe Park and proposing new sites in the green belt.

Balance of homes and jobs

- Affordable housing should good access to employment and transport network

Site/Area specific

Buckmaster

- If redeveloped where could the playing fields go

Westhorpe / Little Marlow area

- It was queried whether the Country Park and Business Park be compatible
- Important to protect the AONB
- Former landfill site might not be suitable,
- Once business park and running track developed it would risk that further development would happen and degrade this area
- Impact on the Chilterns AONB and views from Winter Hill

- Proposal contradicts statements made by the Council regarding further development in the area
- Danger of football ground relocating to this area
- Environmental impact on Westhorpe House (listed building)

Junction 3a

- Very concerned about loss of separation between Flackwell Heath and High Wycombe
- Increased traffic in Flackwell Heath
- Impact on AONB of development
- Noise impacts from the new junction on residential properties nearby
- Use of Spring lane, for access – highly constrained, suggested Abbey Barn Lane better
- Impact on Winchbottom Lane due to increased traffic from South Bucks

9. Princes Risborough - 17th March at Princes Centre, Princes Risborough

The Council produced a Question and Answer sheet for this meeting which is set out below, this was updated to reflect issues raised at the meeting.

Strategic questions

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Why should Princes Risborough take the growth when the population is growing in the South of the District – e.g. High Wycombe? Is the scale justified?</p> | <p>Work on the Local Plan needs to examine all reasonable options for where growth can go. Because over 70% of the District is in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), this restricts major development except in exceptional circumstances. Therefore the potential growth of Princes Risborough (outside the AONB) needs to be carefully examined. This work could in the end show that major growth at Princes Risborough may not be appropriate, in which case it won't go into the Plan. But we would have to be very sure of our reasons for doing so because it would be challenged by neighbouring authorities and the Planning Inspector.</p> <p>The population of High Wycombe has grown because that is where most of the houses have been built recently. The population of Princes Risborough by contrast, has stagnated and is ageing because there has been very little house building for the last 30 years.</p> |
| <p>Won't growth at Princes Risborough just attract more people from London/commuters?</p> | <p>There is a risk that housing growth at Princes Risborough would not be matched by growth in local jobs, leading to more commuting and a 'dormitory town' effect. That makes growth at Princes Risborough a difficult option, so we need to do more work to understand whether it is for the best or not.</p> |
| <p>Will it create a dormitory town?</p> | <p>See above.</p> |
| <p>How do you control development to the west of the town – where will it stop?</p> | <p>The railway has provided a natural boundary up to now, so once it is breached by major housing growth, there is a natural concern that there could be no limit to growth. If the Local Plan does in the end allocate some growth to Princes Risborough, it will set out strong policies as to exactly how much land should be used and where, up to 2031. The Local Plan will periodically be reviewed, but decisions for further growth in the town will be for the next generation to make.</p> |
| <p>Is Green Belt land going to be looked at</p> | <p>One of the other main options for the Plan is to look at areas of the Green Belt in the District that are not also in</p> |

| | |
|------------|--|
| elsewhere? | the Chilterns AONB. This means there could be equally difficult decisions to be made down in the south of District, particularly around Bourne End, Wooburn Green, Marlow and Flackwell Heath. |
|------------|--|

Infrastructure/Facilities

| | |
|---|---|
| What about the A4010 and links to Aylesbury (incl Stoke Mandeville), High Wycombe? | <p>The transport work at Princes Risborough has up to now looked at the more local effects of increased traffic due to growth. An alternative route to the A4010 through the town could relieve the town centre of some traffic and bring the opportunity to make the town centre environment more attractive.</p> <p>There are likely to be more strategic effects on the transport network, for example at the Pedestal roundabout at High Wycombe and on the approaches to Aylesbury. These would need to be looked at in the context of strategic transport planning for Buckinghamshire, and as part of the upcoming fourth Local Transport Plan.</p> |
| Rail infrastructure – services to London have been reduced | <p>There are two important rail projects that will be implemented in the near future which could have benefits for Princes Risborough:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Evergreen 3 project to link Oxford to Marylebone via High Wycombe. It's important that services should stop at Princes Risborough. • The East West Rail (EWR) project will link Oxford to Cambridge via Milton Keynes. A spur to the south will link up with Aylesbury and services will run from there to Marylebone via High Wycombe. At present, services between Princes Risborough and Aylesbury are limited by the single track between the towns. EWR are looking at providing a 'passing loop' (a train layby) between the two towns so that two-way operation can be made easier, leading to more frequent services. |
| How do you get the timing of infrastructure right? | This is a very important point. Planning for infrastructure will be worked up in more detail as we progress with the Plan, right through to when planning agreements are negotiated. |
| How will existing services cope? Will Government provide extra money? What obligations do | <p>Capital finance for infrastructure (like facility buildings and roads), comes with development through planning agreements and through the Community Infrastructure Levy.</p> <p>Revenue finance for services (like teachers, road mending</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>developers have?</p> | <p>and refuse collection), comes through central Government grant and Council tax receipts paid by new and old residents alike.</p> <p>Some revenue comes through the New Homes Bonus, which is paid to the District Council and shared with parishes and the County Council. However, it is not 'new' money as this fund has been top-sliced by the Government from Council grants.</p> |
| <p>What about existing groundwater flooding problems – e.g. Mill Lane?</p> | <p>Part of the work for the Local Plan will include a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which will provide an up-to-date picture of risks from rivers and streams, ground water, and surface water. We encourage everyone to send in photos and information about the recent floods as this will be invaluable information for the updated assessment.</p> <p>The Local Plan does not have a direct role in solving existing problems, but it should have regard to flood risk when identifying the most appropriate places for development. Individual planning applications will also need to do a flood risk assessment (both locally and on the wider area) and where needed, commit to providing effective flood mitigation measures. If the risks of flooding cannot be acceptably treated, then these areas will not be included in the Plan.</p> |
| <p>How will the town centre cope, including parking issues? Would it actually benefit from extra footfall?</p> | <p>The Town Council have identified opportunities for the town centre to be expanded and enhanced, such as the land between New Road and the High Street, and sites such as this one are included in one of our current plans, the Delivery and Site Allocations Plan. The Local Plan should set out where and how new shops should be provided, and protect the town from out-of-town supermarkets.</p> |
| <p>Existing supermarkets won't cope – does that mean we will get an edge of town supermarket undermining the town centre?</p> | <p>See above – getting the retail provision right will be an important part of the Plan.</p> |
| <p>What about gas mains, water etc.?</p> | <p>The Plan will take account of underground pipelines but we have not got to this more detailed stage of assessment at this point.</p> |
| <p>Would all the social housing have to go into</p> | <p>We haven't decided yet on the exact mix or types of housing for new development, although our current policies indicate that a greenfield development should</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| Princes Risborough? | provide 40% of the housing as affordable housing. Affordable housing is a mix of 'affordable rented' and 'shared ownership' (i.e. part buy part rent). Shared ownership helps young people get a foot on the housing ladder. |
| How do we know major expansion would be well designed? | The most recent housing developments in the District can show good quality design. We would want to work with the residents of the town to make sure that the new development would work well and be high quality. The best way to secure this is through strong policies in the Local Plan, rather than leaving it up to speculative applications by developers. We have not prepared any detailed designs or master-plans for the growth options at this stage. |

Process

| | |
|---|--|
| What influence does Princes Risborough have relative to the rest of the District? | Local opinion plays a strong part in assessing what should be included in a Local Plan and what should be left out. However, it is not a vote. In the end, the most appropriate places for growth will be identified principally by good planning reasons and the balance between potential benefit and potential harm. |
| Princes Risborough is low on WDC's priority list? | When we go to the south of the District we tend to hear that we give undue attention to the north. We do try to be fair to everyone. |
| Won't Localism help us? | A Neighbourhood Plan could be the best way to make sure that residents have a say in how new development will work. The Neighbourhood Plan sits under the Local Plan and will need to conform to the housing targets and other strategic policies set out in it. A Neighbourhood Plan is not a way of saying 'no' to growth. |

Other questions

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Burial grounds | The need for burial grounds will be included in our infrastructure planning. |
| What happens if sites aren't built | When identifying suitable sites for housing (and other development) in the Local Plan we have to talk to landowners and developers to see whether they are prepared to release the land for development. If landowners are not prepared to make their site available |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>we may have to consider proposing other sites.</p> <p>However just because a landowner or developer is promoting a site for development and willing to make the land available does not mean that it is the most appropriate site for development.</p> |
| Population projection methodology – more detail | To work out how many homes we need to provide across the District we have to project forward recent past trends in population growth. We have set out several different scenarios based on slightly different trends. We then have to convert this to a homes figure by looking at the rate at which new households are forming across the whole population. The need for new homes is driven both by population growth and the fact that household sizes have been declining. |
| Types (affordability), mix of homes, density? | It's too early to say at present – this will be part of our future work. We're sharing what we've done so far so that people have a chance to have their say and not present a fait accompli. |
| Sustainability: local employment impact (homes : jobs) | As explained above, this is a concern which we need to do more work on to understand whether it is an issue that can be overcome. |
| Molins sports ground future and other urban brownfield (Picts Lane) | <p>Development at Princes Risborough could provide enough value to secure the sports ground for community use. However the site is within the Green Belt and AONB so would be unlikely to be used for major development.</p> <p>There is an active application for housing on half of the Picts Lane site, so at the moment we're not able to comment.</p> |
| Integration of new development with existing town – retail in the right place | Development on the other side of the railway line would need to solve the problems of getting across the line and getting good integration. If these problems can't be overcome, then it may not be suitable to be included in the Local Plan. |
| Picts Lane and alternative route | The alternative route would potentially go through the Picts Lane site and this is something we will have to consider alongside the applicant for development on the site. |
| HS2 | There continues to be concern about construction traffic using the A4010 and routes via Longwick and the A418. |



| | |
|---|---|
| | Information from HS2 Ltd to date on construction impact has been scarce and they have been clear that no mitigation is on the table. These concerns should be brought to the attention of the special parliamentary Select Committee through petitioning. See the 51M website: http://www.51m.co.uk/petitioning/ |
| Need for new hospital | We will continue to work with the NHS hospital trust as part of our infrastructure planning. |
| Impact on Shootacre Lane | There will be more detailed work on the alternative route around the town. We welcome suggestions for other route options or variations on the two options we have looked at so far. |
| Overall flood risk assessment: Kingsmead / Mill Lane | As above |
| Grammar school provision | We are working with the County Council and have identified overall needs for secondary school provision. This will need to be refined for the selective system in the County. |
| What's the benefit of growth? | <p>Growth could bring major infrastructure to the town:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An alternative to the A4010, relieving the town centre and making it more attractive to shoppers • Replacement or upgrade of the sewage works • Stimulating a better retail offer in the town centre • Providing homes which are a public good <p>This is not to ignore or gloss over the risks or potential harm of growth – these also need to be looked at carefully and an appropriate balance or mitigation sought.</p> |
| Need a wider bypass route – better detail on existing options | We welcome people's thoughts about other options for the alternative route. We will develop the existing options in more detail if they look like something that will work. But we wanted to show you what we've done so far so that you can comment on it and shape it. |
| Energy supply and water supply | We are talking to all the utility providers about what growth might mean for their services. If the Local Plan were to set out an energy strategy, it would need to identify suitable sites/areas for solar farms and/or wind farms. We welcome views on this issue as part of this consultation. |
| More clarity on amount of land needed for 2500 | We're at an early stage of this work and so far have identified the 'area of search' between the B4009 and |

| | |
|---|---|
| – how far? | sites already identified at Park Mill Farm and north of Longwick Road and Mill Lane. More work needs to be done to identify suitable sites in this area. We're sharing our early work so that you have a chance to comment now. |
| Will the plan be sound if we put jobs in the south and houses in the north? | This is a very pertinent question which goes to the heart of good planning. As explained above, there is more to do to understand whether growth at Princes Risborough can work well. |
| What alternative options have we looked at in the District? | The other main option is the Green Belt review (see above). We also looked at a new settlement in the Terrick area related to HS2, but our initial assessment told us that it would be unlikely to be viable. |
| What are the consequences of staying at 480? | The risk of choosing a 'lowest' growth figure or staying with the target in our current plan is that it would not be meeting our objectively assessed need and it may be harder to resist speculative development. The recent failure of Aylesbury Vale's Plan at examination just before Christmas was in part due to the fact that the Plan shied away from meeting their objectively assessed needs. With a Plan in place, it is easier to resist speculative development and also make sure planned development delivers all it should. |
| Potential for redeveloping town centre | See above. |
| Parking at the station | Yes, the capacity of the station car park will need to be reviewed, especially in the light of potential service improvements from Evergreen 3 and EWR. |
| Why isn't the MP here/ can he be invited to the next meeting? | We provided all our local MPs with details of the consultation including dates of meetings. We will invite him to a future meeting. |
| What about views from the escarpment/ Whiteleaf Cross? | This is something we will have to consider as we assess the option in more detail. The views from Whiteleaf Cross were not a determining factor in the appeal decisions relating to the Park Mill Farm site. |
| Can't we change the AONB/extend the boundaries | The AONB is designated by the Government, not by the Council, and the boundaries are reviewed very infrequently. We understand the Chilterns Conservation Board may be promoting a review of boundaries to Government but not in this area, and the reality is that the |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Aylesbury vale landscape which is the landscape to the west and north of the town is a very different type of landscape to the Chilterns.</p> |
| <p>Development proposals at Park Mill Farm have been rejected twice in recent years by planning inspectors. Why then do we have to look at it again and bigger options in the area?</p> | <p>The planning “rules” have changed significantly since the most recent Park Mill Farm decision. There is now a “presumption in favour of sustainable development” and through Local Plans we have to try to meet our objectively assessed need for housing and other development. Previously under the South East Plan some of Wycombe’s housing need was met outside of the District and the Princes Risborough area was identified as an area for low growth. The South East Plan has now been abolished and the approach has changed.</p> <p>Issues highlighted by planning inspectors relating to the need for a grade separated crossing of the railway line for pedestrians and cyclists to help with integration of Park Mill Farm with the town remain very relevant.</p> |

10. Events Feedback

10.1. At the events participants were encouraged to fill in feedback forms about the actual event itself, we received 89 feedback forms in total. Overall the feedback from the forms was positive in terms of the content, information provided and organisation of the events, the responses can be seen on the following charts.





10.2. There was some criticism regarding the organisation of events and how they were publicised, the need to register for events and the size and location of the venues chosen. The Council took all reasonable means to promote both the consultation and the public meetings/workshops. Registration is important as it allows us to plan the meetings and confirm that we have suitable venues.

10.3. Wherever possible we will try to make sure that we organise meetings in suitable venues and provide appropriate notification in as cost effective a way as possible.

10.4.

Appendix 1 Legacy Comments

Where we held workshops we also asked people what legacy they wanted to the Local Plan to leave for future generations. The list below summarises the comments received.

- No empty houses – no estates left to rot with no-one living there – make owners of empty property use it
- Extend the AONB to river Thames from A404 to Bourne End
- Drastic and complete overhaul of WDC
- Protect Marlow from becoming a misery like High Wycombe
- Developer / councillor cosy relationship should stop
- Defend our green belt / AONB
- Westhorpe house connected to housing
- A Country Park in Little Marlow that really is for our children to breathe in.
- Marlow is an important town. It needs to maintain its vibrancy, maintain its excellent transport in and out and continue to be the jewel in the crown.
- Marlow keeps the railway and continue to be a vibrant and attractive riverside town. Mixed housing / shops and offices together will help – don't need large warehousing in Globe Park – need high tech offices: it is the future!
- To avoid at all cost any green belt development; Plenty of green land to play in
- The area south of Wycombe including Marlow, Little Marlow, Wooburn, Wooburn Green, Bourne End and Flackwell Heath is a lovely part of the country with picturesque landscape between habitations. Let's not spoil it by digging the landscape and turning the area into one large conurbation.
- A Wycombe District that values its open spaces and particularly its countryside landscape settings – particularly the River Thames Valley Corridor. Don't risk spoiling it.
- Build flats for young singles and couples in the station end of Globe Park
- Build on Foxes Piece Allotments and South Part of Hanging Hill Allotments.
- A pleasant environment with access to open fields etc.
- We changed Marlow for the better
- Maintain a village feel
- By 2031
 - Farming to stay where it is
 - Support farmers
 - Improve the roads first

- To maintain its village appearance and community feel. If development takes place then it should suit the needs of the community.
- How to make this plan attractive to retain a mixed community? – i.e. keep young people here and look after the older residents. Do not make it a centre for migration communities.
- Green open spaces; sensible increase of housing scattered rather than estate; towards Tower Farm seems a good place to start for housing; keeping our AONB and Green Belt
- Air Park: high tech industry associated with aeronautics on Air Park; keep it open for light aircraft
- Traffic noise: control noise from the M40 through the District to open up currently sterilised sites
- Environmental improvements – top priority – noise reduction on the M40 to enable more people to live comfortably in Lane End / Stokenchurch
- More housing and business but decently build and interesting architecture! Also in scale to the size of the communities.
- That next generation's living conditions are such that they have access to greenery, green space, countryside and wildlife.
- High quality, environmentally friendly, affordable housing for everybody.
- Town centre: sensitive restoration; making High Wycombe centre a place to be in and live in.
- Marlow / Bourne End: address the challenge of construction in the flood plain – live with the likelihood of water
- Transport – link to cross rail is essential to future