

**Pictsmede – Picts Lane and the Station area, Princes Risborough Non Statutory Brief for Redevelopment
Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov - Dec 2006)**

Schedule of respondents:

Representation No	Respondent	Date response received
A	John G Hughes, Ridgeway Lodge, Upper Icknield Way, Saunderton	16 th November 2006
B	Graham Wiles, Risborough Area Business Group	17 th November 2006
C	Brian Butler	20 th November 2006
D	Mrs Maureen Judd, 20 Elmdale Gardens, Princes Risborough, HP27 0DL	21 st November 2006
E	Mr J M Maultby, 16 Park Street, Princes Risborough HP27 9AH	22 nd November 2006
F	Gary Hall	22 nd November 2006
G	Mr & Mrs McCombie, 17 Summerleys Road, Princes Risborough	28 th November 2006
H	Mark Roberts, Gladestry, Bledlow Road, Saunderton, HP27 9NG	1 st December 2006
I	Stephen and Louise Jeanes, 4 Mill Stream Close, Princes Risborough HP27 9ED	2 nd December 2006
J	L Adlam, 6 Salisbury Close, Princes Risborough, HP27 0JF	4 th December 2006
K	Risborough Area Residents Association	5 th December 2006
L	Mr Eric Gadsden, W E Black Ltd, Hawridge Place, Hawridge, Chesham HP5 2UG	6 th December 2006
M	Harbour Castle Ltd, Bridge House, Bridge Street, Castletown, Isle of Man IM9 1AX	6 th December 2006
N	GW & DM Ambler, Letterbox Cottage, Shootacre Lane, Princes Risborough HP27 9EH	7 th December 2006
O	Mrs M Wooster, 63 Westmead, Princes Risborough HP27 9HS	8 th December 2006
P	Princes Risborough Town Council, Tower Court, Horns Lane, Princes Risborough HP27 0AJ	8 th December 2006
Q	Risborough Area Community Action, c/o Ridgeway Lodge, Upper Icknield Way, Princes Risborough HP27 9NL	8 th December 2006
R	Denys Williams, 29 Willow Way, Princes Risborough HP27 9AY	10 th December 2006
S	Catherine Campbell, 21 Picts Lane, Princes Risborough	11 th December 2006
T	Ann Smith, J Smith & Sons (Walters Ash) Ltd, 280 Main Road, Walters Ash, High Wycombe HP14 4TJ	11 th December 2006
U	David Butcher, Hives Planning on behalf of Ercol Holdings Ltd	11 th December 2006
V	Mr & Mrs P Green, 5 Picts Lane, Princes Risborough HP27 9DX	11 th December 2006
W	RPS Planning, Mallams Court, 18 Milton Park, Abingdon OX14 4RP on behalf of Hypnos	11 th December 2006
X	Colin White, Chilterns Conservation Board	11 th December 2006
Y	Mr C A Birch, 93 Westmead, Princes Risborough, HP27 9HS	11 th December 2006

**Pictsmede – Picts Lane and the Station area, Princes Risborough Non Statutory Brief for Redevelopment
Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov - Dec 2006)**

Representation No	Respondent	Date response received
Z	Georgina Carlin, 57 Poppy Road, Princes Risborough	11 th December 2006
AA	Mr D T G Kingham, 'Jubilee', Mill Lane, Monks Risborough HP27 9LG	12 th December 2006
AB	Mr John Mason, Friars Patch, Mill Lane, Monks Risborough HP27 9JE	14 th December 2006
AC	Mr C G Dennis, 2 Clifford Road, Princes Risborough HP27 0DU	15 th December 2006
AD	Mr R Norton, Summerfield, 42 Picts Lane, Princes Risborough HP27 9DX	18 th December 2006
AE	Bucks Economic Partnership	19 th December 2006
AF	Stuart Yeatman; Chiltern Railways; John Laing plc, Allington House, 150 Victoria Street London SW1E 5LB	1 st March 2007

Schedule of comments:

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
	General Comments:		
1	Mainly support the proposed Brief	C; E; I; J; L; Q; V; W; Y; Z; AA; AB	Noted
2	Support the brief with some reservations	K; P; S	Noted
3	Brief misses opportunity for comprehensive development	AE	Disagree, this brief enables phased or comprehensive development
4	Don't like the name Pictsmede; Suggestion that local people should be asked their preference for naming of area and streets	O; V; I;	Pictmede was chosen as it was found on the OS map dating from the 1920's. However this name is not fixed and the Council will invite alternative names to be put forward by the public when the brief is adopted. For the avoidance of doubt the brief will be revised to ensure the name Pictsmede is seen only as a suggested future name for the area.
	Analysis/ Context		
5	Would like to see Chilterns AONB highlighted as one of main issues – the AONB boundary is inaccurate on some maps	X	The AONB is highlighted as one of the main issues with regard to the natural setting of the development on page 3 and reflected in redevelopment objectives for the site. Built setting and land use plan will be corrected to accurately show the AONB boundary

**Pictsmede – Picts Lane and the Station area, Princes Risborough Non Statutory Brief for Redevelopment
Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov - Dec 2006)**

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
6	Question analysis in the brief regarding its relationship with the rest of the town and its environmental sensitivity – it is isolated and only has a relationship with the station and as established employment land it is not environmentally sensitive	AE	The sensitivity relates to its position adjacent to the AONB and wider countryside rather than the current internal land use. The brief highlights the isolated relationship and one of its aims is to address this aspect – wording in analysis will be amended to make this aspect clearer.
	Existing site issues		
7	Concerns regarding contamination of employment areas	AE	The brief will be amended to include reference to potential contamination
	Employment vs residential:		
8	Support for 50/50 residential/ employment split	V; X; Y;AA	Noted
9	Preference for a greater proportion of residential development on the site (90%/ 80%) for reasons that include: ensure relocation of existing employment uses within the town; to provide additional housing provision within the existing town area; to offset need to develop Park Mill Farm for residential; as ample employment land elsewhere in the town	A; C; E; F; J; K; L; O; P; Q; W; AB;	This Brief was prepared alongside the emerging Wycombe Development Framework. The Brief reflects the 'Preferred Option' for the future redevelopment of this site which was included in the Site Allocations document which envisages that these areas should be redeveloped with a mix of 60% housing and 40% employment uses. However, there is a strong desire to safeguard against the loss of major employers. If redevelopment of any part of the site facilitates the relocation of the existing business on the site within the town, consideration would be given to altering the proportion of residential to employment in each phase, depending on the extent to which there are overriding benefits to the town that would otherwise not be realised.
10	Preference for 100% residential on the site – for reasons of adverse impact of commercial traffic, viability for relocating employment, suitability in terms of location, and need for more housing.	E; L; P; W	See response for 9) above
11	Concern that businesses may move away if there is an increase	B; J; W	Policy Context section ties any increase in residential development beyond 60% to

**Pictsmede – Picts Lane and the Station area, Princes Risborough Non Statutory Brief for Redevelopment
Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov - Dec 2006)**

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
	in residential development. Preference to tying any residential development to relocation of existing employment locally.		relocation of businesses within the town.
12	Preference for re-locating businesses elsewhere within Princes Risborough (e.g. Princes Estate; Park Mill Farm)	A; C; F; J; L; O; P; Q; AB; AC; W; AE	Policy Context section ties any increase in residential development beyond 60% to relocation of businesses within the town.
13	Concern that site should remain entirely Employment Land, opposed to residential on the site.	AE; M	The employment land review undertaken in 2004 by Atkins on behalf of the council, considered that this site would be suitable for mixed use.
14	Preference for live work units if residential is provided	AE	The brief will be amended to include reference to live work units
15	Concern in mixing business and residential: would be unworkable with young families; traffic (a high proportion of vans and lorries) and vandalism	E;	This aspect would be considered when a detailed layout is submitted as part of a planning application. Employment uses does not necessarily result in high levels of traffic, and part of the thinking behind mixed use is that the traffic patterns of the different uses complement each other.
	Employment		
16	Request to show BRE land as employment on plan on page 4	U;	Plan on page 4 to be amended to include BRE land as Employment land
17	Concerns about identification of alternative employment sites and need for plan to be viable in commercial terms; no study of employment demand.	T; AE	Specific alternative sites for existing employers will be considered and dealt with by the Council in conjunction with landowners when specific proposals are brought forward. A study of employment demand has been undertaken. This forms one of the background studies for the Wycombe Development Framework and this brief follows the recommendations put forward in that study. A reference to the study will be added to the brief
	Affordable housing		
18	Preference for a greater proportion of affordable housing (40% minimum)	A	The brief includes a requirement that 40% of residential development should be allocated for affordable units in Activities and Landuses section on page 13 in accordance with current policy.
19	Suggestion that the affordable housing be solely for local people	K;	Unfortunately this is not possible as this site does not qualify as a rural exception site as Princes Risborough has a population of over 3000. The housing will however be allocated

**Pictsmede – Picts Lane and the Station area, Princes Risborough Non Statutory Brief for Redevelopment
Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov - Dec 2006)**

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
			on basis of greatest need on the housing waiting list.
20	Preference for a lower percentage of affordable housing especially if the site is not 100% residential	L; W;	This would be contrary to existing housing policy.
	Density of housing		
21	Preference for a higher density of residential dwellings	D; F; W;	It is considered that a higher density of housing than that recommended could lead to a poor residential environment unless a reduction in parking ratio is achieved; also it may not be possible with the maximum storey heights as proposed in the brief.
22	Preference for a lower density of residential dwellings	X	Densities are in line with current guidance in PPS3 and reflect the principle of higher densities closer to public transport nodes and town centres.
23	Question low density residential areas proposed	AE	Density of 35dph is above the minimum stated in PPS3 and considered appropriate in light of the surrounding residential development and edge of town location.
	Hotel use		
24	Plan should incorporate more space for hotel	AE	This is included in the list of possible secondary uses on page 13. The Hotel needs survey recently undertaken by Hotel Solutions for Wycombe District Council in September 2006, concluded that there was not sufficient demand for a new hotel in the Princes Risborough area, and recommended upgrading/ enhancement of existing facilities.
25	Concern that a hotel would be better situated closer to town centre	K; P;	Any proposal for a hotel would be considered on its merits, be subject to sequential testing (as advocated in PPS6), and would in any case only come forward if considered viable by the hotel operator – this brief does not rule out potential for hotel development elsewhere in Princes Risborough.
	Open space; landscape treatment		
26	In favour of 'greening' the area	C; K; L; S; X;	Noted
27	Support provision of open space and restoration of streams	X	Noted

**Pictsmede – Picts Lane and the Station area, Princes Risborough Non Statutory Brief for Redevelopment
Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov - Dec 2006)**

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
28	Concerns that open space will encourage problems with young people	S;	This will depend largely on the specific location of the space and the degree to which it is overlooked by neighbouring residential development. This aspect will be considered during application process
29	Preference for some limited residential development on part of the area proposed green space	W;	It is considered essential that the open space needs of the development are met on site as it is in an area of open space deficiency. A development of 100 dwellings should include 0.6 hectares of open space as per NPFA guidelines which approximates the area shown in the brief. If not located in the position shown in the brief; which was chosen as it contains important existing trees, existing streams and is within an area of high flood risk; it would need to be located elsewhere on the site. If the area is developed comprehensively, the open space could be treated as a common cost which would ensure the cost is spread fairly across landowners.
30	Green space is inefficient use of land	AE	Any new residential development places demands regarding open space which are best met onsite or close by. The space chosen would be difficult to develop due to constraints of protected trees and the needs of the stream. (see above)
	Community use:		
31	Support community use for site at South east End of Picts Lane	S	Noted
32	Community facilities need further consultation to identify specific needs	W	Any specific proposal for community facilities would involve further public consultation.
33	New community facilities should be kept in town centre rather than the outskirts as suggested	D; P; Q	Any proposal for community use would need to pass the sequential test as outlined in policy C17 of the WDF Core Strategy.
34	Concern that any intensification of use on eastern side of Picts Lane would affect AONB	X	Any new scheme would need to be assessed on its own merits in terms of impact upon the AONB.
35	Concern that if the community use is located as shown on the illustrative plan should be of a type which would not involve high levels of noise (e.g. Doctors Surgery or place of worship)	N;	Any proposal would need to demonstrate that it did not adversely affect existing neighbours regarding noise pollution

**Pictsmede – Picts Lane and the Station area, Princes Risborough Non Statutory Brief for Redevelopment
Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov - Dec 2006)**

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
36	Preference that the community use facility should not be a church	F; K; P; Q; R;	Noted - A church is only one of the uses suggested in the brief. The brief will be amended to reflect the range of community uses defined in the WDF Core strategy C17
37	Suggestion that existing house identified for proposed community use should be redeveloped for large houses	AD:	This approach is unlikely to minimise impact on the AONB.
38	It is not clear what is meant by community facilities	AF	The brief will be amended to refer to range of community uses detailed in the WDF Core Strategy C17
	Public Art		
39	An opinion that the public art is not prominent enough and should be relocated to the station forecourt	I;	The brief does not rule out public art elsewhere on the site and the brief will be amended to remove the suggested location for public art. The location to be decided as part of the planning application process for the individual sites.
	Transport, traffic, parking:		
40	Concerns regarding the increase in traffic	E; H; I; L; S; Z; AD;	Any applications will be assessed in terms of impact on traffic levels in comparison with existing levels (including employment use of currently vacant sites)
41	Concerns over car parking on verges and streets (e.g. Station Road and Poppy Road)	I; R; Z	Any proposals will need to ensure adequate parking provision is made on site to avoid problems with off site parking.
42	Preference for one-way traffic flow around the Station area	C; D; S;	One way traffic tends to work against the creation of streets, because it tends to encourage traffic travel at higher speeds and so is not preferred
43	Concerns over the road infrastructure of the proposed development area and effect on adjoining roads & parking	H; I; J; S; Y; Z; AC;	See above
44	Concern that road realignment of Station Approach will affect existing residential dwellings	G; AD;	The impact upon existing dwellings was considered against the benefit of delivering a larger development area
45	Suggestion that Manor Park Avenue should be made a public road	P;	This is one of the aims of the Risborough 2035 report but may not be economic. Pedestrians and cyclists can use this road
46	Concern over pedestrian and cyclist safety and general road safety;	S;	Noted

**Pictsmede – Picts Lane and the Station area, Princes Risborough Non Statutory Brief for Redevelopment
Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov - Dec 2006)**

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
47	Layout should provide better access from Summersley Road to the A4010	D	This is beyond the scope of this brief
48	Designate Picts Lane a "Quiet Lane" along the section by the thatched cottage.	D	Wider County Policy on Quiet Lanes has concluded that they are not an effective means of reducing traffic; consideration will be given in the detailed design to realigning the road adjacent to the thatched cottage to mitigate traffic impact.
49	Concern that public transport should be included in the vision for the future	D;	We have by making the station more connected to the town, providing an interchange for buses, and the provision of some residential development will help make the provision of public transport more viable.
	Station car parking		
50	Concerns over capacity and location of car parking at the railway station	H; J; P;	Capacity at least the same as current use and would have a better access from the town. Chiltern Railways have confirmed that in the longer term they have an aspiration to double the amount of car parking; this is achievable using a decked car park as advocated in the brief.
51	Concern over proposal for decked car park in terms of visual impact	X	Proposals would need to be assessed for visual impact at time of application. It will need careful roof treatment and be closely associated with the station.
52	Support for recognition that the station car parking will need to be increased	AF	Noted
	Pedestrian links		
53	Concerns over access to and from town centre	A;	The redevelopment objectives reflect this concern and any proposal will need to address this issue to ensure this area and specifically the station is well connected with the town centre
54	Support for the foot/cycle bridge between Princes Estate and the relocated Station approach. The brief should include this as a key objective to provide access to the Phoenix trail and wider Sustrans network	A; Q; I; S	Noted, the brief does contain the footbridge as an objective

**Pictsmede – Picts Lane and the Station area, Princes Risborough Non Statutory Brief for Redevelopment
Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov - Dec 2006)**

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
55	Support for more pedestrian links with wider countryside	X	Noted
	Layout		
56	Alternative suggestion for location of proposed northern access to be positioned south of Cornwall House as a more realistic approach.	W;	The illustrative layout has been amended to reflect this approach
57	Employment uses should be located in the southern area where redevelopment does not need to support the relocation of an existing employer	W	Each part of the site should reflect the aim for mixed use. Proximity to the AONB and existing residential properties would indicate against locating employment exclusively in the southern area.
58	Concerns that new dwellings and adjacent new road access will affect quality of existing property in Picts Lane – suggestion to move proposed access north to provide greater buffer for existing dwellings	AD;	The illustrative layout shows one option of how the principles contained in the brief could be realised on plan. The impact on existing residential properties will be assessed in detail with any application.
59	New roads proposed make inefficient use of land	AE	Disagree – to ensure this area becomes part of the town we need to create a proper street network to connect and integrate this area. This follows accepted urban design principles and recent government guidance (e.g. Manual for streets).
60	Better explanation of preferred distribution of uses across the site	AF	The plan is intended to retain flexibility in terms of land use because of the need to balance the appropriate mix of uses on the site, market demand and the economics of relocation of operational activities to enable the retention of jobs locally, therefore further detail would prejudice this aim.
61	Support for improvement of access and connectivity to the station	AF	Noted
	Local Character/ Materials/ Impact		
62	Care need regarding design of frontage to Picts lane to ensure no adverse impact on AONB	X;AD	Noted and will make this more prominent in the brief

**Pictsmede – Picts Lane and the Station area, Princes Risborough Non Statutory Brief for Redevelopment
Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov - Dec 2006)**

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
63	Concern that brief does not safeguard future of Picts Lane residents or the character of the area.	AD;	We believe it does – by locating lowest density housing next to Picts lane, and by creating an integrated development, well connected to the town, and realising the assets of the stream and existing trees.
64	Suggestion that the façade of Hypnos be preserved	I;	Noted, but do not consider it is of sufficient merit to be an overriding consideration in the brief.
65	Suggestion that proposed type of materials (ref to Chilterns Design Guide) and design be included in the brief and should reflect local materials/ design (Chilterns/ Victorian/ Edwardian)	V; X;	Noted, will make reference to the Design Guide as a source of information, but as not in the AONB cannot require that it is followed.
	Heights of buildings:		
66	Concerns over height of buildings in the proposed brief, should be less than 4 storeys	A; E; K; P; Q; S; V; X;	The brief advocates four storeys in some limited key locations and any specific proposals would be subject to visual impact assessment.
67	Concerns over height of buildings in the proposed brief, should be less than 3 storeys	E; X	Requiring less than 3 storeys would not make best use of the land. It is considered 3 storeys would not necessarily conflict with the AONB if of sufficient quality.
68	Support building heights of 3-4 storeys	W	Noted
	Policy issues		
69	Concerns that the brief has no status within WDC policy and that mixed use proposed is contrary to the Local Plan policy for this site.	M; AE	The brief follows the emerging policy approach in the Site Allocations Document of the WDF. The site allocations policy would provide a material consideration to outweigh the adopted local plan.
70	Concern that the brief does take into account the recommendations in Risborough 2035	A	It is considered that the brief does follow the recommendations in Risborough 2035, namely making the station become the focus of a wider mixed use area as detailed in section 9 of the Vision framework. The brief will include specific reference to the Risborough 2035 Vision Document.
	Phasing		

**Pictsmede – Picts Lane and the Station area, Princes Risborough Non Statutory Brief for Redevelopment
Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov - Dec 2006)**

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
71	Suggestion that the phasing of development be changed starting with the southern area as it is currently vacant	I;	Phasing will depend upon the landowners, timetables and the layout has been amended to enable each ownership parcel to be developed in any order.
72	Phasing should correspond to proposed road structure	W;	The phasing as shown was developed to ensure both sides of new roads proposed would be developed together.
73	Question whether phasing has taken account of land ownership	AE	The amended phasing shown does reflect landownership boundaries.
	Sustainability:		
74	Should aim for BREEM/ Ecohomes "excellent" standard and more explanation regarding renewables on site – suggest use of local materials like wood chips for combined heat and power facility.	X	The brief will be amended to reflect the requirements set out in the Site Allocations document A22.
	Compulsory Purchase		
75	Concern that local houses will be compulsorily purchased	S;	The council has no plans to compulsory purchase existing homes as part of the implementation of this brief.
76	Request that the reference to Compulsory Purchase should be clarified regarding the apportionment of values/ costs of development or that it should be removed from the proposal	U;	Reference to Compulsory purchase has been removed from the document as the layout can be achieved with the current landownership framework.
	106/ common costs		
77	Common costs can only be identified at the time of any individual planning application	W	Disagree, by definition common costs need to be considered over the whole area covered by the brief.
78	Suggestion that Section 106 contributions should be made available to the town to spend as it thinks appropriate	P; Q;	Contributions would be made in accordance with the soon to be adopted Developer Contributions SPD. Local facilities would be allocated resources in consultation with local bodies.

**Pictsmede – Picts Lane and the Station area, Princes Risborough Non Statutory Brief for Redevelopment
Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov - Dec 2006)**

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
79	The foot/cycle bridge between Princes Estate and the relocated Station approach should be considered a common cost	A	Agree, will amend the brief to include this item.
	Local services		
80	Concern over capacity of local services to accommodate new development	I;	Section 106 contributions will be collected in accordance with Developer Contributions SPD to enhance local service where necessary
	Consultation process		
81	Concerns that consultation was not wide enough	AE	The consultation has followed the requirements outlined in the adopted Statement of Community involvement, including stakeholder meetings, workshop events, and exhibitions which were well attended and the draft document was sent to the usual consultees and advertised on the council website and through the weekly bulletin. The number of responses to the document and good attendance at events demonstrates the consultation was effective.