

## **Statement of Consultation - Appendix 13**

### **Princes Risborough Town Plan Regulation 18 Summary of Responses**

## **Princes Risborough Town Plan**

### **Regulation 18 Summary of Responses**

Wycombe District Council consulted on what should be included in the Princes Risborough Town Plan, as part of the statutory consultation stage (regulation 18) between 11<sup>th</sup> November and 28<sup>th</sup> December 2015. This is not a detailed assessment but a summary of the responses received.

Total respondents: 51

#### **General/Principle of the Plan:**

##### **Respondents (name and id)**

J.D. and P.M. Burnham (PR16 0001)  
 Richard Yeoman (PR16 0003)  
 Woking Council (PR16 0002)  
 Runnymede Council (PR16 0005)  
 Denise Barry-Smith (PR16 0008)  
 Marine Management Organisation (PR16 0012)  
 Valerie Tappin (PR16 0013 & PR16 0052)  
 Saunders (PR16 0016)  
 A & C Poole (PR16 0020)  
 Valerie Page (PR16 0023)  
 Aylesbury Vale District Council (PR16 0025)  
 Savills (on behalf of Bloor homes and Princes Risborough Consortium) (PR16 0027)  
 Chilterns Conservation Board (PR16 0028)  
 Peter and Helen Gibson (PR16 0029)  
 Gladman Developments (PR16 0034)  
 Kate Williamson (PR16 0037)  
 Maggie Wooster Keyte (PR16 0040)  
 Persimmon Homes (PR16 0041)  
 Jane Rogers (PR16 0042)  
 RPS Planning & Development (on behalf of Halsbury Homes) (PR16 0044)  
 Askett Society (PR16 0045)  
 Richard McKenzie (PR16 0049)  
 Peter and Lesley Lunnon (PR16 0051)

Support: 4

Object: 6

Comment: 10

**Support:**

- As much as WDC's unmet housing need should be met within the Wycombe District
- Support for the AAP agreed that the plan has the potential to deliver strategic growth for Princes Risborough through sustainable and effective design
- Support was noted with the need to build more houses, but is in favour of a 'certain' expansion of Princes Risborough

**Objection:****Principle:**

- Large number of objecting statements directed towards the principle of the AAP and scheme in general
- Concern over the speed of the plan process was also noted
- Confusion as to why the Princes Risborough Town Plan and the New Local Plan are separate, and what impact this has on the examination process
- Do not understand the point of the consultation

**Approach:**

- Plan must address alternatives around Risborough and around the district

**Brownfield/Greenfield Sites:**

- Redevelopment of all brownfield sites has to happen before greenfield sites are considered, an overwhelming majority object to any development on greenfield sites
- If development has to go ahead, brownfield redevelopment should be the priority
- Recommendation of Local Landscape designation to stop development on greenfield sites

**DtC:**

- More clarity is needed between the Duty to Co-operate between Central Bucks authorities and how this has been fulfilled

**Scope/Scale****Respondents (name and id)**

Richard Yeoman (PR16 0003)

Denise Barry-Smith (PR16 0008)

Hart District Council (PR16 0009)

Saunders (PR16 0016)

K Wise (PR16 0019)

Aylesbury Vale District Council (PR16 0025)

Savills (on behalf of Bloor homes and Princes Risborough Consortium) (PR16 0027)

Royal Borough of Windsor & Maidenhead (PR16 0026)

Chilterns Conservation Board (PR16 0028)

Gladman Developments (PR16 0034)

Kate Williamson (PR16 0037)  
Persimmon Homes (PR16 0041)  
RPS Planning & Development (on behalf of Halsbury Homes) (PR16 0044)  
Askett Society (PR16 0045)  
Peter and Lesley Lunnon (PR16 0051)

Support: 6  
Object: 5  
Comment: 4

**Support:**

- Support for the current scale of development is noted due to the WDC's current housing need and the need to build houses
- Housing need should be included within the geographical scope of the Town Plan
- There should be no upper-limit cap on the current dwelling number, so the plan can respond to the demand in housing
- Current scale could be successful through appropriate design

**Objections:**

- Town would not be able to cope with the proposed scale of development
- Would change of character of the town

**General:**

- The plan will need to justify the scale and how the proposed level of growth fits in with the objectively assessed needs assessment

**Housing Need:**

- Previously refused applications do not correlate with the proposed scale on the grounds of housing need
- Neighbouring authorities should not be expected to meet WDC's housing need when there are sites that within Risborough that could be put forward for housing

**Social:**

**Respondents (name and id)**

James Tomkins (PR16 0011)  
Geoff and Sheila Clark (PR16 0018)  
Maggie Wooster Keyte (PR16 0040)  
Buckinghamshire County Council (PR16 0047)

Support:  
Object:  
Comment: 4

Communities:

- Important for the plan to focus on the vitality and inclusiveness of the community
- Focus on provisions the vulnerable members of the communities, including the elderly and those with learning/physical disabilities

Low-cost housing:

- Concern for the current level of low-cost housing, and that the plan should address the current lack of these resources for future residents

## **Economy:**

### **Respondents (name and id)**

Peter Keen (Hypnos) (PR16 0007)  
Geoff and Sheila Clark (PR16 0018)  
West Wycombe Parish Council (PR16 0032)  
Persimmon Homes (PR16 0041)  
Peter and Lesley Lunnon (PR16 0051)

Support:  
Object: 2  
Comment: 3

### **Objections:**

- Lack of employment available in Princes Risborough to sustain proposed level of growth

### **Employment:**

- Plan should introduce local employment opportunities
- Provision of more employment land along the proposed new road for employment sites affected by development

### **Impact of transport on town centre:**

- Current transport issues could negatively impact existing trade and activity in the Town Centre

## **Infrastructure:**

### **Respondents (name and id)**

Richard Yeoman (PR16 0003)  
Anthony Tomkins (PR16 0006)  
Denise Barry-Smith (PR16 0008)  
Saunders (PR16 0016)  
Geoff and Sheila Clark (PR16 0018)  
K Wise (PR16 0019)  
Carl and Tara Leaver (PR16 0021)  
Savills (on behalf of Bloor homes and Princes Risborough Consortium) (PR16 0027)  
West Wycombe Parish Council (PR16 0032)  
Maggie Wooster Keyte (PR16 0040)  
RPS Planning & Development (on behalf of Halsbury Homes) (PR16 0044)  
Buckinghamshire County Council (PR16 0047)

Support:  
Object: 3  
Comment: 9

**Objections:**

- Current infrastructure would not be able to cope with scheme; specifically schools and GPs.
- Lack of clear statement concerning covering additional infrastructure and facilities

**General:**

- Improvements needed to existing infrastructure as well as key infrastructure to be provided

**Schools:**

- Need for a new primary school, either 2x2fe schools or 1x3fe through the expansion of Great Kimble, Princes Risborough and Bledlow Ridge.
- Secondary school will also need to be expanded

**Parking:**

- Restrictions needed for on-road parking during school times to ease road congestion around schools
- Suggestions for car parking to be expanded

**Transport:****Respondents (name and id)**

Richard Yeoman (PR16 0003)

Julie Willis (PR16 0004)

Anthony Tomkins (PR16 0006)

Vic Kearley (PR16 0010)

Network Rail (PR16 0014)

Geoff and Sheila Clark (PR16 0018)

Carl and Tara Leaver (PR16 0021)

Aylesbury Vale District Council (PR16 0025)

West Wycombe Parish Council (PR16 0032)

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council (PR13 0033)

Longwick cum Ilmer Parish Council (PR16 0036)

Maggie Wooster Keyte (PR16 0040)

Jane Rogers (PR16 0042)

Chiltern Railways (PR16 0043)

Askett Society (PR16 0045)

Stuart Lee (PR16 0048)

Richard McKenzie (PR16 0049)

Peter and Lesley Lunnon (PR16 0051)

Support:

Object: 8

Comment: 10

### Objections:

- Concerns over the location of the proposed new road around town, full assessment of congestion and impact of surrounding areas will need to be carried out
- Concern for the impact of development on the A4010 and B4009, also beyond the plan area.
- Concern that the new transport infrastructure will lead to congestion in Longwick, Askett, Great Kimble and Monks Risborough
- Concerns over traffic associated with construction of HS2
- New road to the south-east and upgrade of Shootacre lane would invite more developers

### New road:

- Suggestion for the expansion of Upper Icknield Way
- Suggestion of new link road from A4010 to the station and Princes Estate
- Suggestion for outer ring road is supported by some respondents
- Suggestion for new road through the development
- Suggestion for bypass to relieve current issues with the High Street

### Public transport:

- Current public transport system and existing transport links will need to be improved within Princes Risborough
- Improvements to public transport and/or a bypass or ring road could alleviate these issues

### Congestion:

- Concerns with current congestion at school drop-off and pick-up times
- Current one-way system of town centre should be revised
- Congestion issue will only be made worse with development

### Railway:

- Station should be rebuilt on the derelict site adjacent to Longwick road as current station is separate from town centre
- Plan needs to take into account current plans put forward by East-West rail, including a necessary 15m land buffer from railway.
- The planned closure of level crossings must be considered to assess diverted routes and new highways leading from development.
- Noise/vibrations as a result of railway improvements must also be considered

### Cycling:

- Request for dedicated cycling infrastructure to be included in the plan



## Environment:

### **Respondents (name and id)**

Marine Management Organisation (PR16 0012)  
Valerie Tappin (PR16 0013 and PR16 0052)  
Tony Davies (PR16 0017)  
Geoff and Sheila Clark (PR16 0018)  
K Wise (PR16 0019)  
Natural England (PR16 0022)  
Savills (on behalf of Bloor homes and Princes Risborough Consortium) (PR16 0027)  
Chilterns Conservation Board (PR16 0028)  
Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)  
Bucks and Milton Keynes Natural Environment Partnership (PR16 0031)  
Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council (PR13 0033)  
Longwick cum Ilmer Parish Council (PR16 0036)  
Maggie Wooster Keyte (PR16 0040)  
RPS Planning & Development (on behalf of Halsbury Homes) (PR16 0044)  
Buckinghamshire County Council (PR16 0047)  
Richard McKenzie (PR16 0049)

Support:

Object: 4

Comment: 10

### **Objections:**

- Concerns over risk of flooding for both existing and new homes
- Lack of designation for green space/residential space in the proposed development area
- Development threatened AONB
- Impact on AONB has not been fully assessed

### **General:**

- Sustainability appraisal will need to be carried out by LPA
- Woodland boundary should be created for the sake of wildlife and also to screen views.

### **Flooding:**

- Flood risk should be handled through policy, with a specific policy to be written on sustainable drainage

### **AONB:**

- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty must be protected for future generations.
- In the worst case it is mitigated with investment in green infrastructure
- Local Landscape designation could help to protect the AONB
- Development creep must be curbed to protect the AONB

### **Biodiversity:**

- Plan must make provisions to protect and enhance current biodiversity in development area
- Direct policies will have to be written to protect biodiversity

### **Integration and sprawl:**

#### **Respondents (name and id)**

James Tomkins (PR16 0011)  
Janet Voke (PR16 0015)  
Tony Davies (PR16 0017)  
K Wise (PR16 0019)  
Valerie Page (PR16 0023)  
Kate Williamson (PR16 0037)  
Richard Jones (PR16 0038)  
Jill Jones (PR16 0039)  
Jane Rogers (PR16 0042)  
Askett Society (PR16 0045)  
Richard McKenzie (PR16 0049)

Support:

Object: 3

Comment: 8

#### **Objections:**

- Concerns over maintaining separate identities of surrounding villages and hamlets
- Development would absorb historic hamlets into urban sprawl and change character of Princes Risborough
- Concern that the development would lead to Princes Risborough and Longwick merging into one settlement, suggestions are made for natural buffers including woodland and distance

#### **Integration:**

- Any new neighbourhoods created out of the scheme should mesh together and complement each other

#### **Sprawl:**

- Local Landscape designation could protect the AONB and greenfield sites as well as limiting developer creep

### **Heritage:**

#### **Respondents (name and id)**

Savills (on behalf of Bloor homes and Princes Risborough Consortium) (PR16 0027)  
Kate Williamson (PR16 0037)  
Jane Rogers (PR16 0042)  
Historic England (PR16 0024 and PR16 0050)  
Peter and Lesley Lunnon (PR16 0051)

Support:

Object: 2

Comment: 3

**Objections:**

- Concerns over the impact of development on historic character of the area, specifically the Monks Risborough and Lower Icknield Way

**General:**

- Plan needs to give consideration to historic environments
- Specific tailored policy for improving historical environment of not only plan area, but surrounding areas as well, for further benefits
- An up-to-date appraisal will need to be carried out for conservation areas as the currently adopted appraisal is out of date (1990s)