

From: Monica & Brian [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 July 2019 10:44
To: Risborough Expansion
Subject: Risborough Expansion

We wish to comment on these areas of concern which we have in regard to the Risborough Expansion Plan.

1. We are being asked to comment on the Plan when the Local Plan has still to be agreed by the Planning Inspector
2. We've heard that there are concerns from the developers, about the proposals. We are heading towards piece-meal planning. We were told the Local Plan would avoid this.
3. The £12m Housing Infrastructure Fund (Homes England) to 'kick start' paying for the relief road, presented as a 'given' by WDC at the public hearing last September, is doubtful. We've heard developers are not for a relief road and certainly are not going to fund it. This could lead to a dead-end road, something 'Homes England' will want to avoid as a waste of tax payer's money. At the Public Meeting on 16th July, WDC pledged to provide the £12M if the HIF bid failed. However, with Unitary imminent, such a pledge may not be supported by the Unitary Council after WDC has been dissolved.
4. In view of the formation of a Unitary Council there is no point of a Local Plan that is not sound, is unsustainable and does not command the support of the community.

Section 1.0 Introduction

- The document defines the Area of Comprehensive Development as including the Relief Road, the Main Expansion Area, land to the rear of Poppy Road and land at Princes Risborough station. There is no detail on the Relief

Road, the land to the rear of Poppy Road and land at Princes Risborough station.

- You state that written representations on the Proposed Main Modifications have been received and passed to the Inspector for her to consider when finalising her report. These representations were submitted in March, why is this consultation going ahead before they have been acted upon?
- The delivery plan is already out of date and likely to slip even further, and the Council is unlikely to be in existence to adopt the Local Plan if and when it is approved as a new Unitary Authority takes over in May 2020. Is this not a futile exercise and a waste of tax payer's money?

Section 2.0 Analysis

- Many of the major issues raised through the consultation process and recognised by the Planning Inspector have not been acknowledged in Section 2.1. For example,
 - relief road going through AONB and the wider transportation congestion issues
 - The lack of any proper integration with the existing town, and a non-existent buffer Zone with Longwick referred to at the Public Meetings as 'The Longwick Gap' will have sports fields with floodlights, existing traveller sites and new houses currently being built by Rectory Homes, hardly the green buffer to prevent urban sprawl.
 - Lack of employment to justify housing numbers – it is not a sustainable plan
 - Major environmental concerns raised regarding the Poppy Road development.
- Most of the proposed housing development and leisure facilities are more than 1km from the town centre. There should be more town centre residential development
- We also note that all of the PREA is well over ¾ of a mile from the secondary school. This will generate a massive increase in

the size of the school run, with severe detrimental effects on air pollution and traffic flow, during the busiest hours.

Section 3.0 Development Requirements

- There is reference to ‘a green buffer’ between Longwick and Princes Risborough, yet part of the buffer zone is already earmarked as a sports field with infrastructure facilities.
- We note the proposals for ‘improving the capacity of some lengths of existing roads’ – including Summerleys Road, Picts Lane and Shootacre Lane. Whilst we may welcome this and have always said that there is no need for major new road infrastructure that would destroy valuable farmland, green belt and our AONB we are concerned that any ‘temporary’ solution will become permanent and that proposals and plans for work at Phase 1 are not yet available for comment.
- Alscot hamlet, an historical setting and a designated conservation area, will be totally isolated by development and worryingly the choice of high density homes close to its boundary. How does this meet WDC’s vision for the town to ‘strongly reflect its historic roots and setting within the Chiltern Hills’?

Section 4.0 Design details

- No detail on housing or road design, with regard to the Poppy Road development, Station development, Picts Lane, Shootacre Lane and Summerleys Road.

Section 5.0 Delivery Plan

- Is the Culverton link proposed after 1100 homes or 1396 homes.
- The NPPF test of exceptional circumstances has never been provided by WDC for this major development in both AONB

and Green Belt. Nor has WDC ever addressed the issue of bottlenecks on the A4010 - merely stating at the public Hearing that there are no solutions. As BCC are leading on this going forward we believe they should be required to carry out a detailed review and consultation on the whole transport infrastructure proposals before proceeding with the Culverton link.

- Why when Bucks CC are carrying out road calming measures for HS2 traffic through Princes Risborough WDC don't combine their road calming proposals at the same time.
- Page 170 states that 'The housing delivery profile is an indicative profile. It is based on the latest evidence available and assumes that Housing Infrastructure Fund funding is available for the first phase of the relief road.' With regard to the Housing Delivery Profile, this is over-estimating the demand. It takes no account of the unsold stock that exists in the current developments, with 2/3 of homes unsold and building work stopping on sites in nearby Longwick, Chinnor and Haddenham where sales are at a standstill. Government requires homes to be built to meet need but also clearly states 'right homes in the right places'. With such poor take-up, these homes seem not to be in the right places.
- We cannot see how you can justify the numbers proposed unless it is to convince Homes England regarding the award of the Housing Infrastructure Fund.
- The new primary school will not be delivered until Phase 2 – despite the document highlighting only a 5% surplus capacity at present. Where will children during Phase 1 go to school locally? The proposal for new schools delivery will be lagging the need as identified in the document. The first primary school needs to be brought forward.
- Improvements and infrastructure requirements of the existing town are not expected until the completion of phase 3. This

includes the new Sports Hub, remotely located in the green corridor by Askett; improvements to the B4009 and Grove Lane junction and improvements to the existing town. With concerns over local housing demand and developer appetite, and the timescales involved there is worry that phase 3 will not come forward as WDC expect. This puts completion of the A4010 re-routing and town parking, sports and recreation facilities in doubt. All the infrastructure for phase 3 needs to be bought forward and implemented upon completion of phase 2. All this needs to be in place before phase 3 housing is started. Reassurance and commitment to this needs to be formalised within this SPD.

Section - Statement of Consultation

- No matter how you dress up the consultation process this was a failure of the Planning process. It was never genuine, it was not listened to, considered or acted upon. Especially the Princes Risborough Steering Group.
- You state this plan was shaped by input from the Steering group. However, at the Planning Inquiry WDC admitted that this had failed to function. A majority of the local groups produced and signed a minority report, against the working processes and conclusions of the group. This is therefore a contradictory statement.
- If the Steering Group was important then the fact that this group was disbanded before this implementation plan was created, illustrates a lack of the council's commitment to involve people in the planning of their home town (a principle of the NPPF and indeed WDC's policy). The plan has not benefited from any real community involvement. Discussing this implementation plan twice recently with the Town Council does not represent community engagement, particularly as the Town Council is closely allied to WDC and has always been supportive of the wider expansion of Princes Risborough

despite the feedback from over 50% (over 4,000 signatures) of local residents who signed a petition in 2018 seeking a significant reduction in housing numbers to ensure sustainability.

- Residents' opinions was sought over five years ago and based on much lower growth scenarios, the response on most of the questions was against this plan.

We are against the Risborough Expansion Plan as it stands and would ask for a **Neighbourhood Planning Referendum** to be prepared.

This would then democratically determine what local people want and agree on.

Yours sincerely,
Brian Green
Monica Green
Stuart Green

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

***** HELP US TO REDUCE PAPER USE *****
***** DO NOT PRINT THIS EMAIL UNLESS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY *****
***** DISCLAIMER *****

Any opinions expressed in this email are those of the individual and are not necessarily those of Wycombe District Council.

This email and any files transmitted within it are strictly confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this email you must not copy, distribute or use the communication in any other way. If you do receive this email in error please contact the sender as soon as possible and delete the email and any attachments.

Wycombe District Council may monitor the contents of email sent and received via its network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with its policies and procedures.

Wycombe District Council has scanned this email and attachments for viruses but does not accept any responsibilities for viruses once this email has been transmitted. The recipient is responsible for scanning emails and any attachments for viruses themselves.

Two councils instead of five - the best solution for the people of Bucks

There is currently a debate in Buckinghamshire about the future of local government. The district councils' proposal is for two new unitary councils for Bucks. We believe this is the best solution for the people who live and work here. Find out more at www.modernisingbucks.org

This message has been scanned for viruses by MailControl, a service from BlackSpider Technologies.