



Wycombe District Council

Draft Princes Risborough Town Plan Consultation

Feedback Report - November 2016

Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. How we engaged the Community.....	3
3. Summary of Written Responses - Overview.....	6
4. Next steps	11
Appendices	12

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Wycombe District Council consulted on the Princes Risborough Town Plan Draft Plan Consultation Document over two months from February to March 2016.
- 1.2. The Council began work on the Princes Risborough Town Plan as part of 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 for housing, employment and infrastructure and address a range of other issues.
- 1.3. The New Local Plan 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 in July 2013.
- 1.4. The draft Princes Risborough Town Plan (PRTP):
 - allocates an expansion area to the town for around 2000 to 2500 homes to contribute to the district's objectively assessed needs
 - allocates land for business as an expansion to the Princes Estate (Regent Park)
 - secures new and improved infrastructure to accompany the growth proposed, most significantly, major new road infrastructure which the plan depends on in the context of major development here
 - provides a strong green infrastructure framework for the growth of the town
 - sets out opportunities for improving the town centre and railway station area, including proposals for the public realm, retail and parking
 - designates land at the former Molins sports ground for sports and recreation
- 1.5. A separate Area Action Plan for Princes Risborough was originally proposed because of the need to establish planning policy promptly in an area at risk from speculative development. At that time the schedule for the preparation of the main Local Plan for the District was some way behind this. Since then, the timetable for the Local Plan has been accelerated to meet the Government deadline for the preparation of plans; and the Princes Risborough Town Plan timetable has been delayed to accommodate some extra work which arose from the draft plan consultation.

- 1.6. 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 are a number of stages when the community are able to get involved in the preparation of Local Plans (see section 3.).
- 1.7. The purpose of the Draft Plan consultation stage was to share the preferred approach for the town's future growth with local communities, and discuss the issues and opportunities arising from that approach.
- 1.8. This report:
- provides an overview of how we sought to involve people in the consultation (section 2);
 - sets out an overview of the written responses we received to the policies we set out in the draft Princes Risborough Town Plan Document (section 3);
 - briefly summarises feedback we received from other aspects of the consultation (section 4);
 - briefly outlines the next steps.
- 1.9. The Council received 367 responses to the consultation, which equated to 1002 individual comments on a range of issues. Over 650 people attended the consultation events, and we received 2 petitions, both in relation to the route of the proposed relief road.

¹ <https://www.wycombe.gov.uk/pages/Planning-and-building-control/Adopted-Wycombe-planning-policy-and-guidance/Statement-of-community-involvement.aspx>

2. How we engaged the Community

Before the Draft Plan consultation

- 2.1. The option to expand the town significantly was first considered in the main Wycombe District Local Plan Options consultation in February 2014 when it was becoming clear that it would be necessary to plan for a much higher level of housing growth in the District than had previously been required. A high number of responses to this consultation drew out a range of issues over the expansion of the town.
- 2.2. Engagement on this major expansion has continued since then and is ongoing. This has been primarily focused on how to respond to the issues, within the wider policy context. The development of the Princes Risborough Town Plan (PRTP) has been guided and informed through a number of engagement activities (set out below) Key to this was the establishment of the Princes Risborough Steering Group and a regular forum for agents and landowners.
- 2.3. Commissioned by Wycombe District Council, Tibbalds undertook an exploration of the issues in August-September 2014. Initial exhibitions/drop-in sessions took place in September 2014.
- 2.4. The Tibbalds reports were published in December 2014 and Wycombe District Council ran an exhibition and public meeting in January 2015 to explain these and respond to questions.
- 2.5. In March 2015 Wycombe District Council published a Local Development Scheme which confirmed the timetable and preparation of an AAP for the Princes Risborough expansion. During May-June 2015 Wycombe District Council established the Town Plan steering group of local stakeholders², and the agents' forum for land interests in the expansion area.
- 2.6. In July 2015 Wycombe District Council arranged an exhibition and public drop-in sessions to share the emerging development scenario for the major expansion of the town and gather ideas for town centre improvements.
- 2.7. During autumn 2015 Wycombe District Council held a series of intensive workshops on design and infrastructure issues with the steering group and agents'

² This includes elected Members of WDC, BCC and the Town Council; and representatives of community groups including Risborough Area Residents' Association

forum, culminating in an all-day session about the preferred scenario on 1 December 2015.

Steering Group

- 2.8. In June 2015 the Council established a steering group of representative local stakeholders, to further the vision and aspirations of the local community in the Plan. This group is chaired by the Town Council and was formed with the remit to work together to actively assist and guide the development of the Plan and work towards a high quality sustainable development. Papers and minutes from the Steering Group are published on the Council website.

During the Draft Plan consultation

- 2.9. The consultation ran from 25 February 2016 until 28 March 2016 and we engaged with people in a number of different ways.

Publicity

- 2.10. The main vehicle for the consultation was the Draft Plan Consultation Document which set out a number of policies for the comprehensive development of a major expansion to the town, policies for the redevelopment of the town centre and other key sites for the town.
- 2.11. The consultation report was supported by a summary newsletter. The Council contracted the Post Office to deliver this to every household and business in the Princes Risborough Area Action Plan area – 4,183 in total. Delivery was scheduled for between 15 and 19 February 2016, in time to publicise consultation events. In addition to the distribution of the summary newsletter, the consultation was publicised through briefing the local media like the Bucks Free Press and Mix96 radio.
- 2.12. We also contacted statutory consultees along with everyone on our consultation database who lives in the AAP area (over 700 stakeholders), including parish and town councils, residents associations and other local groups. This was principally by email, but we posted hard copies to those without an email address.
- 2.13. We placed hard copies of the consultation document in the local libraries and area information offices along with posters to advertise the consultation generally and

the consultation events. All the consultation material was made available on the Council's website and at the offices of the District and Town Councils.

Public events and meetings

2.14. We held two evening meetings for the public in Princes Risborough, during the consultation period. In the week before this we held three day time events, where the public had the opportunity to discuss the consultation materials with planning officers.

2.15. The Council organised the following public events:

- Market Stall – morning of Thursday 25 February 2016 - Princes Risborough market
- Exhibition – afternoon / early evening of Thursday 25 February 2016 - Princes Risborough Community Centre, Wades Park
- Exhibition - Saturday 27 February, Princes Centre
- Town Plan public meeting - Thursday 3 March Princes Risborough Community Centre, Wades Park
- Town Plan public meeting - Friday 4 March Princes Risborough Community Centre, Wades Park

New Media

2.16. All consultation material was available on the Council's New Local Plan web pages and the Council used Twitter (@wycombedc #wycombedc) to provide regular updates on the events and our free weekly planning bulletin (emailed to subscribers).

3. Summary of Written Responses - Overview

- 3.1. This section sets out the overall written response to the consultation and provides an overview of the issues that received most written responses.
- 3.2. Overall the Council received 367 written responses from individuals and organisations which equated to 1002 individual representations on specific issues, sites and options. Detailed summaries of these responses are set out at Appendix 1, and are set out in the same order that they were presented in the Town Plan draft Plan Consultation Document. They are grouped together by policy, site or issue that was commented on.
- 3.3. There were a number of comments on the process and approach taken by Wycombe District Council. The separation of the Town Plan from the overall Plan for the District was questioned, particularly in respect of setting the strategic context for the growth of the town. Others were concerned about the speed of the plan timetable which might jeopardise the development of a sound delivery strategy. There was also some scepticism from the public over whether the Council's consultation was genuinely intended, and that previous feedback and input had been ignored.

Comments on overall level of growth

- 3.4. Issues raised largely reflected the same issues identified during the 2014 consultation, though in general there were fewer responses that rejected growth outright. There was also good feedback on the specifics of the plan in terms of the policies and further information supplied. Regarding the scale of growth, there was a tension between feedback from the public, which sought to minimise growth; from key Duty to Cooperate³ partners who urged that capacity should be maximised; and from environmental agencies who were concerned, among other things, about the visual impact from key viewpoints in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and from the Ridgeway National Trail.
- 3.5. There were concerns that the economic needs of the town would not be met locally, as the evidence shows that there is limited demand for business space in this location. Consequently this led to a concern that commuter needs would not be adequately planned for through expanding road and rail capacity.

³ <http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/duty-to-cooperate/what-is-the-duty-to-cooperate-and-what-does-it-require/>

- 3.6. There was a difference of opinion on the need for a relief road: some felt that the local road network could be made to serve for future needs by solving existing local problems; others were clear that new road infrastructure was needed but differed on the most appropriate route. It was felt that the strategic traffic impacts of growth should be assessed and mitigated if necessary.
- 3.7. Linked to this were concerns about the impact on other types of infrastructure such as schools, health facilities and availability of public transport. A range of environmental concerns was also raised in terms of loss of open countryside, wider environmental impacts and flood risk.

Issues with the highest level of response

- 3.8. Overall the highest level of responses were received in relation to:
- PRTP6 Provision and Safeguarding of transport infrastructure (237 responses)
 - PRTP1 Princes Risborough expansion area and associated new employment space (153 responses)
 - PRTP5 Development requirements (119 responses)
 - Vision and Objectives (67 responses)
- 3.9. There was a wide range of feedback on PRTP6, including a body of response that questioned the need for new road infrastructure and maintained that congestion through the town could be solved through addressing local issues like the pelican crossings. There was both support for, and objection to, the main options considered for the route of the road. This included a number of responses specifically objecting to routing the road via Horsenden or Picts Lane/Shootacre Lane. Concern was expressed that while congestion might be addressed at Princes Risborough itself, there needed to be a strategic plan for the traffic impacts on network pinch points further afield, such as the Pedestal roundabout at West Wycombe. Impact on the Chilterns AONB was a concern, and more comfort was sought on the timing and delivery of the road.
- 3.10. Responses to PRTP1 tended in the main to focus on the need for growth and the proposed scale of development for Princes Risborough. Issues raised here largely repeated similar concerns identified during the 2014 Local Plan Options consultation, in terms of appropriateness of scale; provision of necessary infrastructure; problems with physical integration across the railway line; loss of

local character; road and rail capacity; lack of local employment opportunities; and others. However, neighbouring authorities urged maximisation of development potential of the town in the context of WDC meeting objectively assessed housing needs. Impacts on the setting of the Chilterns AONB were a concern.

- 3.11. A number of comments on PRTP5 were supportive of specific requirements, including green infrastructure, open space and ecological improvements. The policy attracted similar general concerns to the comments on PRTP1. More specific issues included: access to health services; the proposal to allow cycles on Church Path; environmental policies including archaeology, flooding and biodiversity; greater comfort on school place provision; more detail on sports provision; and others.
- 3.12. Feedback on the Vision and Objectives attracted similar general concerns to the comments on PRTP1 and PRTP5. A number of objectives received supportive comment and wording to strengthen or enhance these was offered. More specific feedback said there should be stronger links between the Vision and Objectives and the supporting policies; the objectives could be more rigorously expressed in terms of being specific and measurable; they should be more inclusive of the town's hinterland.

Response to Princes Risborough Expansion and remaining policies

- 3.13. The draft Princes Risborough town plan sets out a development framework for a major expansion of the town to the west of the Risborough to Aylesbury railway line. This consists of the illustrative expansion area Concept Plan, the accompanying policies PRTP2, PRTP4, PRTP5, PRTP6 and PRTP7 and the Policies Map.
- 3.14. The principle for the major expansion of the town was strongly objected to, as well as the more detailed components of its proposed implementation.
- 3.15. **PRTP2 Comprehensive approach to the expansion area:** this policy attracted similar overall concerns to the growth of the town; however, there was also support for the principle of a concept plan. There was useful feedback on the detail of the concept plan, and clarity sought on the respective roles of the concept plan and a more detailed master plan. Clarity was also sought on housing densities.

Concern was expressed at the extent of development proposed in the setting of the AONB and the impact on views from the AONB.

- 3.16. **PRTP3 Settlement Boundary:** feedback suggested that this policy is over restrictive and in conflict with the NPPF. There were also some comments on the detailed extent of the settlement boundary.
- 3.17. **PRTP4 Expansion area development principles:** most comments here were more relevant to other policies or text within the plan. It was felt that the Plan should set out stronger connections between the evidence base, the concept plan, and the plan policies. Other comments sought stronger commitments on housing mix and tenure.
- 3.18. **PRTP7 Princes Estate and expansion:** synergies were sought here between the heritage railway to help provide walking and cycling links to the station. Visual impact from the AONB and Ridgeway National Trail should be recognised.
- 3.19. **PRTP8 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople:** more detail sought on suitability of alternative sites, including flood risk and impact on the AONB.
- 3.20. **PRTP9 Town centre traffic and public realm enhancements:** improvements to the town were welcomed, while possible options for increased parking provision were all controversial. There was a difference of opinion on whether peak time congestion is an issue in the town and some were concerned that reducing traffic flow could reduce footfall in town centre shops.
- 3.21. **PRTP10 Town centre site: land fronting New Road:** again, possible parking improvements here were controversial. There was a fear that large stores would be introduced to the detriment of the historic town layout.
- 3.22. **PRTP11: Town centre site:** Land south of Horns Lane: there was a difference of opinion on its suitability for more parking provision; prominence in key views should be considered.
- 3.23. **PRTP12 Molins Sports Ground** received more support than objection. Objection focused on the need to provide more homes; some felt it should not be developed at all in the context of views from the AONB.
- 3.24. **PRTP13 Railway station site:** this policy was welcomed by both Network Rail and Chiltern Rail. Others were concerned that a station square would compete unfairly

with the town centre. Part of the site lies within Flood Zone 3, and so will require sequential testing.

- 3.25. **P RTP14 Delivery of infrastructure:** there were strong concerns on the achievability and deliverability of required infrastructure. This section should be clearer and more consistent. There should be more detail on phasing of delivery and clarity on delivery partners.

Feedback from other forms of engagement

- 3.26. This section provides a brief overview of the feedback we received from other aspects of the consultation, including from the public meetings and events.. More detail is provided in appendices to this report or in separate reports already published.

Meetings

- 3.27. The meetings were a significant part of the consultation. The council's preferred approach was to run the meetings with an introductory presentation followed by a structured question and answer session. The meetings were very well attended – the Community Centre has a capacity of over 200 and both meetings were full or nearly full
- 3.28. Common themes that emerged from all of the meetings were around the need for housing, impact and provision of infrastructure and facilities, increased congestion and environmental impacts of development.

4. Next steps

- 4.1. The Council is now assessing how to take the draft Princes Risborough Town Plan forward as part of the district-wide new Local Plan. We are in discussions with our neighbouring authorities about how we can satisfy the Duty to Co-operate – the legal requirement to work closely together on across authorities and agencies to address strategic issues. This includes looking at how housing and other needs are addressed.
- 4.2. Once a decision has been made about the draft plan we will publish a new timetable for preparing the plan (called a ‘Local Development Scheme’ (LDS)), probably towards the end of 2016. This will be published on our website once completed.
- 4.3. There are a number of important areas of work to progress to help prepare the Local Plan itself and we will take careful of account of the comments made during the Draft Princes Risborough Town Plan Consultation as we move forward.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Response summaries page 15 - 121

Appendix 1 Response summaries index

The following summaries are based on all of the responses we have received; they do not aim to reproduce everything that was written to the Council, but provide a summary and overview. Where appropriate there are direct quotes from responses to provide an indication of the nature of response received.

Copies of all the responses received may be viewed on the Council website, using the Public Access for planning service. This can be done by visiting publicaccess.wycombe.gov.uk and searching for the case reference 16/07528/CONSU. The responses can be found by clicking on the “documents” tab.

Alternatively the following address will take you directly to the responses:

<http://publicaccess.wycombe.gov.uk/idoxpa-web/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=ODJN32SC0DE00&documentOrdering.orderBy=description&documentOrdering.orderDirection=ascending>

A list of who commented on what subject is given at the start of each summary.

Policy	Policy name	Page
Vision and Objectives		15
PRTP1	Princes Risborough expansion area and associated new employment space	20
PRTP2	Comprehensive approach to the expansion area	28
PRTP3	Settlement Boundary	37
PRTP4	Expansion area development principles	39
PRTP5	Development requirements	44
PRTP6	Provision and safeguarding of transport infrastructure	59
PRTP7	Princes Estate and expansion	73

Policy	Policy name	Page
PRTP8	Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople	74
PRTP9	Town Centre traffic and public realm enhancements	76
PRTP10	Town Centre site: Land fronting New Road	82
PRTP11	Town Centre site: Land south of Horns Lane	84
Parking		86
PRTP12	Molins Sports Ground	89
PRTP13	Railway station site	91
PRTP14	Delivery of infrastructure	93
Appendices		96
Figures		98
Supporting Evidence		101
Issues		108
Strategic Issues		110
Duty-to-cooperate		112
Process		113
Other Policy Suggestions		119

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: Vision and objectives

Respondents:	<p>J V Cooper (DPRTP 00002) J Romaya (DPRTP 00004) P Goodearl (DPRTP 00005) Dr J Mair (DPRTP 00009) Network Rail (DPRTP 00013) Thames Valley Police (DPRTP 00014) S Heap (DPRTP 00032) B Fowler (DPRTP 00033) T Chettle (DPRTP 00044) S Gledhill (DPRTP 00046) R Howard (DPRTP 00059) C Courtney (DPRTP 00068) C Lishman (DPRTP 00070) S Weir (DPRTP 00071) M Long (DPRTP 00083) K Smethurst (DPRTP 00096) Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) S Bird (DPRTP 00098) S Davenport (DPRTP 00100) P Hussey (DPRTP 00103) A Macfarlane (DPRTP 00105) S M Bailey-Kennedy (DPRTP 00106) C Macleod (DPRTP 00111) Chiltern Society (DPRTP 00114) Sport England (DPRTP 00115) J Farnell (DPRTP 00116) Bloor Homes (Savills) (DPRTP 00119) Halsbury Homes Ltd (RPS) (DPRTP 00121) BBOWT (DPRTP 00123) Bledlow-cum-Saunderton PC (DPRTP 00124) A Wynn (DPRTP 00128) D Garratt (DPRTP 00129) D Wynn (DPRTP 00131) K Nelms (DPRTP 00133) B Nelms (DPRTP 00134) A Wilkinson (DPRTP 00138) Harbour Castle Ltd (DPRTP 00141) C Schulze (DPRTP 00159) T Barton (DPRTP 00174) G Wilkinson (DPRTP 00192) P Raven (DPRTP 00196) P Goodridge (DPRTP 00215) M Hill 2 (DPRTP 00230) T Nicosia (DPRTP 00244) C Leckie (DPRTP 00250) R Joseph (DPRTP 00263) Persimmon Homes North London (DPRTP 00274) L Flaxton (DPRTP 00276) K Goodridge (DPRTP 00277) I Martin (DPRTP 00279) C Shinh (DPRTP 00280)</p>
--------------	--

	G Shinh (DPRTP 00283) S Sheppard (DPRTP 00291) T Thomas (DPRTP 00292) S Ray (DPRTP 00298) BANG (DPRTP 00309) M Nelson (DPRTP 00311) Beacon Wood Real Estate Strategies (DPRTP 00315) G Farnell (DPRTP 00316) G Farnell (DPRTP 00320) A Eden (DPRTP 00323) J Roper (DPRTP 00332) W Harry (DPRTP 00340) T Roper (DPRTP 00341) South Oxfordshire DC (DPRTP 00357) Environment Agency (DPRTP 00365)						
Number of Representations:	67	Objection:	31	Support:	9	Comment:	27

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

Overall

- The Plan sets out objectives which are laudable in their aspiration and should be appealing to stakeholders and local people alike; it has been well thought out.
- Support given for both general terms; however due to uncertainties around the proposals, a site allocation for Park Mill Farm should be retained to allow the site to come forward early on as a stand-alone scheme which would also help kick-start the wider site.
- Plan is only acceptable if implemented in full with a budget the community can afford.
- Support for the green framework without objecting to scale of growth, but the Plan needs intelligent design.
- Within the prevailing policy context, the Plan is an excellent foundation for delivering high quality development. Particular support offered for proposals on green infrastructure, primary school provision, affordable housing and Molins Sports Ground.
- Coverage in the Vision of the historic roots, rich cultural heritage and special landscape setting within the Chiltern Hills supported.
- It is appreciated that local input went into plan.
- The provision of high quality wildlife rich GI is, rightly, a major theme throughout the document and it is thus appropriate it be included in 5.0 Vision.

Infrastructure

- One of the objectives is to provide schools, which will contain sport facilities. Making these available to sports clubs and the community can offer significant benefits to both the school and the local clubs.
- Any school proposal should therefore be designed with community use in mind.
- It is necessary to provide more housing in the town and only by creating a sensible plan can investments in the local infrastructure be ensured.

- Objective 5 is supported - delivery of green infrastructure including link to wider green infrastructure network and the Chilterns AONB.
- Objective 7 is supported with caveat that this should focus on small start-ups; no support any more for large floorplate employment buildings or warehouses with large expanses of pale roofs which detract from the view from the escarpment.
- Objective 13 is supported high design standards merited by the town's location in relation to the Chilterns AONB.

Objecting

Principle

- The Princes Risborough Town Plan to build 2,500 homes is unsustainable and disproportionate to size of town; other areas of the District should take their share of housing need.
- Local employment opportunities are insufficient, proposals will only marginally improve this.
- Infrastructure and roads are at full capacity.
- Railway line would segregate new development.
- Development would harm the Chilterns AONB and existing residents.
- Town centre needs to be addressed now, not later.
- Risborough is not suitable for expansion, does not need growth; need to consider whether this many homes is needed.
- Expansion of high density housing in the centre and additional lower density housing cannot be justified as a joined-up approach as it ignores history, existing culture and likely negative social issues.
- Addressing economic, social and environment aspects of any proposed developments required to ensure sustainable development and delivery on the plan's modern, green and accessible ambition.
- Currently the Plan does not present any evidence of sustainability, no social infrastructure or details of where the jobs are for incoming new residents.
- Expensive new road infrastructure is not the way forward.

Vision

- 'Vision' is entirely lacking in vision.
- Lists a series of aims that are likely to exist through usual robust planning processes
- There is no rigorous and graphic explanation of what sort of place the town wishes to become.
- There are no illustrations or examination of precedents to consider what is possible.
- A Vision and/or guidance for development character and key components (housing/community/spaces/routes) are entirely absent.

Objectives

- These are not specific or measurable.
- This will lead to difficulty in identifying if the objectives have been achieved.
- Objectives 11 and 13 are open-ended and provide little clarity on what is expected to meet this objective.

Commenting

Overall

- Subsequent policies do not properly allow for the implementation of these objectives.

- Given the expansion area covers a substantial area of land with a significant number of different landowners, WDC has made little or no attempt to formulate a delivery strategy which enables these objectives to be realised.
- The significant infrastructure burden associated with the development combined with the lack of any delivery strategy will give rise to a situation of significantly more delay than has occurred in the past with regard to housing and employment at Princes Risborough.
- The Vision seems limited to the remit of Princes Risborough & residents.
- Within the issues and objectives part of the plan, it infers that the proposed development might not be for local people. Surely in such a precious environment we would only expand the town to the degree needed by local demand?
- Support for the vision of making more of Princes Risborough's tourism potential but the PRTP undermines its own vision with policies that will harm the natural beauty of the area and make it less attractive to visitors.
- Plan is not planned vs unplanned, but in the towns interests vs national/regional demand.
- Also, the town council should urgently avoid any more speculative investments – given current house prices the children of current residents will not be able to afford homes in the same town.

Green Belt/AONB/Coalescence

- Loss of farmland not worth it just to turn Princes Risborough into another London dormitory town.
- Safeguards needed for existing community when doubling the town's population.
- Surrounding settlements will not maintain their existing identities, as Monks Risborough is being subsumed into Princes Risborough.

Infrastructure

- The railway line to Aylesbury dissects the town and the proposed development thus preventing natural integration of the development into the town.
- Houses should be put in the sites near the station that have been waste land for years but the green belt areas must not be touched.
- Plan does not present any evidence of sustainability, no social infrastructure or details of where the jobs are for all the new homes.
- Doubling the size of the town, increased traffic and noise pollution as a result of the development would be a deterrent to tourists.
- Concerns expressed about an "us" and "them" problem developing, so much attention is needed to prevent that.
- Preference expressed for small developments created over time.

Trade

- The influx of new residents may increase the revenue of existing trades in the town, but it seems doubtful that any substantial new business will go to the centre from the proposed development.
- Trading is changing from the High Street to on-line shopping (the latter trend unlikely to change anytime soon), which is sad for independent town traders.
- Points raised at the public meeting and in the document about encouraging new business are overestimated.

Duty-to-cooperate

- Objective 3 seen as highly relevant.

- Other councils keen for cumulative impact of growth at Princes Risborough, Thame and Chinnor to be understood, with positive solutions identified and planned for.
- Some assurances needed in the AAP that if any adverse impacts are identified on the B4009 that these will be mitigated appropriately.
- Studies to date have not identified significant increases of traffic in South Oxfordshire, but combining outputs of Councils' own evaluations of transport impacts should enable both parties to gain a comprehensive picture.
- Anticipate further joint work between the district and county councils to understand the direct and cumulative impacts of growth through the duty to co-operate.

Environment/Flooding

- The avoidance of flood risk can be achieved by applying the sequential test.
- After the sequential test is applied and if there are sites in Flood Zones 2 or 3 with justification, then the sequential approach within the site should be considered such as putting the more vulnerable uses within the part of the site at a lower risk of flooding.
- So if the site is within Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3 then WDC should place the higher vulnerability use in Flood Zone 1 with the least vulnerable or no development in the higher risk flood zones such as Flood Zone 3b or 3a.
- After this WDC can consider the control and mitigation of flood risk. After applying the sequential test for the fluvial flood zones it will need to apply the sequential test to sites in Flood Zone 1 in terms of other sources of flooding such as surface water flood risk and groundwater flooding.
- Some areas for development are on land with potential contamination issues. Need to avoid contamination of the principal aquifer in this area through potential pathways formed by piling or infiltration drainage ("absorption").
- This should be included in the objectives and any policies associated with the Princes Risborough expansion. Therefore the management of surface water run-off through absorption or infiltration in to the ground may not always be the most appropriate method.

Transport

- If a relief road is necessary then a less damaging route would be a version of 11a through the field between Shootacre and Culverton Farm, crossing Picts Lane into the old Whiteleaf site.

Other suggestions

- Objective 5
 - It does not recognise the need to avoid impact on existing designated Local Wildlife Sites within area or protect other habitats such as hedgerows, and species e.g. protected/priority species, including farmland birds.
- Objective 12:
 - Should also emphasise wildlife, as the value of GI to the local community in terms of health and recreational benefits is hugely enhanced if a diversity of wildlife is present within green spaces.
- Objective 13:
 - There is huge scope in landscape and building design to incorporate biodiversity other than trees as well, and this should be reflected in the text.

Further work areas:

- Revision of plan document

**Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: PRTP1 Princes
Risborough expansion area and associated new
employment space**

Respondents:	<p>A M Neagoe (DPRTP 00003) J Romaya (DPRTP 00004) P Horrocks (DPRTP 00007) J Wilkins (DPRTP 00016) E Molloy (DPRTP 00023) P Marsh (DPRTP 00045) J Shaw (DPRTP 00047) Dobson (DPRTP 00049) G Huntingford (DPRTP 00054) Hypnos 2 (DPRTP 00056) G Baker (DPRTP 00058) Rectory Homes (DPRTP 00064) S & C Brownlie (DPRTP 00065) P Mussett (DPRTP 00066) C Courtney (DPRTP 00068) C Lishman (DPRTP 00070) J Wise (DPRTP 00072) M Davies (DPRTP 00076) R & V Peel, (DPRTP 00085) V Peel (DPRTP 00086) G Peel (DPRTP 00087) M Williams (DPRTP 00093) Q Cooper (DPRTP 00095) Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) S Bird (DPRTP 00098) E Smith (DPRTP 00102) S Bailey-Kennedy (DPRTP 00106) P Bird (DPRTP 00107) A Edwards (DPRTP 00108) S Bailey-Kennedy (DPRTP 00110) J Farnell (DPRTP 00116) Molins PLC (DPRTP 00117) Aylesbury Vale DC (DPRTP 00118) Bloor Homes (Savills) (DPRTP 00119) Chiltern DC (DPRTP 00120) Halsbury Homes Ltd (RPS) (DPRTP 00121) P Hanlon (DPRTP 00126) S Hanlon (DPRTP 00127) A Wynn (DPRTP 00128) D Garratt (DPRTP 00129) M Solman (DPRTP 00130) D Wynn (DPRTP 00131) R Nelms (DPRTP 00132) K Nelms (DPRTP 00133) B Nelms (DPRTP 00134) K Roberts (DPRTP 00137) Harbour Castle Ltd (DPRTP 00141)</p>
--------------	--

D Wyatt (DPRTP 00146)
 G Wyatt (DPRTP 00147)
 B Green (DPRTP 00148)
 J Cleland (DPRTP 00149)
 L Webley (DPRTP 00153)
 J Bassett (DPRTP 00161)
 C Saunders (DPRTP 00168)
 Fr Kitchen (DPRTP 00170)
 Z Williams (DPRTP 00172)
 D Audas (DPRTP 00175)
 K Bambrick (DPRTP 00179)
 M Bambrick (DPRTP 00180)
 S Allom (DPRTP 00181)
 J Cooke (DPRTP 00185)
 J Baker (DPRTP 00187)
 N Cook (DPRTP 00188)
 A Ingram (DPRTP 00190)
 G Wilkinson (DPRTP 00192)
 P Brogden (DPRTP 00194)
 P Beckley (DPRTP 00195)
 E Beckley (DPRTP 00197)
 D Carrington (DPRTP 00199)
 J Myers (DPRTP 00201)
 P Day (DPRTP 00202)
 I Lishman (DPRTP 00213)
 S Lishman (DPRTP 00214)
 P Baldwin (DPRTP 00216)
 M Billsborough (DPRTP 00220)
 L Jeanes (DPRTP 00221)
 K Yates (DPRTP 00223)
 S Yates (DPRTP 00224)
 D Buffham (DPRTP 00226)
 S Thorne (DPRTP 00227)
 J Goffe (DPRTP 00232)
 D Young (DPRTP 00233)
 J Chivers (DPRTP 00234)
 J Wilkinson (DPRTP 00237)
 M Lane (DPRTP 00238)
 G & A O'Dea (DPRTP 00239)
 A Flynn (DPRTP 00240)
 T Nicosia (DPRTP 00244)
 N Dean (DPRTP 00245)
 H Jackson (DPRTP 00247)
 A Williams (DPRTP 00248)
 P Spittles (DPRTP 00255)
 J Spittles (DPRTP 00257)
 C Bird (DPRTP 00262)
 R Joseph (DPRTP 00263)
 C Joseph (DPRTP 00265)
 C Campbell (DPRTP 00266)
 T White (DPRTP 00269)
 Persimmon Homes North London (DPRTP 00274)
 N John (DPRTP 00278)
 I Welsh (DPRTP 00285)
 J Welsh (DPRTP 00286)

	P Cline (DPRTP 00287) S Wood (DPRTP 00288) S Sheppard (DPRTP 00291) V Solman (DPRTP 00296) A Edwards (DPRTP 00297) J Mackreath (DPRTP 00302) M Carroll (DPRTP 00303) I Thomas (DPRTP 00305) M Carroll (DPRTP 00306) K Williams (DPRTP 00307) M Preskett (DPRTP 00308) M Nelson (DPRTP 00311) C Plumley (DPRTP 00312) I Parkinson (DPRTP 00313) M Hayes (DPRTP 00314) G Farnell (DPRTP 00316) R Cox (DPRTP 00319) T Taylor (DPRTP 00321) J Taylor (DPRTP 00322) A Eden (DPRTP 00323) C Billsborough (DPRTP 00324) R Bunker (DPRTP 00325) A Perry (DPRTP 00326) P Parkinson (DPRTP 00327) M Scott-Jackson (DPRTP 00329) S Eden (DPRTP 00331) M Cudd (DPRTP 00335) P & L Lunnon (DPRTP 00336) J Cudd (DPRTP 00337) W Harry (DPRTP 00340) T Roper (DPRTP 00341) D Hayes (DPRTP 00342) K Irons (DPRTP 00343) P Irons (DPRTP 00344) L Jayatillake (DPRTP 00345) R Jayatillake (DPRTP 00346) K Hayes (DPRTP 00347) N Ghafoor (DPRTP 00348) J Dance (DPRTP 00350) A Rampley (DPRTP 00351) D John (DPRTP 00353) T Plant (DPRTP 00354) C Plant (DPRTP 00355) S Agace (DPRTP 00359) I Crease (DPRTP 00360) P Richardson (DPRTP 00361) R D Smith (DPRTP 00362) National Grid (DPRTP 00363) Environment Agency (DPRTP 00365) Oxfordshire County Council (DPRTP 00367)						
Number of Representations:	153	Objection:	66	Support:	3	Comment:	84

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

- Based on the draft plans with the benefits that the development will bring in terms of new school, shops, amenities and suchlike, development like this is good - it can only enrich the location and fundamentally bring prosperity to the area.
- Support for increase of homes in Princes Risborough for future residents.
- Support for expansion to comprehensive plan. Concern over shorter route for bypass; connectivity across the railway will be crucial.
- Support in principle for housing at Princes Risborough as it would go towards meeting the District needs and make use of committed investment in the rail network.
- The approach being taken by WDC toward meeting their objectively assessed development needs through the allocation of an expansion area to the town of PR is welcome.

Objecting

Previous proposals

- The proposed development at Park Mill Farm has been repeatedly opposed by local residents for over ten years.
- Adding an extra 3-4,000 more homes directly contradicts the Secretary of State decision on Park Mill Farm is unacceptable.
- Proposed number of homes is unsustainable and does not seem to correlate with previous consultations.

Scale of development

- Scale of development proposed does not respect historic nature or village-style development of the town.
- 2,000-2,500 new homes are too many; no proven need for them.
- Housing numbers are misleading as they do not take any account of existing applications being put forward for Princes Risborough; the latter should be accounted for.
- Objection to the level of expansion proposed as the greatest demand for houses in Wycombe district is not around Princes Risborough.
- It does not make sense to build the number of new houses proposed in Risborough with associated infrastructure and amenity requirements when the demand is elsewhere.
- WDC town plan for the proposed expansion of Princes Risborough is on such a large scale. Object to doubling the size of Risborough as:
 - the proposed scale of the development is unsustainable;
 - it would not integrate into the town properly;
 - it will have a severe adverse impact on the existing town;
 - it will be badly served by current road/rail network stretching their capabilities;
 - it does not address flooding;
 - jobs for the new residents are not there;
 - new housing is needed but not at the expense of changing/destroying the character of a historic market town;
 - It will have an adverse impact on surrounding areas; little study seems to have been undertaken on the impact to surrounding areas of natural beauty such as Whiteleaf Cross, Coombe Hill or other;
 - development taking place on existing brownfield sites, i.e. former the Hypnos factory, is enough to meet local needs;

Infrastructure

- Princes Risborough does not have the necessary infrastructure, in all the documentation it is acknowledged this is a major issue.
- There are a large number of issues with the town already in terms of parking, wellbeing, character and its position as Gateway to the Chilterns that need to be addressed short-term as a priority; the whole premise of the plan needs challenging.
- Amount of homes is not sustainable with proposed infrastructure:
 - Traffic issues & GP/A&E services access not addressed.
 - No provision for new supermarkets.
 - No additional retail.
 - No new parking in town.
 - Employment opportunities will be low.
 - Railway is already at full capacity with no plans to address this immediately
 - Railway line creates a barrier between existing town and new development.
- A number of the facilities are shared with the surrounding areas that will also grow and these have not been considered.
- The extent of the proposed scale of growth should be reconsidered to allow the town to grow and support an increase, rather than change completely beyond recognition.

Transport

- Transport infrastructure the key problem.
- Mitigating this with a bypass which causes further environmental harm is not ideal.
- Princes Risborough is poorly connected to major towns like High Wycombe and Aylesbury and the A4010 is a disaster for commuters
- No plans seen for improvements to the A4010 between Bradenham to the M40, P.R. to Thame or Junction 6 of the M40.
- Some commuters may head to Aylesbury but the majority will head south to West London, Maidenhead and Reading.
- Monks Risborough cannot sustain any more people, as the traffic is already extremely bad and the parking is awful and there is not enough.
- Traffic travelling the A4010 which has struggled during peak times for many years will come to a standstill during planned 7 years of HS2 construction at Stoke Mandeville.

Boundaries of proposed Expansion Area

- Objections to the proposed Princes Risborough Expansion Area as it includes land beyond the administrative boundary of Princes Risborough and could hinder Longwick PC's future neighbourhood planning of the area.
- Expansion area should be scaled back from the boundary with Longwick.

Green Belt/AONB/Environmental concerns

- The Green Belt and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) must be protected for current and future generations.
- WDC is under pressure to meet Government targets for housing, but should reconsider its decision to build on these beautiful fields. .
- It's unfair to inflict regional housing requirements on an area of AONB because it contains brownfield land and is not yet a large settlement.

- Shootacre Lane is in an AONB, development will affect this quiet rural lane plus the natural nature area within.
- Development would ruin good agricultural land.
- Querying how green will new development buildings will be.

Commenting

Alternative locations

- Build large scale housing on land nearer to the main arterial roads, such as land to the south east or south west of the M40/A404 interchange (to the north of Marlow Bottom or to the north of West Marlow). This would be very well connected allowing residents easy access to the main arterial roads.

Transport

- PRTP evidence base has not taken into consideration the extra traffic from HS2 or the movement of the residents from the 1,000's of new homes built, already in construction and planned for Aylesbury.
- Increased vehicular traffic counter to the NPPF objective of a greener community with reduced car usage.
- DPRTP proposes many new residents will commute via Chiltern Rail links. Doubts raised by public whether the train network can cope with larger numbers of additional commuters
- In the recent meeting at Princes Risborough various options for a bypass were shown as being considered but it was also stated there is very little in the budget to fund a bypass. The findings of the draft are very misleading, especially so with regard to a proposed bypass; this is being forced upon existing users of the A4010 and the people of Princes Risborough without due consideration for its effect to both new and existing residents.
- Question the use of Stoke Mandeville as the hospital for residents of High Wycombe, this must be considered as the A4010 is the only route for emergency vehicles and patients

Growth scenario/numbers

- Development should be on a smaller scale, with sensitivity paid to the character and community. Not opposed to delivering houses, but only in proportion to the character of the existing settlement not disproportionate to the size of the town.
- It is not clear why is the housing number is so vague at 'about 2000-2500 dwellings'; the plan should be authoritative on this. How can the impacts be tested properly through SEA/SA/AA with this lack of clarity?
- Plan makes it unclear why the 2,000-2,500 growth scenario was picked; housing numbers need reviewing, as proposed scale is not sustainable or needed.
- 2,000 – 2,500 extra houses is excessive; 500 - 1,500 more sensible given current infrastructure, and was supported by the Core Strategy.
- Little information is provided regarding the conversion of land areas into dwelling numbers or business expansion areas into jobs, the information likely does exist and should be made available.

- Volume of houses must be reduced to be in line with an achievable increase in employment opportunities and affordable housing ratio aligned to ensure that the lack of employment opportunities do not result in a larger local unemployment problem.
- If the duty to cooperate and HEDNA processes are carried through, the eventual number of new homes could be much smaller than 2,500.
- Recent developments in other local areas (Aylesbury) show there is no demand from young professionals for housing in the area.

Green Belt/AONB/Environmental Issues

- All new development must be sustainable and on brownfield/infill sites - not on agricultural land/greenfield sites.
- If an area is to be created by the 'Crowbrook Stream Corridor' it must be ensured that Longwick and Princes Risborough remain separated and no buildings are on any part of the site to keep the buffer 'green'.
- Changes are required to ensure that the proposed development does not harm the AONB, Special Area of Conservation or its habitats.
- Alscot Conservation Area must have green 'buffer' reinstated north of CA, have high density housing pushed further towards Princes Risborough, have low density housing/landscaping to soften impact on CA, and maintain all protected trees and hedgerows.

Previous policy/plans

- A compelling case has not been made to overturn existing policy, which allows for an increase of 480 homes in Princes Risborough. It is not clear what in Princes Risborough has changed between the adoption of this policy and now – the opportunities and challenges remain as they were.

Infrastructure

- No record of electricity and gas transmission located within the AAP area, however there may be low/medium pressure gas distribution pipes present within proposed development sites.
- Stoke Mandeville should concentrate on the Aylesbury Vale area and High Wycombe as the larger town needs to build a new hospital to cope with the needs of its residents both existing and new

Flooding

- Most of the expansion area lies within Flood Zone 1. However a small part of this area at the southern point of the expansion area lies within Flood Zone 3. If WDC are allocating sites within Flood Zone 3 will need to sequentially test these sites in order to be compliant with NPPF.
- Any sequential test will need to form part of WDC's evidence base.
- Too many houses/people proposed on flood-prone land with no guaranteed bypass.

Duty to cooperate

- With the likelihood that WDC will have a proportion of needs it cannot meet, as much as possible should be met within the district close to where the need is arising, particularly for affordable housing.
- There may be further potential for development north of Mill Lane if further dwellings are sought; this could relate well to Monks Risborough Station.
- Even with this expansion it is unlikely WDC will be able meet its housing needs to 2033 in full, and therefore ask that WDC seek to ensure maximisation of the development potential of this expansion area.

Other

- Issues with the Princes Estate, the scale and frequency of vehicles accessing the site; noting site is accessed by a low bridge meaning not all vehicles can get through.
- Serious concerns over density and a perceived lack of holistic overview.
- The constraint on business is finding a market, employees are currently not available and it is unrealistic to think that the development will generate significant employment opportunities locally.
- How can developers take control of where they can build in a county where the public decided who would protect towns and countryside? Since when did developers take control of planning?
- No single member of planning or council been willing to say why Princes Risborough is the only place these homes can be built, nor who actually chose Princes Risborough as the location; who decided Princes Risborough?
- Argument that it is a choice between uncontrolled expansion and this plan is specious – it's possible to have controlled expansion on a smaller scale with less threats to what makes the area special for those who live here and visitors.

Further work areas:

- Continuing Duty-to-cooperate work
- Revision of plan document and policies

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: PRTP2 Comprehensive approach to the expansion area

Respondents:	<p>Z Arnott (DPRTP 000100) J Mirzoeff (DPRTP 00261) Persimmon Homes North London (DPRTP 00274) N John (DPRTP 00278) D Taylor (DPRTP 00281) R Burt (DPRTP 00038) D Whitaker (DPRTP 00052) H Lemanski (DPRTP 00078) P & J White (DPRTP 00084) Longwick Cum Ilmer Parish Council (DPRTP 00094) Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) Gladman Developments (DPRTP 00194) P Bird (DPRTP 000107) Sport England (DPRTP 00115) Aylesbury Vale District Council (DPRTP 00118) Savills (DPRTP 00119) Chiltern District Council (DPRTP 00120) RSP Planning and Development (DPRTP 00121) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife trust BBOWT (DPRTP 00123) H D Town Planning Ltd (DPRTP 000141) J Rae (DPRTP 00152) J Selwood (DPRTP 00156) P Hayes (DPRTP 00165) J Baker (DPRTP 00187) L Denham (DPRTP 00193) P Raven (DPRTP 00196) A Flynn (DPRTP 00240) R Goodman (DPRTP 00246) J Barlow (DPRTP 00249) M & M Brightman (DPRTP 00258) S Hawkins (DPRTP 00259) V White (DPRTP 00272) C Hawkins (DPRTP 00275) I Martin (DPRTP 00279) S Hampton (DPRTP 00284) M Edwards (DPRTP 00295) A Turner (DPRTP 00299) R Cox (DPRTP 00319) A Perry (DPRTP 00326) J Roper (DPRTP 00332) D John (DPRTP 00353) T Plant (DPRTP 00354) A John (DPRTP 00356) South Oxfordshire District Council (DPRTP 00357) Thames Water Property Services (DPRTP 00358) The Environment Agency (DPRTP 00365)</p>						
Number of Representations:	46	Objection:	12	Support:	6	Comment:	28

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

Site allocations

- The scope of the proposal is consistent with growth in the past.

Plan in general/ concept plan

- This is a thoughtful and sensible response to what is needed in the town space between Princes Risborough and Longwick.
- The principle of a concept plan to guide development is supported in order to assist with a comprehensive approach to delivering development.
- Support for the well thought out plan for Princes Risborough incorporating green areas and new infrastructure.
- Support for the new housing development near Picts lane on the old Hypnos site.
- Support for the need for comprehensive planning development.
- An Area Action Plan (AAP) is an appropriate way to manage delivery of development.
- Support for the APP considering and actively promoting the need for infrastructure to support development.
- Support for the approach taken to PRTP2 and the inclusion of a concept plan.
- The concept plan is a clear approach to the general distribution and form that development should take and the key principles are supported.

Sense of place

- Support for elements of the plan seeking to protect the boundary and maintain the gap between the Parish of Longwick-cum-Ilmer and Princes Risborough.

Sewage

- Support for the conclusion that relocation of the Princes Risborough STW at this time would not be viable.
- Support for the proposed land uses adjacent to the boundary of the STW, as these aren't considered odour sensitive uses.

Objecting

Infrastructure

- Increased strain on infrastructure which won't be able to cope.
- Lack of space to increase the town's amenities.
- Princes Risborough cannot support the size of the proposal.
- As the proposed housing is far from the town centre, people will drive, and there is unlikely to be enough parking to cater for this.

Site allocations

- The size of the development is disproportionate to the existing market town and will significantly increase the population.
- The new and old areas will be separated by the railway line so they won't link well
- The scale of the development is too large, excessive, unsustainable, and inappropriate.
- Risborough is close to large towns, and housing available in and on route to these towns outweighs the need for development in Princes Risborough.
- Objection to lack of justification in locating the main primary school in the South-West corner of the development. Given the comments regarding the importance of Longwick road and the proposed location of the local centre it would be better to locate the school adjacent to this where it would lie closer to the centre of the development.

Conservation

- The character of the area will change and be lost.
- A vibrant market town will become a centreless commuter town.
- Risborough is a picturesque village which shouldn't be turned into a built up town.
- The development is disproportionate to the character of the town.
- The proposal will result in adjacent rural areas becoming urban.
- The proposed green buffer is inadequate and its coalescence with Longwick, and doesn't meet objective 10 of the draft plan.
- Princes Risborough will be joined to Longwick, there will not be a large enough town centre to allow this size of settlement to join cohesively.
- The plan doesn't differentiate/ separate the individual villages and areas of Princes Risborough, and the small green spaces won't create distinct green barriers, causing a conurbation.
- The scale and location of the development weakens the town's boundary, risking urban sprawl, coalescence with Longwick and loss of the town's rural character.

Highways

- Traffic will increase.
- Road network won't be able to cope with the scale of the proposal.
- Lack of jobs, meaning people will commute to work, causing traffic problems.
- Under the bridge floods regularly and traffic is unable to pass.
- The roads are in a poor condition, and increased traffic would worsen the situation.
- Speeding is already an issue and increased traffic would make this worse.
- Additional pressure on roads connecting Risborough to larger towns, which already experience queues and heavy traffic.

Flooding

- The new homes are likely to be prone to flooding, due to not only rain water but overflowing sewage.

Sewage treatment works expansion

- Given Wycombe's housing requirement, the loss of developable land to the expansion of the treatment works is unacceptable.

Process

- The plan states land owners will need to work in partnership with the council to develop the concept plan into the masterplan. There's no indication of how the council will participate or control this process, and nothing has yet to come forward to suggest landowners will cooperate, so the council should not assume that all land owners have accepted the arrangements. The process should be reviewed due to the lack of landowner feedback.
- Issues including deliverability, stakeholder coordination and anticipated progress of the masterplan need addressing to fulfil objectives, which will hold back development. Therefore the comprehensive approach in this policy isn't deliverable, effective and so isn't sound.

General

- The plans for Mill Lane are poorly thought through.
- Objection to the new relief road.
- The council haven't properly addressed the physical barrier of the Aylesbury railway line.
- Density is vague and inconsistent with draft plan ideals.
- Concern over social integration, given the segregated nature of this development.

Commenting

Sense of place

- The development must be sensitive to the local vernacular.
- Key features of the town must not be lost.
- The traditional market town must be kept.

Conservation

- The proposed green boundaries need to have considered planting of trees/ undergrowth.
- Developers need to be persuaded that appropriate green planting on their estate is necessary.
- Green buffers must be retained throughout the town and surrounding area.
- The Crowbrook Stream Green Corridor should be widened which would also help protect Alscot conservation area.
- Local wildlife sites should have a wider buffer, which will need the scaling back of developments in areas of local wildlife sites.
- Hedgerows need to be retained and buffered with semi-natural environment.
- The scale of the proposal means there a high risk of impact to biodiversity and the environment, in particular to local wildlife sites, hedgerows and to species which rely on farmland/open areas, particularly farmland birds and bats.

- The hydrological impact will need to be assessed, and evidence that the proposed SuDs scheme will be able to maintain appropriate levels of water quality, quantity to maintain the integrity of the wildlife sites is needed.
- The conservation risks could be mitigated by reducing the scale of the development in line with the original agreed policy, in particular by keeping development to the west of the conservation area.

Community facilities/ Pedestrian links/ Cycle links

- The proposed footpath/cycle path may be unsuitable given the potential disturbance.
- Pedestrian/cycle links outwards to the wider countryside should be invested in.
- The principles of active design guidance should be fed into the draft plan and used to inform the detailed masterplan.

Nature conservation area

- Lack of rationale for the size of the nature conservation area – it's very wide, likely to become unused and create areas not subject to natural surveillance.
- The width of the nature conservation area needs to be revised.
- The Nature Conservation Area is also being used as a buffer to Alscot, whilst there has been no assessment of why the Conservation Area should be provided with an offset, built development (in a sympathetic form) could as easily be built adjacent to Alscot.

Site allocations

- Development must be contained in the area laid out in the plan.
- The housing must meet social needs and the needs of the community.
- The impact on Picts Lane should be mitigated as best as possible.
- It would be preferable to contain development between the town and the bypass.
- Unnecessary skew towards Monks Risborough, Askett and Longwick.
- Too many houses in too small an area, with no attempt to distribute the housing.
- Housing development West of the Aylesbury train line need to be integrated with housing East of the line, to avoid 'ghetto-ising' this Western part of the town.
- Development must be phased to avoid developers picking and choosing where they would wish to build to the detriment of the area.
- The extent of the built area should be reduced – particularly the depth northwards towards Longwick and Eastwards towards Askett.
- The settlement boundary should exclude land East of Mill Lane, and development pulled back substantially from the Northern and Eastern boundaries.
- Disagreement over the statement that restricting development here will leave it open to speculative housing proposals. This can be controlled with the town plan and a tighter settlement boundary.
- The site at Mill Lane has been included as open space, however the site isn't available for open space and is in private ownership. The owner hasn't been contacted regarding this and this is against their wishes.
- The policy that development mustn't cross the boundary line between the railway between Marylebone and Birmingham is restrictive & contradictory to the framework.

- Other sites promoted but not included in the draft plan should be considered for inclusion.
- Build only on brownfield sites.
- Infill and brownfield sites should be the priority for development before any Greenfield development is entertained, which would make more sense and impact the environment less such as redevelopment of the waste ground next to the train station.
- Lack of explanation as to why all the planning is to the North of the town, and none to the west and there is no guarantee the proposals will be able to mitigate or foresee any future needs to the town. Planning works best when this is piecemeal, sequential and planned organic growth.

Proposed new road

- The alignment of the proposed new road makes no allowance for the crossing streams within the site.
- The alignment of the proposed new road makes no allowance for phasing of development to allow elements of the road to be delivered.
- A more detailed assessment is required in relation to the alignment of the road.
- When the alignment is amended it may not be consistent with the concept plan and policy.

Sewage treatment expansion

- Features to minimise odour spread should be utilised, delivered at the cost of the utility provider, not the developer.
- The Plan states the buffer will restrict land uses yet the requirement for upgrades is to be concluded. It's unknown if the buffer will restrict land use, and the requirement can be mitigated, and so the statement is misplaced.
- The claim sewage facilities could cope with additional pressure needs investigating.
- Sewage/ Drainage infrastructure along Mill Lane must be improved before development.

Density

- No detail for the density ranges for the higher, medium and lower density areas within the master plan.
- The plan references that densities are typically between 8-10 dph which seems out of place and needs clarity.
- The density of the proposal seems low, and the results of the local density study show the town's average housing density is higher than the density of this proposal.
- Development within the expansion should be of an appropriate density to ensure efficient use of land.
- The density of the proposed development doesn't reflect the character of the existing town's density and is contradictory to the vision statement and would lead to urban sprawl.
- High density housing should be avoided, it would look incongruous with the existing density and negatively impact town views from viewpoints.

Flooding

- Areas within the highly flood-prone around Mill Lane must be retained, as it's unsuitable for housing.
- Development North of Kingsmead along Mill Lane to the junction with the B4009 must be built with appreciation of the increased flood risks to properties in Kingsmead so flood mitigation measure must be put in place.
- Further and deeper ditches must be put in the field at the land at Mill Lane site at mitigate flooding issues to the field, Kingsmead and the road,
- There's higher density housing at the southern point of the expansion area, however this development type should be set away from flood zone 3 which is a 'more vulnerable use'. This area could be used for open space/ amenity with no ground level raising.

Infrastructure

- Facilities at Monks Risborough station need to be improved to accommodate increased demand.
- Cars parks must be included in plans for the new sports areas at sites off Mill Lane North and Northwest of Kingsmead , to avoid parking pressure on Kingsmead and Mill Lane near the sports areas.

Highways

- A 20mph speed limit along Mill Lane would improve safety for residents.
- Remove the proposed roundabout from within the green corridor.
- Route any new roads away from existing housing.
- Improvements to roads are required, particularly Mill Lane to cope with additional inhabitants.

Business

- Small accommodation for industrial space compared to residential.
- Effort is need to attract businesses, to avoid excessive amounts of commuters, as there is already high pressure on roads.

AONB

- Development in the setting of the AONB can cause harm to the AONB.
- There should be no development North of the Crowbrook stream, this land is highly visible from the AONB.
- The Lower Icknield buffer to Longwick as proposed isn't wide enough to protect visual impact from Whiteleaf, it would be imperceptible as a gap and ineffective.
- There should be no development East of Mill Lane as this land is highly visible from the AONB. Views of development couldn't be mitigated with planting and it would be ribbon development. Sports pitches aren't a suitable use and sport facilities should be avoided within the main development area and instead the land should be enhanced as a green corridor.
- The strategic open space should be expanded to form a continuous open space by adding Green space around Leo Laboratories.

- Expansion below the scarp slope needs careful consideration. The views out of the AONB from key viewpoints are significant to the enjoyment of the AONB. This is a nationally important place and should be protected.
- Reference should be added in the plan non-statutory guidance which has been produced in respect of development affecting the setting of the AONB.
- The open space for the land at Mill Lane site should not only be secured but also reclassified as AONB, as this land is prominent within the landscape.

Buffer zones

- Green buffer zones between houses and roads in previous documents aren't present on the current concept plan.
- Safety & noise shouldn't be secondary considerations.

Comments on policies

- An issue is that other policies are too specific and prescriptive and so don't reflect the thrust of PRTP 2.

Alternative suggestions

- There are other, more developed areas of Bucks which would support this level of expansion.

Comments on supporting text

- Concern that supporting text is contradictory in parts
- A more detailed land parcel commentary could be included, providing more detail on what each land parcel is expected to deliver.
- A clear density range should be provided.
- The expansion area forms a series of development parcels that can be clearly defined by written text and a plan, through reference to the Crowbrook Stream and the existing roads network.
- The language of the AAP needs to be consistent and reference the future delivery of the master plan.
- The plan provides a number of very specific comments which may not be met.

Green spaces and rights of way

- The need for the Kingsmead Green Lane was contested, as the Westmead crossing is going to be closed and appropriate pedestrian connections should be provided from Mill Lane and Longwick Road to provide access to the remaining right of way.
- The justification underpinning the width of land safeguarded along the railway was contested.

Process

- Shootacre Lane has not been included on the concept map due to falling outside the Princes Risborough town plan area and residents have been disregarded when planning possible routes, who are likely to be most negatively affected, and greater consideration is needed for residents of Shootacre Lane.

Sustainability

- It has been made clear that the support of local employment or attraction of companies isn't sustainable, which contradicts the NPPF, requiring schemes to achieve sustainable economic development. The new population will effectively be a large scale commuter town.
- The proposal won't achieve a sustainable 'Live, Work, Visit' community.

Land uses

- Given that the land off Mill Road site has a footpath running through it and is prone to flooding, the site should be used in all or part as a nature reserve. This would enhance the view, and assist to ensuring flooding isn't heightened.
- If the land at Mill Lane site is used for recreation, then careful consideration will be needed to ensure flooding, visual impacts of the site, resident's views and privacy, and parking on road isn't affected. There may also be the need for a carpark on site which would cause flooding issues and increase traffic along Mill Road which is already dangerous, and used as a cut through. Double yellow lines should be put on this road to prevent on street parking becoming an issue.
- If the land at Mill Lane site is used as public open space, measures need to be taken to ensure the privacy and security of adjoining householders, such as planting bushes/trees, as making this field public will increase the risk of crime. Also, parking should be provided for those wanting to use the area to avoid on road parking issues

Accessibility

- When considering access to/from Mill Lane to the Mill Lane development site, its important opportunities for increased traffic flow along this rural stretch of lane are identified and restricted.
- Any development toward the North Western end of Mill Lane should back onto it, so there isn't direct access to it, as Mill Lane isn't capable of taking large traffic volumes.

Further work areas:

- Revision of concept plan
- Greater clarity on housing densities

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: PRTP3 Settlement Boundary

Respondents:	S J Rogers (DPRTP 00204) Persimmon Homes North London (DPRTP 00274) H Wood (DPRTP 00037) J Shaw (DPRTP 00047) Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) L Barrowclough (DPRTP 00104) B Morle (DPRTP 00117) Savills (DPRTP 00119) RPS Planning & Development (DPRTP 00121) H D Town Planning Ltd. (DPRTP 00141) K Williamson (DPRTP 00242) S Sheppard (DPRTP 00291) JCPC Ltd. (DPRTP 00310) M Cudd (DPRTP 00335) J Cudd (DPRTP 00337) T Plant (DPRTP 00354) C Plant (DPRTP 00355)						
Number of Representations:	17	Objection:	7	Support:	1	Comment:	9

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

- Emphasis for protecting views of the AONB supported in the Policy text.

Objecting

Boundary

- Increasing the boundary to the railway line will create a 'satellite town' that will add nothing to the character of Princes Risborough.
- Buffer zones between Longwick and Meadle are inadequate, new housing is too close to these areas.

Separation

- Longwick will be absorbed into Princes Risborough and lose its identity.

General

- Policy is restrictive and does not confirm with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) as it does not boost the housing supply significantly.
- Policy conflicts with emerging Local Plan, in failing to provide enough land to meet the objectively assessed need.

- The expansion area is already defined in PRTP1, therefore this policy is not necessary.
- Amending the settlement boundary will result in Princes Risborough becoming sprawl.
- Development beyond the current boundary makes sprawl more likely.

Commenting

General

- A revised highway route should be proposed connecting B4009 to Mill Lane, to create a potential new 'entrance' to the Town.

Boundary

- Policy wording makes no reference to amending the settlement boundary to include the expansion area, may potentially prevent the boundary from being amended.
- Boundary should be altered to include the entire boundary of the former Molins Sports Ground.
- Green Belt should be designated around settlement boundary to maintain a definite boundary beyond the Plan period.
- Settlement boundary should be amended to include all of the land with established residential use, such as that associated with Pentrelew.
- Settlement boundary needs to remain flexible through preparation of the Town Plan.

Separation

- Gap between Princes Risborough and Longwick should be wider and planted with trees.
- Buffer between Longwick and Princes Risborough needs to be guaranteed to stay as non-development zones for a period of at least 10 years.
- Policy needs to specify which settlements are protected, suggested are: Monks Risborough, Askett and Longwick.

Expansion area

- Settlement Boundary should be extended northwards from Mill Lane/Kingsmead to the edge of the expansion area.
- Policy does not recognize that a significant element of the expansion area contains existing allocations from the adopted Local Plan.
- Map is incorrect, expansion area includes parts of Monks Risborough (train station, Church, park and various roads), therefore Plan is proposing to expand Monks Risborough also.

Further work areas:

- Revision of concept plan and plan document

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: PRTP4 Expansion area development principles

Respondents:	<p> A Williams (DPRTP 00248) Persimmon Homes North London (DPRTP 00274) A M Neagoe (DPRTP 00003) L Stevens (DPRTP 00041) C Courtney (DPRTP 00068) Mrs Tann (DPRTP 00069) A & W Cuddihy (DPRTP 00074) M Long (DPRTP 00083) V Peel (DPRTP 00086) G Peel (DPRTP 00087) A Hussey (DPRTP 00101) P Hussey (DPRTP 00103) Chiltern Society (DPRTP 00114) J Farnell (DPRTP 00116) RPS Planning & Development (DPRTP 00121) Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust (BBOWT) (DPRTP 00123) Historic England (DPRTP 00139) H D Town Planning Ltd (DPRTP 00141) J Cleland (DPRTP 00149) J Rae (DPRTP 00152) J Woodward (DPRTP 00157) J Bassett (DPRTP 00161) P Bassett (DPRTP 00162) J Cleland (DPRTP 00167) J Baker (DPRTP 00187) P Brogden (DPRTP 00194) P Goodridge (DPRTP 00215) L Jeanes (DPRTP 00221) G & A O'Dea (DPRTP 00239) K Williamson (DPRTP 00242) R Goodman (DPRTP 00246) E Williams (DPRTP 00251) C Ellis (DPRTP 00268) S Rae (DPRTP 00271) K Goodridge (DPRTP 00277) N John (DPRTP 00278) S Sheppard (DPRTP 00291) S Ray (DPRTP 00298) J Mackreath (DPRTP 00302) K Williams (DPRTP 00307) Beacon Wood Real Estate Strategies (DPRTP 00315) G Farnell (DPRTP 00316) J Roper (DPRTP 00332) M Cudd (DPRTP 00335) J Cudd (DPRTP 00337) T Roper (DPRTP 00341) D Hayes (DPRTP 00342) K Hayes (DPRTP 00347) D John (DPRTP 00353) </p>
--------------	---

	C Plant (DPRTP 00355) A John (DPRTP 00356) S Agace (DPRTP 00359)						
Number of Representations:	52	Objection:	29	Support:	3	Comment:	20

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

Housing provision

- Self-build opportunities welcomed as part of Princes Risborough expansion.
- Provision of affordable housing welcomed, especially to local residents.

Design/Density

- Density of development matching existing developments is supported.

General

- Existing housing allocations from adopted Local Plan must be maintained in Princes Risborough Town Plan.

Conservation/Landscape

- Emphasis on sustainable development and respecting landscape sensitivity is welcomed.
- Strategy ensuring that development proposals set out how the conservation area will be preserved and enhanced is welcomed.
- Development welcomed as houses are needed, however this must be handled carefully to respect Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and wildlife.

Objecting

General

- Concern over speculative planning applications.
- Concern over scale of development.
- Concerns that new housing development will have no character.
- Concerns that development will create a separate 'village'.
- Concerns that northern part of expansion area will be isolated from the south part.
- Concerns that expansion will ruin character of Princes Risborough.

Highways

- Road option via route 17 (Horsenden Lane) would harm the conservation area and destroy character of surrounding village.
- Impact of road option via route 17 (Horsenden Lane) would have too great and too negative of an impact.

- Road option via Shootacre Lane will cut off residents from the countryside and will be unsafe.

Town centre

- Town centre in current form is too small to support an expansion of this scale.
- Proposed changes to town centre would deter tourists.

Process

- Concerns that central Government guidance has not been followed with regards to the making of the Plan.
- Policy does not contain any indication of phasing of development, therefore failing to demonstrate the deliverability of the Plan - this must be demonstrated in either PRTP5 or as a separate policy as well as a Phasing Plan.
- Plan looks to rely on s106 agreements rather than a CIL-based approach, this will be extremely difficult to implement, and does not agree with Council's approach to the Princes Risborough Town Plan.
- Lack of connection between the policies in the Plan, the evidence base, and the Concept Plan.

Infrastructure

- Council has not assessed infrastructure provision correctly, particularly towards phasing.

Landscape/Conservation

- Development will destroy the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and remove the views from Whiteleaf Cross.
- Proposals will not provide environmentally sensitive homes due to impact on the countryside.
- Current housing proposals will damage Alscot conservation area as they are too close, the original idea to add a buffer between Alscot conservation area and development should have been retained.
- Road schemes are equally inappropriate to Alscot conservation area, as they are too close.
- Bypass is not necessary for Princes Risborough, it will damage the surrounding countryside and encourage more cars on the road.
- Development would merge Askett with Princes Risborough.
- Objection to development north of the railway line.

Environment/Flooding

- Fields within the expansion area are prone to being waterlogged in the winter and are unsuitable for housing development.
- Increased noise and pollution from development would deter tourists.
- Objection to loss of greenfield land and wildlife.

Housing provision

- Provision of affordable housing needs to be higher than 40%, all new development should be affordable.

Employment

- Businesses do not want to relocate to Princes Risborough, therefore only appeal is for the surrounding area, housing development will remove the appeal.
- No evidence justifying lack of employment proposals for new residents, will encourage commuting and add pressure to roads.

Commenting

General

- Development feels like it will bring new people into the Town, rather than servicing the existing community.
- Guideline densities need to also be referred in PRTP5 to avoid them being overlooked.
- More should be done to improve tourism to Princes Risborough.
- No mentioning in text about character or charm of Princes Risborough as a small Chilterns market town.
- Vision for Princes Risborough to 2033 does not take into consideration the state of the town now, or residents that live on the edge of the Town Plan area.

Landscape/Conservation

- Supporting text needs to place more emphasis on protecting and enhancing the setting and views of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- Whiteleaf Cross should be enhanced with improved facilities to encourage visitors to the views of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- Policy needs to ensure that development proposals will sustain and enhance key features of the area's character and appearance. An updated conservation area appraisal may be needed to identify these features.
- Concept Plan and policy PRTP4 do not consider the identified area of archaeological remains located in the expansion area, Plan should seek to avoid or minimise harm to their conservation.
- In addition to maintaining a green corridor along the path of the Crowbrook Stream the historic views from Alscot of the Chiltern Hills can be preserved through ensuring existing mature trees and local hedge lines are incorporated into the new development proposals.

Housing

- Clause H needs to be revisited regarding Government's plans regarding affordable housing and self-build homes.
- Housing mix should provide provision for 'live-work' units, to reduce the need to travel.

- Clause stating that new housing will be 40% of current market values will be difficult to maintain, as houses within the area are already expensive.
- New housing should give priority to local people wanting to get on the housing ladder rather than commuters.
- Design of new houses should match those existing in Princes Risborough.

Integration

- Requirement to integrate the town across the railway line is not acceptable, instead this should be subject to willing landowners.
- New development must integrate new development into the existing community.

Infrastructure

- Sewage systems in the expansion area would need upgrading, this would add additional costs.

Highways

- As an alternative to a relief road, one-way system should be removed from town centre, crossings should be replaced with underpasses so traffic can move freely.
- In order for expansion area to be integrated, access roads should be provided onto Summerleys Road, A4129/Longwick Road and Mill Lane – otherwise integration is not possible.

Further work areas:

- Revision of relevant policy / evidence areas

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: PRTP5 Development requirements

Respondents:	<p> T Madziya (DPRTP 00001) Z Arnott (DPRTP 00010) L Barnard (DPRTP 00011) Network Rail (DPRTP 00013) B Highe (DPRTP 00015) J Highe (DPRTP 00017) J Summerbell (DPRTP 00027) A Paterson (DPRTP 00030) Risborough Area Community Bus (DPRTP 00031) J Bury (DPRTP 00036) J Beaton (DPRTP 00040) L Stevens (DPRTP 00041) P Knall (DPRTP 00048) C Dalton (DPRTP 00050) K Nijjar (DPRTP 00055) G Baker (DPRTP 00058) Rev J Tomkins (DPRTP 00060) M Wooster Keyte (DPRTP 00067) C Courtney (DPRTP 00068) A & S Brown (DPRTP 00073) A & W Cuddihy (DPRTP 00074) Anonymous (DPRTP 00075) M Davies (DPRTP 00076) J Brunton (DPRTP 00082) M Long (DPRTP 00083) R G Cole & C M Kerr (DPRTP 00091) Chiltern Railways (DPRTP 00092) Longwick-cum-Ilmer PC (DPRTP 00094) Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) S Bird (DPRTP 00098) S Davenport (DPRTP 00100) A Hussey (DPRTP 00101) P Hussey (DPRTP 00103) Gladman Developments (DPRTP 00104) Chiltern Society (DPRTP 00114) Sport England (DPRTP 00115) J Farnell (DPRTP 00116) Aylesbury Vale DC (DPRTP 00118) Bloor Homes (Savills) (DPRTP 00119) Halsbury Homes Ltd (RPS) (DPRTP 00121) BBOWT (DPRTP 00123) A Wynn (DPRTP 00128) D Wynn (DPRTP 00131) Historic England (DPRTP 00139) Harbour Castle Ltd (DPRTP 00141) B Green (DPRTP 00148) J Cleland (DPRTP 00149) J Rae (DPRTP 00152) J Woodward (DPRTP 00157) </p>
--------------	---

G Clark (DPRTP 00158)
 A Ankers (DPRTP 00160)
 P Bassett (DPRTP 00162)
 T Raynor (DPRTP 00171)
 S Allom (DPRTP 00181)
 J Baker (DPRTP 00187)
 G Wilkinson (DPRTP 00192)
 L Denham (DPRTP 00193)
 D Carrington (DPRTP 00199)
 H Webb (DPRTP 00200)
 M Purnell (DPRTP 00206)
 P Purnell (DPRTP 00207)
 P Goodridge (DPRTP 00215)
 K Yates (DPRTP 00223)
 S Thorne (DPRTP 00227)
 M Hill (DPRTP 00230)
 M Hill (DPRTP 00231)
 J Vellacott (DPRTP 00236)
 A Flynn (DPRTP 00240)
 M Makepeace (DPRTP 00241)
 A Stoodley (DPRTP 00254)
 P Spittles (DPRTP 00255)
 J Spittles (DPRTP 00257)
 R Joseph (DPRTP 00263)
 Princes Risborough Steering Group (DPRTP 00267)
 Mrs. Nicola (DPRTP 00270)
 V White (DPRTP 00272)
 Persimmon Homes North London (DPRTP 00274)
 K Goodridge (DPRTP 00277)
 N John (DPRTP 00278)
 I Martin (DPRTP 00279)
 D Knights (DPRTP 00282)
 S Wood (DPRTP 00288)
 S Sheppard (DPRTP 00291)
 T Thomas (DPRTP 00292)
 V Solman (DPRTP 00296)
 S Ray (DPRTP 00298)
 K Williams (DPRTP 00307)
 BANG (DPRTP 00309)
 I Parkinson (DPRTP 00313)
 G Farnell (DPRTP 00320)
 A Eden (DPRTP 00323)
 C Billsborough (DPRTP 00342)
 R Bunker (DPRTP 00325)
 A Perry (DPRTP 00326)
 P Parkinson (DPRTP 00327)
 S Eden (DPRTP 00331)
 J Roper (DPRTP 00332)
 M Cudd (DPRTP 00335)
 J Cudd (DPRTP 00337)
 S M Clark (DPRTP 00339)
 W Harry (DPRTP 00340)
 T Roper (DPRTP 00341)
 D Hayes (DPRTP 00342)
 K Irons (DPRTP 00343)

	L Jayatillake (DPRTP 00345) R Jayatillake (DPRTP 00346) K Hayes (DPRTP 00347) C Conely (DPRTP 00349) A Rampley (DPRTP 00351) D John (DPRTP 00353) A John (DPRTP 00356) South Oxfordshire DC (DPRTP 00357) Thames Water (Savills) (DPRTP 00358) I Crease (DPRTP 00360) P Richardson (DPRTP 00361) Environment Agency (DPRTP 00365) Oxfordshire County Council (DPRTP 00367)						
Number of Representations:	119	Objection:	9	Support:	8	Comment:	102

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

General

- Appreciation of all the work that has gone into the production of this draft Plan; fully support it so long as it results in through traffic being diverted away from the A4010 through the town, and the enhancement of the town's facilities doesn't get put onto a back burner and forgotten about.
- Much has been done to provide the best solution possible to create a sustainable number of new homes in Princes and Monks Risborough.

Duty to Co-operate

- Support for the route of the new road and the provision of a bus service to incorporate Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish.
- Support for the need for "essential infrastructure" as identified in policy PRTP5.
- Requirements 11 and 12 in draft policy PRTP5 relating to schools are supported. Consideration may need to be given to the wording of point 12 to ensure that sufficient contribution is gathered.

Amenities/Services

- Support for policy PRTP5 and its requirements, specifically points 18, 19, 21 and 22 which require developers to undertake a joint Integrated Flood Risk Management assessment integrate Sustainable Urban Drainage systems into their development proposals and ensure the necessary water and wastewater network and treatment work capacity exists to serve their proposed development.
- Support also for the supporting text to Policy PRTP5 in para. 8.82 – 8.84, however proposed to remove the following text from para. 8.83 "The increased pressure on the sewage treatment works may result in a larger odour buffer".

Housing

- More houses are needed in Princes Risborough:
 - at affordable prices;

- for those who cannot afford to buy.
- In this regard, the long term blueprint for Princes Risborough is very good.

Transport

- Agree with most of these suggestions but the alternative route to the A4010 should not go along Shootacre Lane (route 11b, or 15b).

Policy specifics

- Particularly for support:
 - the proposed network of green infrastructure as set out in 8.19-8.26, 8.34-8.37, 8.45-8.81, Policy PRTP5, and illustrated on the Concept Plan;
 - opting for two primary schools rather than the potentially cheaper option of one, so that provision is as close as possible to the population it serves (Policy PRTP5 para 11 and 8.65);
 - the requirement for 40% affordable housing (Policy PRTP5 para 1);
 - the proposed use of local delivery vehicles such as a Community Land Trust;
 - the option to relocate and potentially enlarge the secondary school (para 8.15, 8.17) should not be ruled out. The recently announced national proposals to convert all schools to academy status may increase opportunities for delivery which are not subject to other council concerns over viability.
 - The objective of ensuring the density of housing is consistent with the existing character of the town. But the guideline densities referred to at many points in the commentary sections (for example 8.14 and 8.27-8.29) need also to be referred to within Policy PRTP5 to avoid them being overlooked or lost as development proposals crystallise.

Objecting

General

- Princes Risborough unsuited to major development:
 - Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty(AONB)
 - No employment potential
 - Historic significance. Despoliation of an historic market town.
 - The proposal to construct up to 2500 new homes in P.R. would increase the population by 65% which is unsustainable in the timescales of this plan.
- Clearly not expansion of local business and industry driving requirement for these new homes, therefore it must be assumed that the new inhabitants of the town will be traveling elsewhere for their employment. This fact is not factored into the traffic assumptions which underpin the traffic modelling. Plan does not attempt to address or promote green travel when it should be supporting the Central Government's drive to encourage green transport.
- It would be far more sensible to build these new houses to areas where there is already a larger conurbation and jobs, infrastructure and facilities are available.
- Routes of the proposed relief road and the significant environmental impact these will have are in themselves not a long-term solution for traffic relief of the town.

Infrastructure

- Overall objection to the scale of the developments outlined and the required infrastructure to support them.
- Town would need additional capacity in several areas: doctors, dentists, leisure centres, secondary schools (additional places at grammar as well as upper schools),

increased retail opportunities (not just another supermarket, but a thriving town centre), parking space and further capacity on the rail network and other transport links. Current plan not sufficient in these areas.

- These requirements are extensive and expensive:
 - The overall infrastructure package has yet to be properly costed;
 - It includes a substantial amount of offsite improvements, some of which concern land controlled by external organisations such as rail line crossings.
 - The variability of the cost of the road options will affect viability.
- It appears that arrangements for new infrastructure are being left primarily to the developers to sort out and WDC will need to be convinced that such arrangements to deliver the requisite infrastructure package are in place before any consent is granted. Effectively WDC are dispensing with the responsibility for any delivery arrangements and passing them on to the developers to undertake.
 - This is not acceptable and, even if the package was deemed to be viable, is not acceptable in the context of central Government advice;
 - More importantly, it fails the tests of soundness because the Plan itself is demonstrably not effective.
 - WDC should either take greater responsibility for its own Plan, or devise a better arrangement whereby individual phases of development can come forward quickly without all the infrastructure being settled immediately.
- Concerns reiterated over future residents in the expansion area using level crossings at Mount Way and Church Path, which they expressed in the past in the context of the Park Mill Farm appeal. At the time developer was advised that they would support the provision of a footbridge instead of these 2 level crossings. The closure of level crossing n31 next to the Mill Lane site has since been advocated; application was opposed on the basis of the impact of development on the level crossing usage.
- To public there seems to be little engagement with Chiltern Rail for both increased frequency and capacity of their service to the town.
- Increasing the size of the town overall by twofold will fundamentally change the nature of a small, rural, market town forever:
 - The development has been planned as an add-on to the town;
 - Proposal shows no way to integrate development into existing community;
 - It is essentially a bolt-on to the town with a completely different character.
- Issue of housing demand in the south east of England:
 - Will not be solved by doubling the size of small rural communities.
 - Needs to be solved at a national level through increasing demand for housing elsewhere in the country by developing regional economies thus increasing employment and job opportunities.
 - Creating more housing in South-east will simply continue to increase demand.
 - Housing shortage pushes up prices, pushes employment to other regions.
- A relief road will not stop congestion in the town centre.
- Walking/cycling routes inconsequential when expansion size means people will drive.
- New retail space in the new development will fragment the town.

Church Lane

- Opposition to proposals to put an underpass across the railway carrying a footpath and cycle path, via Church Lane to Church St.:
 - Church Lane is a private road and a public footpath and, as such, only residents have right to cycle on it.
 - It is maintained by the residents; increased usage will cause rapid deterioration.
 - The lane feeds 10 residences which use around 20 cars, add 15 or so delivery vehicles using the road daily and it is clear that there is no possibility of safely sharing the narrow lane with a cycle track.

- WDC should consider alternative foot/cycle route Park Mill<->town centre.

Commenting

General

- Draft policy PRTP5 includes a list of development requirements but does not prioritise them

Cycling paths/Footpaths/Underpasses

- New development foot/cycle access to town emphasised in plan over needs of existing resident cyclists/riders/families/pedestrians on Shootacre and Picts Lanes.
- Cyclist access town centre ↔ Horsenden Lane amenities & Phoenix Trail not in plan.
- Cycle route provision is needed for existing residents, not just for new dwellings:
 - Needs to be enough infrastructure to support both sets of users.
 - Existing pedestrian/cycle routes are poor;
 - Though the proposals are good, a wider cycle network between the major settlements of the town should be considered.
- Only aspect missing from a Monks Risborough perspective on the plan is the provision of one or more footpaths or other connections across the railway line between Mill Lane and Longwick Road.
 - In the 'northern section' between Longwick Road and Mill Lane there will be no underpass/footbridge connections as planned for the 'southern section'.
 - This problem is compounded as the existing footpath across the railway currently coming out at Westmead will not now cross the rail line and there is no footpath at the bottom of Mill Lane heading eastwards away from the line.
 - The lack of one or more footpaths in the 'northern section' will not achieve the stated aims of the draft plan for people living in Monks Risborough.
 - Pedestrian access will be blocked to the proposed green corridor and there will be segregation of the existing and new communities for pedestrians rather than enabling them to be knitted together.
 - Comparing Princes Risborough to High Wycombe in justifying no proposed access across the 'northern section' is not a valid comparison as these are two very different communities both in character and size.
 - Plenty of room at Westmead existing footpath to enable a footbridge to be built without the need to encroach on any residential properties.
 - When the plan is reviewed WDC should include at least one pedestrian access point across the railway line between Mill Lane and Longwick Road.
 - Safe and direct] crossings of the railway line will be vital for integrating the expansion area with the existing town across the railway line. It is important to preserve the public right of way across the railway line in Westmead and this crossing appears to be not considered.
 - Proposal's alternative route under bridge in Mill Lane adds several hundred yards in both directions, which would be a deterrent to walking.
 - Network Rail should provide equivalent of Australian pedestrian warning bells at Westmead crossing
- A new underpass at Wades Park will help, but:
 - once it leaves the park it is unclear how cyclists & pedestrians will be catered for as the new path ends up in the road, with no proper crossing or pavement;
 - better provision needed for elderly/disabled/disability scooter users;
 - will be a significant challenge at night as street lighting will be limited.
- There has been little deliberate promotion of safe cycle routes - safe cycling routes across the whole town must be encouraged, promoted and provided.

- This is an opportunity to create purpose-built cycle ways and paths that will encourage cycling and walking, making a significant difference to take-up and reducing need for significant new parking space.
- Disabled access across railway line:
 - It's incredibly disappointing that the two crossings in Monks Risborough will have no disabled access.
 - Planning office representative suggested that people with impaired mobility would 'have to go round'.
 - This is completely unacceptable twelve years after the Disability Act, which seems only to have made developers and town planners learn the phrase 'take reasonable steps to make accessible for all'.
 - Other concerns e.g. developers' profits and Network Rail's desire to close level crossings, appear to take precedent over the national law aimed at giving disabled people the same access as everyone else.
 - Making the level crossing accessible even if it requires a speed limit on the trains and signals is a 'reasonable step' – there are four unprotected pedestrian crossings over bypasses in a ten mile radius of the town including the A41 which appear not to have any safety concerns.
 - These rail crossings are an appalling omission for a large new development. The need for new houses is appreciated but an increase of the town by this size needs to be sustainable and have appropriate & sufficient infrastructure.
- Walking and cycling policies:
 - Draft PRTP explicitly state building on current cycling networks but this is in total contrast to the bypass proposal on the current access to Phoenix Trail and Chiltern Cycleway link on Shootacre Lane.
 - The bypass options would effectively cut off the main access to the Phoenix Trail and be in conflict with ensuring that the many cyclists and walkers, including many local families, who use this trail, can access it safely.
 - This is in direct conflict with the WDC Walking and Cycling policy.
 - Underlines the contradictory nature of the draft Local Plan document which cites that the bypass will assist in making Princes Risborough a safer place to walk and cycle.

Flooding

- The fields backing the railway line - one adjacent to Mill Lane & its neighbour - are both extremely prone to flooding with huge areas of surface water after raining.
- Please ensure that the developers are made to drain these fields properly; house buyers will not want to purchase a house there if there is nothing in place. No objection to building houses there, just need to ensure they are not prone to flooding or that the homeowners have to cope with extremely soggy gardens.
- The Chiltern spring line may make proposed development land unsuitable; all infrastructure and housing will be at high risk of flooding from springs fed by Chilterns rainfall, and that will be impacted by climate change in the Plan's timeframe.
- PRTP does not properly address flooding that is likely to occur in the proposed housing site.
- Support promotion of the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS).
- Point 17 needs to include flood avoidance to be considered first before flood mitigation. Point 18 does not include fluvial flood risk management and as part of the proposed development in Princes Risborough is within Flood Zone 3; this should be included in the development requirements.
- Requirement for a strategic Sustainable Drainage scheme funded by developers will come too late and should not be deferred:

- Impacts & constraints needs to be understood now at the plan-making stage to inform the appropriate quantum of housing that can be accommodated.
- Where groundwater levels are high use of SUDS may not be possible; could lead to run-off rates that increase flood risk downstream, impair water quality.
- Local Plan proposes that open space is secured for this site:
 - Would substantially assist in ensuring that flooding is not heightened by any use put to this field.
 - Further and deeper ditches must be put into this field forthwith to assist with the severe flooding issues to the field, Kingsmead and the road.
 - If the site is to be used for recreational use then careful consideration needs to be given as to what. It should ensure that only natural grass and other materials are used, to ensure that the flood water issue is not affected; any AstroTurf or anything of this nature could have serious implications to the flooding, not to mention the visual impact that this would have on the area.
 - Careful landscaping needs to be planned to ensure that the residents of Kingsmead have their views and privacy respected and complimented. At a local exhibition when questioned about the Mill Lane Road and parking, a planner acknowledged that they had not yet taken into consideration that there may be issues with people parking on the Mill Lane Road to use any facilities of recreation within the field. This needs to be seriously considered.
- There may need to be a car park in the field; this again poses serious implications in terms of flooding and increase of traffic to Mill Lane Road, which is already a seriously dangerous road to pedestrians on footpath to/from school etc. as well as used as a cut-through.
- Yellow lines or any other form of prohibition could be put into force on Mill Lane Road to prevent a barrage of people parking there to use facilities in the field, together with parking for residents and visitors to Kingsmead residents only in Kingsmead Road, so that the cars don't come into this road instead to park, as this road is barely single track and even residents currently park inconsiderately on the pavement all the way down the road.
- If houses are to be built in the fields behind Westmead, perhaps the parking facilities should sit within these fields? However, whatever is decided needs to be done so as to REDUCE traffic onto Mill Lane; residents' concern is that it will only heighten it.
- The road and parking is such a major issue, further public consultation and involvement is paramount, before anything takes place.

Sports facilities

- An allocation for some CIL monies to allow for an extension of Princes Centre's buildings and car parking facilities would be welcome:
 - Nothing in plan about sports facilities, unless they are to be offered through the new primary schools.
 - Considering how small the current leisure centre is, and the health issues in society this should be a key requirement for the new development: either the one much-larger sports complex or a new smaller one as well as current one.
- Risborough School have recently had a sports complex added which is open to residents to use/book out. Instead of developing another sports complex, the money would be better spent in other ways, e.g. toward affordable housing.
- More details on the sports facilities proposed in the plan and the evidence base underpinning it requested.
- Residents have severe concerns about the nature of any plans to enlarge Risborough Springs Swim & Fitness Centre:
 - Last such application withdrawn in March 2014 in view of objections based on the lack of evidence for need at that time & impact on residents.

- However, the footprint of those plans even then would have approached very close to the boundaries of Stratton Road properties, and would likely have incurred noise & parking nuisances in excess of those already experienced.
- If any resubmission of such plans were put forward, they would need to be very significantly modified to avoid objections from neighbouring residents.
- The existing outdoor & indoor facilities at Wades Park & Springs have insufficient footprint to provide for the proposed PRTP development, and alternative sites would need to be found within the latter.

Church Lane

- The proposed underpass on the outskirts of Wades Park will erode part of it. The pathway will be very close to housing, ruining the current Church Lane tranquillity.
- Object to the use of Church Lane as a cycleway on grounds it is an inappropriate use and might leave the door open to it being used for motorcycles in the future.
- Suggested alternative:
 - Constructing a cycle path from proposed new railway underpass routed alongside Wades Park & exiting onto Stratton Road would overcome above issues, providing a safer & lower-maintenance alternative away from traffic.
 - Alternatively or in addition, the cycle path from this proposed underpass could be routed along Brooke Road to Longwick Road where a potential cycle path has already been indicated, retaining the public footpath in Church Lane.
- Suggested new foot/cycle path along lower Icknield Way between the Total petrol station and the Mill Lane junction, to link the footpaths of Longwick, Longwick Road, those coming north out of the development area and the quiet road towards Owlswick and the footpaths off it; preferably to be set behind a hedge to improve safety, aesthetic quality and air quality for users.

Road options/traffic

- Rounds around the Tesco roundabout in Risborough already become congested.
- Whichever relief road option is adopted will need to give consideration to railway bridges, HS2 construction traffic and car parking (especially near station)
- New development will bring a huge influx of traffic; a bypass is not the answer:
 - It will divert potential passing trade away from the high street;
 - It will not divert enough additional traffic away from the town centre to ease existing bottleneck areas, simply moving congestion elsewhere.
 - Instead, localised measures such as mini roundabouts, pedestrian footbridges and left-turn or one-way restrictions are needed.
- Pedestrian crossings should be signal controlled. Road & footpath upgrades needed.
- Plan acknowledges changing characteristics of Longwick Road post-development but doesn't go far enough in terms of proposed speed limits and how heavy traffic will be deterred from using it. PRTP 9 Figure 7 shows the current 30 mph speed limit simply extended along Longwick Road but this is largely ineffective without enforcement or other measures to slow or deter traffic.
- Traffic, especially into High Wycombe, is already very difficult at rush hour. Some work will be needed on the West Wycombe roundabout to avoid this worsening.
- Town centre management proposals could make it more difficult/time-consuming to get in/out of the existing town by car.
- It is important that the new relief road be made to be fast and free-flowing to encourage use rather than saddling the existing road with traffic calming measures.
- New infrastructure needs to be delivered before the new housing.
- Rationale behind requirement for provision of A4010 alternative strongly contested.

- The cost of the new road and viability needs to be thoroughly considered so that the road and other development requirements can be delivered.
- Ensure:
 - adequate road safety across the new relief road that goes through Park Mill.
 - a crossing in line with current public footpath/diverted path across the field, over the railway line and into town.
 - Park Mill Farm road is kept as no-through road and the character of the lane is preserved and that it does not become a short cut to the station.
 - the road is diverted away from Shootacre Lane and across the field.
- Mill Lane Road issue needs to be carefully considered:
 - Entire proposal of housing could potentially put a strain onto Mill Lane Road, since the new Road proposed will only be built gradually as the new Estates are built, due to the funding. Where the traffic will go until completion unclear.
 - If it is onto Mill Lane, then this raises serious safety issues. Cars currently come along the Lane at high speed, and it is extremely dangerous to walk to and from school using the single footpath, particularly under the train bridge.
 - Nothing clearly indicated as planned to ensure Mill Lane is protected immediately. Unaware as to whether traffic lights or any other form of measure ever been considered near to the train bridge, as when users pass under it, it is a blind corner.

Transport - bus

- Local bus services would only take on new or extended routes if a second bus was provided and provide services off-peak times during weekdays and Saturdays.

Transport - train

- Chiltern Rail cannot accommodate large numbers of additional commuters – it is already at capacity; trains are already overcrowded, especially at rush hour.
- Extra services to London/ Birmingham/Oxford will be needed.
- Chiltern Rail ability meet the needs both locally and in the wider network questioned.
- No point in better links to station if Chiltern Rail cannot handle extra passengers.
- While Princes Risborough-Aylesbury line improvements are welcome there is no mention of improvements to the Birmingham-Marylebone main line. With the link to Oxford Parkway last October Princes Risborough has already lost out in terms of frequency of trains and slow/stopping rather than direct services.
- Unrealistic to imagine that new younger residents will all be able to work locally. Journeys by train, direct walking/cycling routes to station and secure covered cycle parking at the station should all be encouraged and addressed.
- WDC and developers will need to work closely with Network Rail to ensure that the need for connections across the railway line is balanced with the operational & safety requirement of the railway. This will include closely managing traffic and ensuring that local transport networks are designed to move people to key destinations.
- The plan states that 15m of land may be required for future use by Network Rail for dual tracking and electrification of the line. This is purely an aspirational concept not consulted upon. The plan makes it clear this is indicative and is a vision for -> 2043.
- Consideration to be given that houses near the Risborough-Aylesbury line already vibrate when freight trains pass.

Medical Services

- Challenges the assertion that all that is needed are extra GPs and no extra surgeries
- Requirement for more ambulance support.
- Area has enough retirement homes - surgery needs to be upgraded / replaced.

- Uncertain as to whether the lack of need for more doctors' space is because current surgeries have capacity to have more doctors working.
- Consider Inclusion of a property with consultation rooms; could be for Dentist, Physiotherapist or rooms to hire to local therapists.
- Area Action Plan lacks detailed outlines for long-term locally-based health and social care provision in the Risborough area.
- Undoubtedly partner organisations would need strategic 'buy in' to centralised and integrated health and social care provision:
 - There is an implied response that GPs have only to increase their number by a few GPs, but they are private practices operating within a monopoly.
 - Even if local budgets cannot be coordinated at this stage (it will be inevitable in due course) there is not much to overcome for provision of health and social care to be co-located in a modern building with facilities for resident and visiting services.
 - Such a building would need pedestrian access and patient/staff car parks for long-term demand (i.e. not demand perceived for the short term).
- Consideration must be given to the published fact that the % over 65's in the Risborough entity is notably higher than elsewhere in the WDC area:
 - Long-term thinking about locally based health and social care provision needed now, not later on.
 - If our health and social care professionals are not capable of it, then some clear-eyed thinking by patients and clients' needs to be added to the mix.
- Wellington House Surgery:
 - The proposal acknowledges that relocation owing to size, parking capacity & limited road access may be necessary, but doesn't give any specific plans.
 - Please keep it at its current location - easy to get to for many ambulant people in the locality.
 - Moving the surgery to a location that requires car transport to access it would make life for patients more arduous.
 - A car park built at rear of existing surgery would take little from Wades Field.
- Dental surgeries:
 - If the area is expanding then there is no doubt that the NHS dental services provision also needs to be looked at as they will be unable to cope with additional requests. Although they have the manpower, they do not have additional funding to cope with any expansion.
 - Request this be considered as part of the expansion project; there will need to be discussions with Thames Valley Area team to assess whether additional NHS funding will be available for them to manage the expansion.

Services

- Need to re-consider schools again.
- Services such as schools, doctors' surgeries, etc. will have to expand accordingly:
- School place proposals are inadequate.
- Parks are needed - activity parks for all ages, not just open spaces.
- Questions raised over capacity & ability of GP surgeries, Stoke Mandeville, Wycombe General, Police, Fire and Rescue Services to cope with proposed growth.
- PR needs more accessible local services that reflect the communities' needs, and support its health, social and cultural wellbeing:
- A full time police station should be provided.
- The current library is woefully small, with reduced opening hours, cannot serve doubled-size community.
- Community centre: enlarged facility needed, but same considerations as for Wellington House Surgery – where to put it.

Sewage works

- Need to reconsider the water processing plant; contrary to plan, existing sewage works are not adequate.
- Concerns that the existing sewage plant will not be able to manage the considerable number of additional homes at both Princes Risborough and Longwick.
- The issue of the smell for new nearby residents: need to ensure that any development contributions to provide improvements in this arena are delivered on.
- According to the Lepus (2015) report, there is increased pressure on the sewage treatment works which may result in a large odour buffer. The sewage works needs improvement work carried out.
- The proposal indicates the need for an increase in capacity & an odour buffer, but costs & effectiveness are not quantified.

Parking

- Existing residents would welcome village hall-type community buildings with car parking;
- shopping areas need parking too.
- Many would cross the town to be able to pop into a small shop if there was ample free parking - this would incentivise companies to take on retail space.

Town centre/retail

- PR lacks employment opportunities, so people need to travel out of the town to work. The town centre does not offer many opportunities to expand to service the incoming population as there is simply not enough space. If a high number of people move to new homes in the area, they will spend much of their time driving to other places for work and essentials (suggests proposed increase in housing is not sustainable).
- Need to be more facilities and shops, but also the landscape character of the area should be protected; increased development and associated pollution will not bring more visitors to the area.
- Strong consideration should be given to additional corner shops/convenience outlets.

Schools

- Will there be an increase in grammar school places to accommodate this population? How will this happen if new grammar schools cannot be built and children from outside Bucks can compete for the places?
- Concerns about the ability to provide additional forms of education. 2 new primary schools are planned there are issues within the education system:
 - It is difficult to recruit new teachers in the area.
 - Currently PR has close-to-failing junior & top schools, low teacher morale, retention problems, & poor OFSTED reports.
 - Given this, will there be any support for the secondary school?
- Additional primary schools noted, but secondary school provision not clear; concern plan lacks new/additional secondary school in plan.
- Access to the expanded secondary school also an issue; Clifford Road cannot cope with the additional traffic so school access needs to expand to include car access.
- New Primary but not new Upper School suggested; latter will be required unless children are bused to existing schools out of area, adding to congestion & pollution.
- More investment in secondary school places would be required and further thought will be needed on this area; reconsider schools as they stand in the plan again.
- Page 58 para 8.65 and PRTP5 (11, 13): The need for two primary schools is questioned and it is suggested that provision of the required three forms of entry for

primary schools should be provided in one new school and the cost savings arising from not building a second new school used towards the relief road option 17.

Duty-to-cooperate

- . There is no proposal in this list, or the more detailed PRTP6, to fund any transport mitigation measures within Oxfordshire. Seek to see evidence that there is no need for improvements of roads within Oxfordshire which should be attributed as a development cost.

Archaeology/Historical remains

- Wording of the paragraph and the lack of a clear policy guiding an approach to the archaeological remains identified within the Areas of Expansion fails to fulfil the requirement to present a positive strategy for the historic environment as required by the NPPF.
- Recommend this be addressed by incorporating a requirement in Policy PRTP4 that proposals for development should be informed by an appropriate archaeological assessment and that the need to preserve areas of archaeological remains identified should be given consideration in the layout of development proposals, using public open space, where practicable, to preserve remains in-situ.
- A presumption against the loss of remains of national importance should be stated.
- Given the identification of an area of archaeological remains within the site it would be appropriate to identify this within the plan as an Archaeological Notification Area affecting applications within this part of the Area of Expansion in particular.
- The loss of identified areas of archaeological remains should require clear and convincing justification, including demonstration that options to avoid their loss have been explored and been shown to be unviable.
- Where loss of archaeological remains is unavoidable to deliver the objectives of the plan, and the public benefits of the proposals are shown to outweigh the harm to the archaeological resource, preservation by record should be required within the policy.

Green Belt/AONB/Environment/Ecology

- Green corridors should be extended and made larger; no three storey properties.
- Important to retain green spaces for relaxation and recreation.
- The protection and preservation of ancient hedges and field boundaries should be included as a policy in PRTP5; currently only mentioned in passing within draft plan.
- Roundabouts shown on the concept plan generate requirements for overhead column lighting which could be detractors in views from the AONB.
- Welcome mention of lighting in paragraph 5 of PRTP5; however it should also reference a lighting strategy that minimises impact on wildlife.
- Proposals for walking and cycling routes which will reduce pollution from vehicular transport welcome (with proviso they are routed so as to avoid wildlife impacts and where lighting is essential this is also managed so as to minimise wildlife impacts).
 - The section 19 on SuDS should make reference to SuDS being designed so as to maximise benefits for wildlife e.g. so that SuDS is designed in a way that maximises the opportunity to benefit biodiversity
- In addition a policy statement is needed to ensure protection of the Local Wildlife Sites, hedgerows and priority and protected species (see NPPF paragraphs quoted above). This should cover:
 - need for 50m buffer of biodiverse rich priority habitat, such as lowland meadow, to be established between any development and the LWSs;

- a commitment to carry out a thorough hydrological assessment & to only permit development that can be taken forward without impacting on the integrity of Local Wildlife Site for hydrological/other reasons;
- the need to retain and enhance existing hedgerows;
- and the need to assess impact on protected and priority species and take appropriate measures to ensure impacts are fully mitigated, and compensated where mitigation not possible.
- If the proposals proceed then the development should be arranged so that back gardens are not directly adjacent to the buffer area to minimise dumping of back garden rubbish over the fence and installation of private access gates.
 - Lighting would have to be managed carefully to ensure it is of a low spill variety, of a spectrum that minimises impacts on birds, bats and insects, and directed into the development.
 - Conditions/covenants that control the type/power/direction of security/outside lighting that can be installed on houses are also suggested.
- No benefit to Princes Risborough and very detrimental to an AONB. Ruinous to an historic area used by many for recreation; once gone, lost forever.
- Support for street lighting which protects dark skies.
- Support for green infrastructure and improvements to public right of way including link to wider countryside Support for ecological enhancements to deliver a net gain in biodiversity.
- Support for comprehensive strategic tree planting.
- Need to add requirements to provide wildlife corridors and recreation routes to link to the surrounding Support for local Plan proposal that open space is secured for this site. Serious consideration should be given in going further and reclassify this field as AONB.

Utilities

- Add criterion to policy dealing with sustainable water supply.
- Policy PRTP5 does not explain where the PR water supply comes from or raise issue of what impact new development will have on the chalk aquifer.
- The latter is currently over-licensed, so any increased demand would need to be met by sources elsewhere to avoid detrimental impact to the aquifer.
- The plan should explain that the chalk aquifer (WRMU2) is currently failing the Water Framework Directive on the grounds of water quality (assessed as Poor due to Nitrate levels).
- Nitrate levels in groundwater can cause issue for public supply. If levels were to continue to increase it could affect supply and therefore water availability.
- Nitrate levels can take several decades to manifest themselves so a rising trend could have long term resource implications.

Other

- Recent development in Chinnor saw social housing tenants relocated from London boroughs. Although the new development in Princes Risborough should undoubtedly include some social housing, the town will need to also provide housing that would be attractive to commuters if it is to maintain a dynamic and thriving economy. Attractive estates and houses with reasonable-sized gardens are needed for this.
- There is a significant list of development requirements which need to be assessed against the viability of development taking place.
- Finally proper provision needs to be made for a shared faith space in the new development area. The existing Christian churches in the town are keen to

encourage faith within the new development, and want to make sure that this is adequately catered for in the community centres being planned.

- Two plans provided show the location of various equipment such as electricity cables, electricity poles and substations located in the expansion area. This equipment may need to be relocated if the expansion goes ahead.
- Need to challenge assumption that there is actually demand for the housing. Recent experience of large scale development in Aylesbury at both the Buckingham Park and Berryfields developments, both of which have failed to attract buyers despite the perceived housing shortage and large demand, proves that poor town planning can and will blight a town if badly executed.

Further work areas:

- Revisions to policy
- Update to Princes Risborough Wastewater Treatment Works Assessment
- Continue to work with Clinical Commissioning Group and GP surgeries
- Test capacity released by changes to existing transport network

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: PRTP6 Provision and Safeguarding of transport infrastructure

Respondents:	<p>Mr Darrell (DPRTP 00008) C Leaver (DPRTP 00012) Network Rail (DPRTP 00013) Rt. Hon S Baker, Conservative Party (DPRTP 00020) S Miall (DPRTP 00021) S Woods (DPRTP 00024) A Jennings (DPRTP 00025) J Robson (DPRTP 00028) A Robson (DPRTP 00029) D Brown (DPRTP 00043) T Chettle (DPRTP 00044) S Gledhill (DPRTP 00046) J Shaw (DPRTP 00047) P Knall (DPRTP 00048) D Dobson (DPRTP 00049) P McAleavey (DPRTP 00051) D Whitaker (DPRTP 00052) P & C Messenger (DPRTP 00053) G Huntingford (DPRTP 00054) G Baker (DPRTP 00058) A Hitchcock (DPRTP 00061) T Stumpp (DPRTP 00062) C & S Brownlie (DPRTP 00065) P Mussett (DPRTP 00066) C Courtney (DPRTP 00068) J Tann (DPRTP 00069) C Lishman (DPRTP 00070) S Weir (DPRTP 00071) J Wise (DPRTP 00072) Cuddihy (DPRTP 00074) M Davies (DPRTP 00076) J Woods (DPRTP 00077) H Lemanski (DPRTP 00078) A Speechley (DPRTP 00079) N Vickers (DPRTP 00080) G Odell (DPRTP 00081) P & J White (DPRTP 000840) R & V Peel (DPRTP 00085) V Peel (DPRTP 00086) G Peel (DPRTP 00087) E Peel (DPRTP 00088) R Peel (DPRTP 00089) Chiltern Railways (DPRTP 00092) M Williams (DPRTP 00093) K Smethurst (DPRTP 00096) Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) S Bird (DPRTP 00098) N Rogers (DPRTP 00099) A Hussey (DPRTP 00101)</p>
--------------	---

	<p> P Hussey (DPRTP 00103) A Macfarlane (DPRTP 00105) S M Bailey-Kennedy (DPRTP 00106) P Bird (DPRTP 00107) A Edwards (DPRTP 00108) Cllr C Etholen (DPRTP 00109) S Bailey-Kennedy (DPRTP 00110) J Baker (DPRTP 00112) K Bailey-Kennedy (DPRTP 00113) Chiltern Society (DPRTP 00114) J Farnell (DPRTP 00116) Aylesbury Vale DC (DPRTP 00118) Bloor Homes (Savills) (DPRTP 00119) Halsbury Homes Ltd (RPS) (DPRTP 00121) Bledlow-cum-Saunderton PC (DPRTP 00124) G Webb (DPRTP 00125) P Hanlon (DPRTP 00126) S Hanlon (DPRTP 00127) A Wynn (DPRTP 00128) D Garratt (DPRTP 00129) M Solman (DPRTP 00130) D Wynn (DPRTP 00131) R Nelms (DPRTP 00132) K Nelms (DPRTP 00133) B Nelms (DPRTP 00134) D Cutler (DPRTP 00135) M Wheatley (DPRTP 00136) K Roberts (DPRTP 00137) A Wilkinson (DPRTP 00138) C Young & J Hutchins (DPRTP 00142) L Byrne (DPRTP 00143) J Cremin (DPRTP 00144) D Cremin (DPRTP 00145) D Wyatt (DPRTP 00146) G Wyatt (DPRTP 00147) J Cleland (DPRTP 00149) S Mooney (DPRTP 00150) C Brooks (DPRTP 00151) J Rae (DPRTP 00152) J Martin Hall (DPRTP 00154) N Burrows (DPRTP 00155) J Woodward (DPRTP 00157) Dr A Ankers (DPRTP 00160) Dr J Bassett (DPRTP 00161) P Bassett (DPRTP 00162) G Cowland (DPRTP 00163) M Stenton (DPRTP 00164) P Hayes (DPRTP 00165) C Saunders (DPRTP 00168) K Wise FRCS, (DPRTP 00169) F Kitchen (DPRTP 00170) T Raynor (DPRTP 00171) Z Williams (DPRTP 00172) S Corry (DPRTP 00173) D Audas (DPRTP 00175) </p>
--	--

P Danger (DPRTP 00177)
 J Williams (DPRTP 00178)
 S Allom (DPRTP 00181)
 P Gallagher (DPRTP 00182)
 E Gallagher (DPRTP 00183)
 M Yeoman 2 (DPRTP 00184)
 J Cooke (DPRTP 00185)
 N Cook (DPRTP 00188)
 C Frith (DPRTP 00189)
 A Ingram (DPRTP 00190)
 Dr G Wilkinson (DPRTP 00192)
 P Brogden (DPRTP 00194)
 P Beckley (DPRTP 00195)
 E Beckley (DPRTP 00197)
 G Lister (DPRTP 00198)
 D Carrington (DPRTP 00199)
 P Day (DPRTP 00202)
 G Ingram (DPRTP 00203)
 L Todd (DPRTP 00205)
 M Purnell (DPRTP 00206)
 P Purnell (DPRTP 00207)
 S Kearley (DPRTP 00208)
 R Norton (DPRTP 00209)
 V Kearley (DPRTP 00210)
 I Lishman (DPRTP 00213)
 S Lishman (DPRTP 00214)
 P Goodridge (DPRTP 00215)
 P Baldwin (DPRTP 00216)
 P Baldwin (DPRTP 00216)
 D Tarres (DPRTP 00217)
 R Tarres (DPRTP 00218)
 N Tarres (DPRTP 00219)
 M Billsborough (DPRTP 00220)
 L Jeanes (DPRTP 00221)
 K Yates (DPRTP 00223)
 S Yates (DPRTP 00224)
 C Wilson (DPRTP 00225)
 S Thorne (DPRTP 00227)
 C Thorne (DPRTP 00228)
 S Wilkins (DPRTP 00229)
 M Hill (DPRTP 00230)
 M Hill (DPRTP 00231)
 W Streule (DPRTP 00235)
 J Wilkinson (DPRTP 00237)
 A Flynn (DPRTP 00240)
 K Williamson (DPRTP 00242)
 T Nicosia (DPRTP 00244)
 R Goodman (DPRTP 00246)
 A Williams (DPRTP 00248)
 T Burton (DPRTP 00252)
 J Spittles (DPRTP 00257)
 K Millard (DPRTP 00253)
 A Stoodley (DPRTP 00254)
 P Spittles (DPRTP 00255)
 M Tedman (DPRTP 00256)

<p>V Williams & A B Bernstein (DPRTP 00260) J Mirzoeff (DPRTP 00261) C Bird (DPRTP 00262) C Campbell (DPRTP 00266) Princes Risborough Steering Group (DPRTP 00267) C Ellis (DPRTP 00268) S Rae (DPRTP 00271) D Williams (DPRTP 00273) Persimmon Homes North London (DPRTP 00274) C Hawkins (DPRTP 00275) L Flaxton (DPRTP 00276) K Goodridge (DPRTP 00277) I Martin (DPRTP 00279) D Knights (DPRTP 00282) I Welsh (DPRTP 00285) J Welsh (DPRTP 00286) K Berman (DPRTP 00289) G Nash (DPRTP 00290) S Sheppard (DPRTP 00291) T Thomas (DPRTP 00292) D Thomas (DPRTP 00294) M Edwards (DPRTP 00295) V Solman (DPRTP 00296) A Edwards (DPRTP 00297) A Turner (DPRTP 00299) L Redrup (DPRTP 00300) D Hollands (DPRTP 00301) J Mackreath (DPRTP 00302) M Carroll (DPRTP 00303) D Edwards (DPRTP 00304) I Thomas (DPRTP 00305) M Carroll (DPRTP 00306) K Williams (DPRTP 00307) M Preskett (DPRTP 00308) BANG (DPRTP 00309) M Nelson (DPRTP 00311) C Plumley (DPRTP 00312) M Hayes (DPRTP 00314) Beacon Wood Real Estate Strategies (DPRTP 00315) G Farnell (DPRTP 00316) J Edwards (DPRTP 00317) M Borrelli (DPRTP 00318) R Cox (DPRTP 00319) G Farnell (DPRTP 00320) T Taylor (DPRTP 00321) J Taylor (DPRTP 00322) A Eden (DPRTP 00323) C Billsborough (DPRTP 00324) R Bunker (DPRTP 00325) Gt & Little Kimble PC (DPRTP 00328) M Scott-Jackson (DPRTP 00329) S Eden (DPRTP 00331) J Roper (DPRTP 00332) M Cudd (DPRTP 00335) J Cudd (DPRTP 00337)</p>

	W Harry (DPRTP 00340) T Roper (DPRTP 00341) D Hayes (DPRTP 00342) K Irons (DPRTP 00343) P Irons (DPRTP 00344) L Jayatillake (DPRTP 00345) R Jayatillake (DPRTP 00346) K Hayes (DPRTP 00347) N Ghafoor (DPRTP 00348) C Conely (DPRTP 00349) J Dance (DPRTP 00350) A Rampley (DPRTP 00351) M Gisby (DPRTP 00352) T Plant (DPRTP 00354,) C Plant (DPRTP 00355) A John (DPRTP 00356) South Oxfordshire D C (DPRTP 00357) S Agace (DPRTP 00359) I Crease (DPRTP 00360) P Richardson (DPRTP 00361) R D Smith (DPRTP 00362) Environment Agency (DPRTP 00365)						
Number of Representations:	237	Objection:	97	Support:	22	Comment:	118

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

Transport

- Support for:
 - Proposed replacement bridges at Summerleys Road (south bridge) and Grove Lane (north bridge), subject to relevant agreements being reached with Network Rail in respect of asset management and property.
 - Safeguarding of land to allow for the rail track between Princes Risborough and Aylesbury to be double-tracked in the future.
 - Provision of the new relief road/bypass:
 - due to congestion of A4010 main road through PR.
 - as part of the plan accepting that the road options which take a wider route to the west are not practical because of the costs involved in crossing the railway tracks.
 - given it is important to consider the effect of road improvements associated with the development, which are likely to have implications for traffic flows in and out of Aylesbury Vale, particularly given the level of growth also being proposed at nearby settlements in AV.
 - to act as a true bypass, taking not only the new traffic for the new housing areas but also traffic away from A4010 through Risborough.
 - should be designated as the A4010, with the existing section of road between Shootacre Lane and Grove Lane being re-designated as a local 'B' road; this "one-time" opportunity for an outer relief road should not be squandered.

- Proposals to improve traffic and reduce speed along the existing A4010 especially with regard to the potential future impact of the HS2 development.
- Bypass/relief road to speed up Wycombe-Mandeville journey for ambulances.
- Bypass options 11a/b or 15a/b.
- Plan overall: well thought-through, positive, impressive level of detail covered.
- Any bypass or infrastructure solution should improve road access to the rail station.
- The relief road seems unambitious; ideally it should go ahead and link Aylesbury or Stoke Mandeville directly to an area south of Risborough.
- The provision of a relief road/bypass is essential; only Options 12, 13a, and 13b should be considered. All other Options modelled fail to meet the basic criterion of what a relief road or bypass is meant to be, and because of this general application of a Benefit to Cost Ratio comparison is not appropriate.
- Another argument for the is the number of ambulances using the existing road High Wycombe-Stoke Mandeville since closure of Wycombe General A&E.
- If scheme must go ahead prefer an alternative alignment east of Shootacre Lane.

Road option 11a

- If a new route is needed, consideration should be given to route 11a.
- 11(a) is a better choice than (b):
 - More direct and shorter, therefore have less impact on the area.
 - Allow ambulances travelling High Wycombe-Stoke Mandeville to make the journey in less time.
 - Affects less houses so has less impact on the amenity value of the area.
 - Is safer:
 - Less driveways therefore less local traffic reversing on/off new road.
 - Road is used by cyclists and is part of the Bucks & Oxon cycle paths.
 - Road currently used by a lot of horse riders for travel & to/from stables.
 - Will have less impact on noise and pollution levels.
 - Apparently the owner of Culverton farm would be amenable to selling part of his land to enable 11a to go ahead without compulsory purchase, has been in contact with the council before; public confirmation of this welcome.
 - With the amount of new housing to be built more direct, 11(a) is overall less complicated, affects less people and will probably be more cost-effective.
- Variation on route 11a through the field adjacent to Culverton Farm should be used.
- All that said, long-term a proper bypass would be sensible.

Road option 11b

- Lesser impact on landscape and open countryside.
- Less expensive and less harmful to the environment.
- Reduced impact on the Horsenden Lane area.
- Puts the new road in a development area rather than an existing rural one.
- A new main road that runs in/out town & in/out new development is sensible.

Road option 12

- Preference for wider bypass route which goes further out from town with potential to serve the new industrial estate.
- Alternative route much easier/quicker to construct, with smaller impact on residents.
- Best option to speed traffic around Princes Risborough, offers lower in-town congestion, road wear and exhaust gases levels.

Road option 17

- Is the preferred route for relieving traffic from the town.
- Contributes towards delivering better accessibility to the Princes Estate.
- Is the best option for the town but has drawbacks for Shootacre Lane; suggest alignment with Horsenden Bridge rather than Shootacre.
- Traffic report concludes it is the only sensible one; any other build would waste good money on roads that will ultimately make little difference.
- Implementing PRTP7 only really makes sense in an Option 17 world.
- 17 should begin at the new junction of Upper Icknield way with A4014 (not at start of Shootacre) then connect with Picts Lane junction & Station Road.
- If the plan is adopted in full then 17 is the only long-term feasible relief.
- 17 is the best option to speed traffic around Princes Risborough and lower in-town congestion, road wear and exhaust gases levels.
- Carries the greater cost of opening up further Green Belt to development, yet would still be far less detrimental overall.

Objecting

Road option plans in general

- Objection to the proposed relief road/bypass on the grounds that:
 - Too little too late.
 - town needs more people through it, not less;
 - There is nowhere sensible to build a relief road.
 - increased exhaust fumes will aggravate sufferers from breathing conditions;
 - significant impact on ecology and AONB.
 - If house building was only done for local requirements the bottleneck through PR could be dealt with by realignment of the road, taking away pelican crossings and replacing them with underpasses or over-road walkways.
 - Need for a relief road & vast expenditure not convincing given PR's slow traffic twice a day for 40 minutes does not qualify for the term congested when compared with Cambridge's traffic congestion some years ago.
 - it will take trade away from town centre
 - Putting a bypass through rural, residential roads will destroy wildlife and negatively impact those who use the road.
- A proper bypass is needed rather than sending traffic down residential streets.
- Objections to the premise that a relief road is required, and to the routes proposed; if there must be a bypass, it should completely avoid the town.
- Objects to proposed foot/cycle path as it cuts off part of resident's land.
- Only Option 12 is worthy of further consideration. Trying to eliminate this on landscape, environmental or cost grounds given the massive scale of this overall project is unacceptable, and should stop at this relatively early stage or the decision will cost WDC local support.

Objection to specific road options

- Objection to the current proposals to build a western bypass / relief road around Princes Risborough along proposed routes 11b, 12 or 17 due to:
 - Pollution levels and air quality,
 - Main access route between local paths and trails,
 - Noise pollution.
 - Health & Safety.
 - Plans are unaffordable.
 - Concern over road safety and noise disturbing residents.

- Argument against Option 11b:
 - not suitable for a small town like Princes Risborough
 - 40mph speed limit will make it dangerous in residential areas
 - Will split the town in two.
 - Inadequate to deal with the proposed new housing development and longer term growth of the town, including car ownership.
 - Opposed to 11b/any alternative that increases traffic along/across Picts Lane.
- Argument against option 17:
 - Opposed to the siting of a relief road along residential country lanes when a non-disruptive and cheaper alternative is available.
 - It will ruin the peace of the tennis and cricket clubs and the rural edge of PR.
 - It would be dangerous for residents pulling out from their driveways.
 - Loss of amenity for walkers, joggers, horse riders e.g. access to Phoenix Trail.
 - Don't want added pollution or noise.
 - Don't want to be cut off from town by a busy road that will cause problems.
 - Children will have to walk to school down busy road and cross it.

Green Belt/AONB

- Princes Risborough is 'the Gateway to the Chilterns' in an AONB and as such should be protected as much as possible from large developments.
- The proposals set out in Policy PRTP6 would harm the AONB and its setting.
- Any work must be compatible with conserving and enhancing the AONB. Objection to
 - a new road in the AONB;
 - the insensitive widening or intensification of Shootacre Lane and Picts Lane;
 - any insensitive junction improvements at the junction of Shootacre Lane with the A4010, or the junction of Shootacre Lane with Picts Lane.
 - diverting volumes of through traffic down these lanes in the AONB.
 - the options involving a western bypass that draws traffic down Shootacre Lane, as they will harm the rural character of Horsenden.
 - how it will lead to pressure for westwards expansion of Princes Risborough.
 - transport schemes within the expansion area which detract from the setting of the AONB, such as new roundabouts.
 - bypass options that go through AONB land used by walkers, cyclists, etc.
- Coalescence issues between Saunderton, Horsenden and Bledlow Road seeing them separated from Princes Risborough. (Also some objections to reverse.)
- Options 11b, 12 & 17, and the idea of a bypass, are strongly opposed on grounds of :
 - harm to the AONB (particularly so soon after HS2)
 - harm to the conservation area in Horsenden
 - loss of community amenity, in particular enjoyment of AONB scenery & setting
 - noise pollution
 - highway safety
 - air quality/pollution
 - nature conservation
 - health and wellbeing.
 - Also 12 & 17 contrary to emerging Neighbourhood Plan.
- Any road option will lead to destruction of conservation areas.
- Option 17 would open up Green Belt for further development in the future. Given there are many roads around the Chilterns which would be classed as 'passing through' green belt and AONB, not seen as clear-cut; public awareness needed.

Horsenden/Lane-specific objections

- Strongly object to any new relief road/bypass route passing through Horsenden.
- Objection specifically to proposed bypass option 17 on the grounds of:
 - loss of natural biodiversity such as veteran trees, hedgerows
 - Detrimental impact on/irreparable damage to:
 - Horsenden Conservation Area
 - area of historical heritage
 - historic buildings of Horsenden village
 - recreational site access/walking to amenities (more hazardous)
 - The quiet residential community in an AONB that is Horsenden.
 - Effect on Windsor playing fields: a busy road near to this area will significantly reduce the pleasure of those playing sport, also risk the health of those playing, particularly those with respiratory diseases e.g. asthma.
- Objections to any plan to alter Horsenden Lane:
 - it is a beautiful unspoilt lane
 - has wonderful views of the hills
 - contributes much to the physical/mental wellbeing of not-so-/local population.

Shootacre Lane-specific objections

- A relief road or bypass down Shootacre Lane; will make it more dangerous.
- New routes proposed are to detriment of Shootacre residents.
The vision for a relief road as it is short-sighted, limits expansion possibilities.
- Routes 11b & 17; both will increase AONB pollution & damage.
These roads would:
 - not suitable for heavy traffic;
 - Be detrimental/unsafe to local users e.g. sports clubs, walkers, cyclists etc.
 - Require bends added & a rebuilt bridge to become so;
 - Basically need to be rebuilt to handle a large amount of traffic.
 - This will not alleviate problems in the traffic network elsewhere.
 - New roads should be put in instead.

Congestion

- Even with bypass and increase of vehicular movements along A4010 from HS2 & new development construction traffic, there will still be congestion at the Pedestal roundabout from traffic heading south to High Wycombe and the M40.
- Proposals to alleviate congestion on A4010 at Princes Risborough make no sense unless other bottlenecks including those at Wycombe and Aylesbury addressed.
- Cost of adding more level crossings on the route is a waste of money.
- None of the transport options address issues further up the network.
- A4010 through Monks Risborough and Further North - given especially that the relief road/bypass will be in place, disagree with:
 - the need to place mini-roundabouts at the Peters Lane, Mill Lane and Holloway junctions with the A4010; latter will have no beneficial impact.
 - the 20 mph zone being required in this vicinity; either the other two mini-roundabouts or the proposed 20 mph zone should be introduced, not both.
 - the 30 mph speed limit zone being extended to the north of the Cadsden Road crossing; to avoid Monks Risborough/Princes Risborough coalescence, the extant 30 mph zone start/finish should remain.

Other

- Objection to expansion plans and through-road.
- Objection raised over question of the timing of delivery; felt strongly bypass should be delivered before any housing is built.

Commenting

Duty to Co-operate

- Policy provides for studies & upgrades to local transport infrastructure.
- The focus on B4010 is understood and potential route improvements noted.
- At this stage there does not appear to be a significant difference between the options to road infrastructure and capacity in South Oxfordshire.
- As such no comment to be made about a preference.

Compensation

- Compensation for residents adversely affected by routes isn't considered in the plan.

Infrastructure (other than road/rail)

- Underpass concerns:
 - Hygiene of an underpass
 - Some people feel vulnerable in underpasses; provision of alternative safe crossing areas requested.
- B4009 improvement detail including drainage improvements and sewerage capacity.

Transport/Congestion

- Concept design for the new development now at point where there is sufficient information available relating to the rest of the proposed development to properly cost & finalise road proposal.
- The final road infrastructure decision needs to reflect the positions of the existing railway lines and the objectives for the new road.
- The need for a relief road has been identified, to ease existing and anticipated future congestion in Princes Risborough centre without any additional development, and work for this should already be in hand.
- Rail bridge alterations due to relief road build will cause disruption to railway users which will be reclaimed from WDC and so passed on to taxpayers.
- No large scale development at Princes Risborough should:
 - have an adverse effect on traffic volumes in High Wycombe and
 - not adversely affect the road network in High Wycombe.
- The new bypass/relief road and huge amount of extra houses being planned will have a major impact on Great & Little Kimble-cum-Marsh Parish:
 - Will see a sharp increase in traffic through area w/the children's playground.
 - Playground is also meeting place for parents & children returning from school.
 - School organise 'crocodiles' to encourage children to walk to/from School several times a week.
 - Getting across this road is not easy, but with added traffic this will be nigh on impossible for large groups of primary school children.
- Bridge Street and Church Lane already suffer with some 'rat run' effects which may increase should this plan be implemented.
- Relief road will not solve the problem of traffic congestion going into Aylesbury or Pedestal in West Wycombe which are already jammed; latter inadequate for existing traffic with little room for improvement.

- To reduce traffic through the centre of Princes Risborough will require a more ambitious relief road than is proposed in the draft plan:
 - Traffic will need to be taken off the A4010 at Little Kimble.
 - The bridge under the railway will need to be re-aligned.
 - The A4009 will need to be improved and further extended to meet Picts Lane, but then taken further to join Shootacre Lane/A4010 at its present junction.
- Alternative partly using the existing Longwick Road:
 - Emphasis should be on non-use of cars.
 - Only build houses if people can be employed locally;
 - Any relief road should stay east of the railway line which forms a natural boundary protecting country/villages to SW from being swallowed by PR;
 - Improve existing A4010 instead of relief road.
- If this development proceeded and developers put up financing for a bypass, proposed route would be far better if:
 - it came off A4010 at crossroads with Woodway/Upper Icknield Way,
 - ran straight across Garners Field behind Culverton Manor
 - crossed Picts Lane to run directly into Summerleys Road before the Station;
 - avoids expensive/unnecessary dog-leg along Shootacre Lane and Picts Lane.
- Suggestion of an alternative road option running east-north via Upper Icknield; this East route has 3 major benefits:
 - Railway lines not touched.
 - Soft impact on residence.
 - (Ancient) path exists, almost straight line => fastest route - 40 mph possible?
 - Concerns over conservation.
- Concern over the 40mph speed limit and possible increase in traffic.
- Transport improvements will not help in the context of the wider network.
- Limited improvement possibilities for A4010 to adequately compensate for additional traffic load generated by additional commuters out of Risborough towards London.
- Suggested new roads will take trade from the town centre businesses.
- Beautiful, important areas will be destroyed for little overall benefit for motorists.
- The plan recognises that surrounding villages should retain their unique character, but the plan doesn't account for the increase in traffic for these single carriage roads.
- The plan envisages the use of a residential road for a bypass with attendant impact on air quality habitat and safety for the residents.
- The proposals will not solve the congestion; it will just be transferred to the inadequate junction at West Wycombe where the A40 is at capacity.
- Even if a relief road is built it will still connect to A4010:
 - latter will still be clogged with poor motor transport & HS2 traffic
 - Consigns town to years of constant upheaval from development & HS2 traffic.
- Query/concern re. potential new junction on Picts Lane through old Hypnos site.
- A relief road is not the best solution to the town congestion problem:
 - the latter is minor, limited to a proportion of the peak hour Mon-Fri (Jacobs);
 - therefore does it even warrant the proposed expense as a "solution";
 - further commuter traffic will aggravate problems at Aylesbury & Wycombe;
 - projected increases in traffic since 2000 have not risen to levels expected;
 - there is inadequate justification for the route chosen;
 - other significantly cheaper options to improve traffic flow have not yet been considered and presented;
 - diverting traffic will have a negative effect on the town's businesses.
- The 40mph speed limit & new junctions/corners proposed cause great concern over:
 - the safety of residents reversing in their driveways
 - the uncertainties with regards to the geometry:
 - at the corner of Shootacre/Picts lane
 - at the station junction, including the impact of bus services

- at the old Hypnos site.
- Bypass would not solve congestion and is therefore not needed.

Rail

- The improvement of railway crossing points for cars, cycles and pedestrians appears to be an essential part of the plan and should include upgrading the Grove Road junction with the A4010 (Jacobs report October 2013).
- Consistent & justified position required between WDC & Network Rail to enable appropriate safeguarding along the rail boundary. PRTP6 should accurately reflect agreed position: that the narrower the land-take associated with rail improvement, the stronger the connection between the existing & expanded town that is likely to result.
- Potential upgrade works by Network Rail are acknowledged, though as yet do not have a specific timescale for implementation; detailed design work is yet to be undertaken.
- Need new road structure around rail station, Summerleys Rd & development road.
- Princes Risborough to Aylesbury branch train line:
 - Requirements of an enhanced service could see the need to
 - double and electrify the line
 - remodel the junction at Princes Risborough.
 - It is vital that the alignment of the railway is protected in the long term for these improvements.
 - As the service frequency increases, including freight trains at night, it will also be important to mitigate the risk of noise and vibrations to new residents in the expansion area.

Flooding

- The new road link through the former Hypnos and Whiteleaf site and the new road through the expansion area both go through Flood Zone 3; in the Wycombe District Council SFRA dated November 2014 this includes Flood Zone 3b.
- WDC will need to sequentially test proposed road links in order to be NPP-compliant.
- WDC will have to decide which vulnerability from Table 2 the roads fall into as this will have an impact on their acceptability or otherwise in the Functional Floodplain (Flood Zone 3b).
- WDC will have to justify choice of vulnerability from Table 2 'Flood risk vulnerability classification' in the Planning Practice Guidance.
- Plan will be found unsound at the examination submission stage for lack of consistency with NPP and not having a robust evidence base, if it is not supported by a sequential test for any development allocated at the strategic planning stage.

Bypass/relief road(s)

- Routing of new relief road will have disproportionate impact on some local residents.
- Consider alternative Culverton Farm to Picts Lane route and reconsider 11a option from crossroads to Picts Lane. Bypass will only move the traffic elsewhere.
- Option 11a should be considered in a modified form:
 - with the junction placed closer to Culverton Farm;
 - a variation through the field adjacent to Culverton Farm.
 - is preferable to 11b & 17 with slight alterations.
 - should be on the edge of development rather than through it.
 - would be more direct and less invasive into residents' lives.
 - siting a new, shorter, straighter road behind Culverton Farm.
- Bypass is not necessary, but if so then routes 11b or 17.
- Route 17 is the absolute minimum needed - totally opposed to route 11.

- The primary concern is that option 17 outer relief road will not be chosen due to cost, but it is the only credible and effective choice to make.
- Past mistakes on underestimating highway volumes nationally have led to costly further road re-development; if planning for 2-2,500 homes with the option of either 11 or 12b inner road, Princes Risborough will forever be seen as an example of how not to expand a balanced social community.
- Any bypass should avoid residential areas for safety and amenity reasons - therefore neither of the routes should be shortlisted. Alternative routes should be considered.
- The planned new bypass passes through rural and community areas and their quiet and safe nature will be altered irrevocably; it will destroy country lanes.
- Diverting traffic out of town will harm businesses in the town centre, taking trade out.
- New road may divide new development; route through trading estate is better.
- Use B4009 then make a new road over to the A4010 around the Saunderton area.
- Bypass to relieve the A4010 is needed, and while green infrastructure is welcomed increased car traffic seems inevitable.
- The proposed bypass and options:
 - had insufficient and misguided consultation not undertaken independently;
 - lack credibility and need to be re-evaluated.
- Concerned that if the relief road should be implemented there will be an increase in pollution and noise; sound-proofing barriers should be provided to mitigate latter.
- Need a clear outer ring road/bypass to take through traffic around Risborough, rather than simply moving it through residential areas; essential for sustainable growth.
- Proposed route lacks a full-length pedestrian footway; existing road has a hidden dip.
- The proposed 'bypass' is grossly under spec'd; it should be moved wide of the residential areas, with safe pedestrian and cycle crossings installed at the Mill Lane/Owlswick and Askett/Meadle crossing of the B4009.
- Concerns over access to and from residents' property – querying:
 - justification for raising speed limit from current one in lanes.
 - Whether grass verges will be removed.
 - planned methods for managing traffic speeds.
 - plans for station access to and from the bypass.
 - Timings for all of the above.
 - Affording Askett and Crowbrook Road residents more consideration than Summerleys Road when the issues are the same for all three.

Shootacre Lane/Picts Lane-specific comments:

- At the southern end of the outer ring road it should be routed away from Shootacre and Picts Lane, to skirt around the back of Horsenden, across the fields and link up with the Lower Icknield Way, thereby creating a true bypass.
- Suggested option: a new road built straight across Picts Lane, possibly under the existing road or a roundabout, leaving Picts Lane between Acre Wood and Mill Stream Close to cut through the north side of the field adjacent to Culverton Farm; would be a faster, safer variation and would safeguard the environment of Shootacre Lane and Horsenden; it might even provide space for some more housing to be built.

Other

- The policy sets out a number of requirements for the delivery of infrastructure outside the control of developers.
- Policy should be replaced with a much higher-level statement of principles incorporated in a single new policy that can address all relevant matters, with reference to the phasing & infrastructure delivery plan referred to in PRTP14.

- The plan cannot progress until there is a costed long term road solution which is fundamental to the overall operational and financial viability of the scheme.
- The consultation has to then be assessed against the final proposal, not the current plan which has no firm proposal for the road solution.
- Greater effort needs to be given to arrive at the best solutions for road infrastructure. There is a lack of robustness and accuracy at present which should be remediated.
- The Jacob's report has indicated "it is assumed that there would only be the potential for significant traffic redistribution if a new/upgraded WRR is provided in full. No distribution is assumed as part of scenarios A or B". This is a flawed assumption – there would be some redistribution, although not as significant. This makes the very small margins of benefit indicated in the report for Option C traffic flow unreliable.

Further work areas:

- Further work on refining options for relief road
- Testing final transport scenario through traffic forecasting model
- With the County Council, come to a formal decision on the preferred route.
- Develop phasing and delivery plan for the road, supported by testing in the transport model if necessary
- Landscape capacity study
- Develop proposals for underpass design
- Update sequential test report

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: PRTP7 Princes Estate and expansion

Respondents:	P Mussett (DPRTP 00066) Chiltern Railways (DPRTP 00092) Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) Halsbury Homes Ltd (PRS) (DPRTP 00121) A Wilkinson (DPRTP 00138)						
Number of Representations:	5	Objection:	2	Support:	0	Comment:	3

Summary of issues/comments:

Objecting

- Concern over the impact on wildlife, caused by a new access for the expanded Princes Estate through woodland.
- Expanding the Princes Estate is inappropriate; it should remain in its current form.

Commenting

- Implementing PRTP7 (Princes Estate Expansion) only really makes sense if Option 17 is taken forward as a road option.
- The requirement for a layout and design that has particular regard to its visual impact from the AONB escarpment is supported, but reference to national trails needs to be added.
- Creating green roofs (not sedum) or breaking large floorplates into smaller less detracting roofscapes should be a requirement of any new large buildings on the town.
- Planned railway works will require track improvements and the construction of a new platform. The interaction of any development to the west of the station (including Princes Estate) with this project should be closely coordinated to ensure the aim of both schemes can be met, including the desire for pedestrian and cycle links to the station from this direction.

Further work areas:

- Landscape capacity study

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: PRTP8 Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Respondents:	Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) S Sheppard (DPRTP 00291) Environment Agency (DPRTP 00365)						
Number of Representations	3	Objection:	1	Support:	0	Comment:	2

Summary of issues/comments:

Objecting

- The gypsies should be left where they are, they have been there for years and are part of the community.

Commenting

AONB

- Add caveats to protect areas where new pitches could cause harm e.g. the Chilterns AONB and its setting.
- It is unlikely that additional traveller pitches could be provided in the AONB without harm to the designation objectives and its special qualities.
- Any development that takes place in the AONB should bring about conservation or enhancement of the natural beauty of the AONB. Traveller sites tend to have limited architectural merit and do not comply with the principles of the Chilterns Building Design Guide.
- The focus should be on meeting needs of those who qualify under the new 2015 definition of travellers, if required to be displaced from the expansion area, and doing so in a way that is compatible with the statutory requirement for public bodies to have regard to the nationally designated landscape.

Flooding

- This type of development falls within the 'highly vulnerable' category in terms of flooding. Highly vulnerable development within Flood Zones 3a and 3b should not be permitted and this would raise policy objections and the plan would be considered unsound.
- When looking at site allocations for Gypsy and Travellers sites, the sequential test still applies in Flood Zone 2 but site allocations would not be appropriate in Flood Zones 3a or 3b. The sequential test also applies to change of use applications to land for a caravan, camping or chalet site, or to a mobile home site or park home site.

Further work areas:

- Revision to policy / plan document

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: PRTP9 Town centre traffic and public realm enhancements

Respondents:	<p>J Durrant (DPRTP 00019) Persimmon Homes North London (DPRTP 00274) K Goodridge (DPRTP 00277) N John (DPRTP 00278) E James (DPRTP 00006) Mr Darrell (DPRTP 00008) Z Arnott (DPRTP 00010) T & N Standing (DPRTP 00022) P Speechly (DPRTP 00026) V Langley (DPRTP 00042) P & C Messenger (DPRTP 00053) S & C Browlie (DPRTP 00065) C Courtney (DPRTP 00068) A & S Brown (DPRTP 00073) M Long (DPRTP 00083) S Davenport (DPRTP 00100) P Bird (DPRTP 00107) S Bailey-Kennedy (DPRTP 00110) D Garratt (DPRTP 00129) Historic England (DPRTP 00139) BMTrada (DPRTP 00182) A Ingram (DPRTP 00190) M Purnell (DPRTP 00206) K Yates (DPRTP 00223) S Thorne (DPRTP 00227) M Hill (DPRTP 00230) A Williams (DPRTP 00248) C Joseph (DPRTP 00265) I Martin (DPRTP 00279) I Welsh (DPRTP 00285) St. Johns Combined C of E School (DPRTP 00292) P Summerscales (DPRTP 00293) A Edwards (DPRTP 00297) M Hayes (DPRTP 00314) G Farnell (DPRTP 00316) C Billsborough (DPRTP 00324) R Bunker (DPRTP 00325) J Roper (DPRTP 00332) C O'Reilly (DPRTP 00333) M Cudd (DPRTP 00335) J Cudd (DPRTP 00337) T Roper (DPRTP 00341) D Hayes (DPRTP 00342) K Hayes (DPRTP 00347) K Irons (DPRTP 00343) P Irons (DPRTP 00344) A Rampley (DPRTP 00351) I Crease (DPRTP 00360)</p>
--------------	--

Number of Representations:	48	Objection:	1	Support:	2	Comment:	45
----------------------------	----	------------	---	----------	---	----------	----

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

- Excellent proposal addressing dead areas between Longwick Lane and Summerleys Road in particular.
- The public realm and highway improvements will represent as positive strategy, contributing to the increased enjoyment of the historic environment of the area, and other benefits.
- Town centre improvements are welcomed, and will positively impact tourism.

Commenting

Infrastructure

- The underpass into Wades Park may flood and be scary to use in poor light and will erode green space.

Flooding and drainage

- Development of a flood plain will increase flood risk which is already an issue.

Parking

- The creation of a multi-storey carpark at Horns Head and the proposed Mount Car Park will be eyesores, and will change the area's character, making it less appealing and may encourage anti-social behaviour.
- The carparks will increase congestion.
- Increased parking in Wellington surgery will erode the Green Space.
- Concern over the decked parking scheme at the Mount as this car route is through an already difficult road layout and encouraging increased traffic won't be good for conservation or for encouraging waling and cycling. It would be better have more parking at Horns Lane/ New Road.
- Increased parking will increase pressure on the A4010 route and won't encourage public transport, walking and cycling.
- The town is already congested with on-street parking. Expanding the town will make this worse unless free parking in WDC car parks is introduced.
- Concern over the number of multi-storey car parks proposed.

Conservation

- There needs to be further 'greening' of the town.
- Expansion of the High Street will obscure historic elements of the town.

Sense of place

- The demolition of houses won't maintain and improve the character of the town.
- The changes to the station and High Street are out of keeping with Risborough and will change the character of these areas.

Public transport

- Lack of improvements to public transport, such as bus links from Princes Risborough to other towns.
- The rail service is at capacity, and new services to various destinations will prevent improvements to services to the town.

Process

- Concern this proposal will have the same poor outcome of previous developments.
- Concern over the council's ability to implement improvements such as a new relief road, and effect improvements to the area around New Road.
- Alternatives haven't been considered or presented.

Design

- The plan should include provision to ensure the pavement edges are suitably landscaped.

Highways

- More needs to be done to control traffic and speeding.
- The flow of traffic will constantly be interrupted through the town under the proposals.
- Congestion only occurs at peak times and the plan overstates congestion, so the bypass isn't necessary and other measures would be equally affective.
- Improved traffic flow through Princes Risborough will encourage traffic, so pressure will increase at the A4010/A40 junction at West Wycombe.
- Town centre traffic calming measures will put pressure on the new route to have a higher speed limit, making it less attractive to live on.
- Current traffic bottlenecks and there needs to be a solution to the main roundabouts on New Roads and their approaches to avoid bottleneck delays on the A4010.
- Concern about increased traffic along Longwick road, which would impact the environment and speeding is already an issue.
- Roads are already congested and dangerous and current traffic control is unacceptable.
- Town centre calming measure will negatively impact neighbouring parishes with the relief road and the residents living along it will be affected. Given congestion only occurs at peak times, this may not be justifiable.
- Removing traffic from the town centre may turn it into a ghost town, therefore affecting businesses, and could impact the potential to fill the proposed shopping units.

- Concern over the proposals for mini roundabouts along the A4010 and an underpass to the employment area. The roundabouts will be difficult to negotiate, causing safety concerns, and instead routes should be designed as streets.

Pedestrian and cycle facilities

- Concern over making the High Street and other town centre roads more pedestrian friendly by introducing doubt into the minds of drivers, cyclists and pedestrians, as this is likely to lead to incidents between users.
- Church Lane is unsuitable for a pedestrian and cycle link.

General

- A more robust proposal is needed.
- The station area, square, hotel and retail have no obvious well founded benefits and will compete with the High Street, and a square has no place in a market town outside the market area.

Commenting

General

- The provision of evidence that areas of historic street surfacing, contributing to the area's character will be protected would be welcomed.
- It is noted the policy requires a financial contribution to be made towards the town centre enhancements. These contributions will need to be considered against the viability of the wider scheme.

Business

- The High Street isn't as good as the plan suggests and there should be more focus on retailers and correcting traffic management of the town centre. Expanding the size of the town will just exasperate problems.
- Rental rates for the town centre should be reduced to encourage business.
- Focus should be on small independent shops which make Risborough different.

Pedestrian and cycle facilities

- The towns improvements should be biased towards pedestrians and cyclists by focusing foot access and cycle links, not just car drivers.
- The pedestrian and cycle facilities in the proposed new development are excellent but the current ones are poor – the only cycle path has been under consultation for closure and is usually blocked by vehicles.
- Consideration of the ways and justifications why pedestrians move through the town is needed, e.g. no tries to traverse the main road past the library, so any traffic interruptions/ changes here are unjustified.
- Is the High Street Cycle lane necessary?
- Cycle lanes are a hazard for pedestrians; future proposals within the development of traffic flow need to take this into account.

- How will pedestrians wanting to access the train station be able to cross the bypass without a pedestrian crossing which will cause traffic build up and reduce the speed of traffic, which will remove benefits of using it, leading to drivers seeking alternative ways through the town.

Public transport

- A 15 minute bus service can only be achieved with council funding as this isn't commercially viable.
- Placing the bus station on New Road should be considered.
- No mention of how traffic can be decreased by improved bus services, which would help to improve traffic and reduce the need for increased parking.

Highways

- Traffic should be improved by utilising public transport.
- 20mph speed limits should be expanded throughout the estate.
- The road improvements shouldn't lead to increased traffic.
- Car access shouldn't be hindered with roundabouts and multi-storey car parks.
- The option to for a bypass is favoured, the cycle lane in the High Street should be maintained and the one way system in the High Street should be aborted.
- Buses should be moved out of the High Street , and there should be better use made of layby areas on New Road and other existing bus stops around the town.
- Changes to existing road system should be tested before committing to a bypass option.
- The impact of increased traffic from Princes Risborough to and from surrounding areas hasn't been considered.
- Consideration should be given to going further with traffic measure through the town – a 20 mph speed limit and obligating construction traffic to not go through the town.
- Traffic flow, rather than volume is the issue, and there has been a decrease in traffic since 2000, so forcing heavy traffic onto the relief road would be a cynical move.
- It is important to consider the bottlenecks occurring at West Wycombe and Stoke Mandeville in Princes Risborough town planning.
- Previous town centre improvements have failed, and buses, crossings and the one way system are the main causes of congestion, so the bypass is unnecessary and an underpass/ pedestrian bridge and changing the one way system and returning traffic to two-way would improve the traffic flow and be cheaper and would allow Risborough to have a thriving High Street.
- Risborough congestion only occurs at peak times, whereas the congestion at either end of the A4010 is a more significant due to increased commuter traffic.
- Town centre congestion wasn't an issue until the Town Council changed the priority of the High Street, and introducing 100% more traffic will increase congestion, which won't be mitigated by a new bypass.

Alternative options

- There are other cheaper/easier options to alleviate congestion than the bypass that would maintain the through flow and reduce the need for a relief road:
 - Improvements to existing road infrastructure and traffic management

- Buses should be rerouted via New Road
- Improving parking
- Mini roundabouts should be added
- Pedestrian over bridges or underpasses
- One way or left turn only restrictions
- Crossings should be reconsidered
- The one way system has caused congestion issues and should be removed
- Extending the period pedestrian lights outside Marks and Spencer remain green for would reduce traffic queues
- Alternatives need to be considered and a deeper study of alternatives is needed.
- The provision of free parking would reduce on street parking and amount of cars looking for spaces.
- Moving the level crossing from outside M&S to the other side of the exit from the High Street, and the one way system combined with the crossing causes congestion and this option hasn't been considered.

Further work areas:

- Revision to policy / plan document

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: PRTP10 Town centre site: Land fronting New Road

Respondents:	D Hayes (DPRTP 00342) E James (DPRTP 00006) Historic England (DPRTP 00139) A Macfarlane (DPRTP 00105) Z Mawani (DPRTP 00176) J Mirzoeff (DPRTP 00261) S Sheppard (DPRTP 00291) Princes Risborough Steering Group (DPRTP 00267)						
Number of Representations:	8	Objection:	4	Support:	1	Comment:	3

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

- Connecting the High Street and New road and restructuring the back-land is long overdue.

Objecting

Parking

- A multi-storey car park at New Road / M&S would be visible from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- The layout of New Road is not suitable for the increased traffic that the additional parking will bring. Tesco would accommodate it better.
- Leave New Road alone, parking there is related to flats and shops need to use it for deliveries because of strict time limits on the High Street.

Highways

- Concerns raised over the impact of additional traffic for elderly pedestrians accessing town via the existing M&S car park / fire station.

Proposals

- A big-style store is inappropriate in this location on historic grounds, as the area is characterised by historic medieval burgage plots. It would also not fit the character of a market town and would be detrimental to the High Street shops.
- A new large store in the town High Street will cause more congestion.

Commenting

General

- The planned public realm and highways improvements represent a positive strategy. There should be some account taken in the improved pedestrian access of the protection of listed buildings and other heritage assets which make a positive contribution to the area.
- Does the council have the ability to effect the improvements in light of the replacement of the old post office with a modern building of low merit?
- Should development on the New Road site contribute to the overall public realm improvement plan like development on the land south of Horns Lane?
- Relocate the fire station and expand the parking at M&S that way, rather than put in a multi-storey.

Further work areas:

- Revision to plan document / policy

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: PRTP11 Town centre site: Land south of Horns Lane

Respondents:	Mr Darrell (PRTP 00008) S Davenport (PRTP 00100) J Farnell (PRTP 00116) Historic England (PRTP 00139) J Mirzoeff (PRTP 00261) T Roper (PRTP 00341) W Streule (PRTP 00235) J Titchen (PRTP 00212) Princes Risborough Steering Group (PRTP 00267)						
Number of Representations:	9	Objection:	3	Support:	0	Comment:	6

Summary of issues/comments:

Objecting

- Locating a multi-storey car park at Horns Lane would be an eyesore.
- The proposed work at Horns Lane is contrary to the plan's own principle that growth should support the tourism potential of the town.
- Development rising above the roofline would be inappropriate for the town.

Commenting

General

- Additional parking at Horns Lane is preferable to decked parking at The Mount.
- The new retail space and multi-storey car park is at odds with the existing historic character. How can it be integrated aesthetically?
- With improved design to the streets, the existing vacant shops at Horns Lane could be reinvigorated.
- Town centre design seems almost entirely designed for cars.
- Even with the proposed expansion, Princes Risborough is unlikely to generate the necessary footfall to warrant a multi-storey car park.
- Concerns that a multi-storey car park near an area known to have issues will have a negative effect on the crime rate.
- The existing open car park is more favourable to the elderly, pushchairs and cyclists.

Landscape

- Protection of views from the conservation area to the Chilterns escarpment should be considered.
- The impact on views from key vantages such as Whiteleaf Cross should be considered.

Further work areas:

- Revise policy wording

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: Parking

Respondents:	<p>E James (PRTP 00006) P Horrocks (PRTP 00007) Mr Darrell (PRTP 00008) Z Arnott (PRTP 00010) J Vowles (PRTP 00057) C Courtney (PRTP 00068) A & W Cuddihy (PRTP 00074) M Davies (PRTP 00076) A Browne (PRTP 00090) A Hussey (PRTP 00101) P Hussey (PRTP 00103) A Macfarlane (PRTP 00105) D Wynn (PRTP 00131) Historic England (PRTP 00139) B Green (PRTP 00148) J Woodward (PRTP 00157) E Jones (PRTP 00186) P Cresswell (PRTP 00191) G Wilkinson (PRTP 00192) P, J and J Vowles (PRTP 00211) M Hill (PRTP 00230) W Streule (PRTP 00235) T Burton (PRTP 00252) J Mirzoeff (PRTP 00261) R Joseph (PRTP 00263) D Brooker (PRTP 00264) C Joseph (PRTP 00265) Princes Risborough Steering Group (PRTP 00267) C Ellis (PRTP 00268) N John (PRTP 00278) S Wood (PRTP 00288) S Sheppard (PRTP 00291) C O'Reilly (PRTP 00333) M Cudd (PRTP 00335) J Cudd (PRTP 00337) S M Clark (PRTP 00339) D John (PRTP 00353)</p>						
Number of Representations:	37	Objection:	21	Support:	4	Comment:	12

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

General

- Overall good proposals addressing the necessary areas between Longwick Lane and Summerleys Road.
- Chances to improve the town centre are exciting.

- It is vital that parking improvements are made to the town centre, to prevent residents from shopping elsewhere.
- Examining opportunities to improve parking is welcomed, but must be sympathetic to the look and character of the town.

Objecting

General

- Car parking is already an issue in Princes Risborough, new residents will only add to existing problems.
- Town centre is at full capacity, no more opportunities for car parking are available.
- Car parks attract anti-social behaviour and may discourage pedestrian use if near the town centre.
- Concerns with the numbers of multi-storey car parks being suggested.
- Proposals for expanding properties and roads will result in the demolition of existing properties.

The Mount

- A raised deck car park at the Mount will destroy the setting of St. Marys Church, which will harm the Conservation Area and deter tourism.
- Adding a deck to the Mount would not represent an enhancement to the scheduled ancient monument or contribute to a better use.
- Development at the Mount would likely result in harm to the monument, therefore development should be avoided.

Other proposals

- Increasing the car parking space at Wellington House surgery will take over Wades Park.
- Adding a new level to the Mount is a bad idea, it will add to congestion and ruin the views of the church and surrounding area.
- Concern that by improving the Mount it will encourage traffic to an already difficult road layout, which will affect the Conservation Area.
- Multi-story car parks are not suitable for Princes Risborough.
- Existing proposals at the train station and Marks & Spencers result in no need for a multi-storey car park.
- Building on Horns Lane would have a negative visual impact on the town.

Commenting

General

- Parking in the area needs to be 'future-proof' in terms of capacity and cost.
- WDC must maintain effective control over parking in the area.
- Road improvements need to prevent more traffic division issues in the town centre.
- It must be ensured that local people can still park easily outside their homes.
- Parking issues have to be dealt with before any houses are built.

- Introduction of 2 hours free parking would encourage local businesses in the town centre and generate employment.
- Emphasis on retail may be under-justified.
- Princes Risborough town is not an appeal to shoppers, therefore it should be questioned whether parking provision is needed at all.

The Mount

- Due to the historical significance of the Mount, parking should be taken away from the site and be used as a historical feature of the town.

Public transport

- Removing the buses from using High Street would help to resolve parking issues in the town centre .
- Parking at the station is too expensive, these fees should be make the train an attractive choice.

Alternative suggestions

- Instead of providing multi-storey parking at the Mount, alternative parking should be created at Horns Lane, High Street, New Road, Tesco and the train station.
- If Horns Lane is chosen as an alternative, the setting of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Whiteleaf Cross, and Red Kite nests must all be protected.
- If Tesco is chosen as an alternative the Leo Pharma site on Longwick Road should be offered as an exchange, this would allow the shop to extend and be situated near the new development. Parking should also be reimbursed if a certain amount is spent in store.
- Cross Keys surgery also has insufficient parking and should be examined when looking for improvements.
- Several single-storey car parks would be better than a single multi-storey option.
- Alternative could be to demolish the fire station to provide a location for parking.
- Potential hotel and retail in the station improvements could provide parking opportunities.

Further work areas:

- Develop alternatives, working through the Steering Group

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: PRTP12 Molins Sport Ground

Respondents:	Chiltern Society (DPRTP 00114) Sport England (DPRTP 00115) J Fowler (DPRTP 00034) M Hill (DPRTP 00231) A Johnson (DPRTP 00243) Wilks Head & Eve (DPRTP 00117) Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) S Sheppard (DPRTP 00291)						
Number of Representations:	8	Objection:	2	Support:	4	Comment:	2

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

- Support the use of the site as an outdoor site, suggest adding restrictions on floodlighting, built development, and parking.
- Site is located in a visually sensitive site in the AONB therefore support not having development on the site.
- Support keeping the site for open space / leisure due to setting in Green Belt and AONB.
- Overall support bringing the site back into leisure use, increase of traffic as a result could be an issue though.

Objecting

- There are already plenty of sports grounds in the local area.
- Upkeep of local sports grounds is an ongoing issue.
- The policy cannot be implemented, and the site should instead be used to deliver housing. The site is immediately developable, an application has been lodged, and to dismiss it would be unsound and inconsistent with government policy.
- Development of the site for housing would cause no material harm to the purposes of the Green Belt or the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- Development of the site for housing would bring in contributions via CIL and S106 to local infrastructure.

Commenting

- Site should be kept as an open field, with a single building to house a function area for weddings etc. since there is a lack of such buildings in Princes Risborough.
- Exact detail of the types of sports the site is to host should be supported by a robust evidence base.

- The site has not been used as a sports ground in many years, and while it was in use it was a private facility, not a public one. Draft Plan is unclear on how the sports ground being brought back into use might be delivered.

Further work areas:

- Noted

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: PRTP13 Railway station site

Respondents:	Network Rail (DPRTP 00013) C Courtney (DPRTP 00068) S Gledhill (DPRTP 00046) B Green (DPRTP 00148) A Hitchcock (DPRTP 00061) R Joseph (DPRTP 00263) C Joseph (DPRTP 00265) V Kearley (DPRTP 00210) Environment Agency (DPRTP 00365) Aylesbury Vale District Council (DPRTP 00118) Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) Chiltern Railways (DPRTP 00092) K Roberts (DPRTP 00137) T Roper (DPRTP 00341) Princes Risborough Steering Group (DPRTP 00267) G Wilkinson (DPRTP 00192)						
Number of Representations:	16	Objection:	3	Support:	5	Comment:	8

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

- Improvements to the station are welcome as these will have a positive impact on tourism in the area.
- Safeguarding land to “twin track” the line at Princes Risborough is supported.
- Intentions to improve the station area and redevelop the land east of the station is supported.

Objecting

- Uncertain the station can become a ‘gateway to the Chilterns’ when other proposals will build up the area and spoil views.
- The amount of development at the railway station appears to be overdevelopment; the level of infrastructure proposed outweighs the need.
- A hotel at the station is unnecessary.
- The amount of development will make the area much busier, noisier, and harm the air quality.
- The proposals for the station area will compete with the High Street.
- The concept of a square is misplaced; the only place for a square in a market town is the market itself.
- Concern that the density of housing on the site be greater than the proposed levels.
- It is questionable just how much tourism redeveloping the station area might entice into the area.

Commenting

- The alignment of the line should be protected for future line improvements, and WDC should be mindful that if all developments at the station go ahead then station facilities may require enhancement.
- Links across the railway line will change as level crossings are closed.
- Hypnos / Whiteleaf sites and railway station area are an eyesore. The development sites should be brought forward and planned improvements to the station should be enacted.
- Will the development of the station area include safe pedestrian crossings, and if so, how can this be achieved without creating bottlenecks and a situation as bad as what exists presently?
- The station area presents an opportunity to tap into the rural visitor economy by adding information centres and signage about the making walking and cycling opportunities accessible from the area.
- The proposed bypass goes right by the station, which commuters will have to cross. Has this been given proper consideration in this context?
- The site lies within flood zone 3, and will require sequential testing. A full flood risk assessment will need to take account of the sequential testing in addition to all sources of flooding (including fluvial flood risk).

Further work areas:

- Update sequential test report to include climate change allowances

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: PRTP14 Delivery of infrastructure

Respondents:	<p>G Young (PRTP 00039) E Williams (PRTP 00251) Persimmon Homes North London (PRTP 00274) J Fowler (PRTP 00034) J Shaw (PRTP 00047) A Hitchcock (PRTP 00061) P Mussett (PRTP 00066) A & S Brown (PRTP 00073) M Davies (PRTP 00076) M Long (PRTP 00083) A Macfarlane (PRTP 00105) Aylesbury Vale District Council (PRTP 00118) RPS Planning & Development (PRTP 00121) H D Town Planning Ltd (PRTP 00141) B Green (PRTP 00148) A Ankers (PRTP 00160) D Carrington (PRTP 00199) V Kearley (PRTP 00210) P Baldwin (PRTP 00216) M Hill (PRTP 00230) Princes Risborough Steering Group (PRTP 00267) P Cline (PRTP 00287) S Wood (PRTP 00288) G Nash (PRTP 00290) S Sheppard (PRTP 00291) S Ray (PRTP 00298) Beacon Wood Real Estate Strategies (PRTP 00315) A Perry (PRTP 00326) M Cudd (PRTP 00335) J Cudd (PRTP 00337) Oxfordshire County Council (PRTP 00367)</p>						
Number of Representations:	31	Objection:	10	Support:	2	Comment:	19

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

General

- Approach of securing developer contributions through section 106 agreements is supported.
- The requirement of a masterplan to deliver infrastructure is supported.
- It is important to get the Plan right, so the Plan and its contents must be supported.

Objecting

General

- Concerns over achievability of infrastructure plan.
- Belief that in order to deliver the necessary infrastructure it requires large housing developments on this scale is wrong.

Costs

- Concerns over costs of delivering the necessary infrastructure.
- Concerns that funds for necessary infrastructure will not be sufficient, therefore leading to compromises.

Process

- Concerns over practicality of securing the majority of the infrastructure via section 106 agreements given the limitation of pooling contributions.
- Approach to dealing with infrastructure delivery through individual planning applications is flawed, as developers will delay development and this will not guarantee infrastructure delivery across the entire Area Action Plan area.
- Securing necessary infrastructure will be difficult if it is dependent on budget and programme decision making of third parties out of WDC's control.

Phasing

- Area Action Plan proposals are of a scale and complexity which means development will not be brought forward quickly, including necessary infrastructure requirements.

Policy wording

- PRTP14 (3) conflicts with PRTP14 (2) to the extent that PRTP14 (3) requires that individual applications do not prejudice wider delivery of the expansion scheme whilst PRTP14 (2) requires a detailed phasing and infrastructure delivery plan in the absence of an overarching master plan.
- Policy is tied to PRTP5 and PRTP6 as it is subject to the same fundamental problems in their prescriptive nature.
- Section seems to contain many inconsistencies and confusion – mostly in part to lack of overall phasing.
- Concerns over lack of utilisation of Community Infrastructure Levy to deliver infrastructure.

Railway

- Railway services lack the capacity to take on additional commuters

Commenting

General

- Feasibility studies must be carried out on the works of the bridge.
- More clarity is needed on the construction traffic routes for the new road.

- Developers must be made to pay towards necessary infrastructure.
- Infrastructure delivery should be handled in the phasing and delivery masterplan rather than PRTP14.
- It must be ensured that infrastructure as well as houses will be delivered.
- As part of the works, road surfaces must be improved.
- Provisions must be put in place whilst the access roads are in use.

Costs

- Questions raised over whether costs have been fully included in Plan.
- Use of Community Infrastructure Levy must be used to fund the plan and not used as revenue for the Town Council, commitment has to be put in place.

Phasing

- Phasing of infrastructure has yet to be determined; facilities will need to be provided at the right time.
- Infrastructure must precede the building of houses so existing facilities are not put under strain.
- Infrastructure should be provided on the basis of the detailed phasing and infrastructure delivery master plan, which should be prepared alongside the land-use master plan.
- More detail needed on who is responsible for the road as well as detailed phasing of its delivery.
- As the roads in the town centre are already congested, the relief road must be delivered before anything else in the expansion area.
- Improvements to Shootacre Lane and Picts Lane as well as the new connection at Picts Lane need to happen at the same time as the new connections to Summerleys road and Longwick Road to alleviate possible problems.

Further work areas:

- Refine / revise infrastructure delivery schedule
- Develop phasing plan

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: Appendices

Respondents:	Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) Sport England (DPRTP 00115) Harbour Castle Ltd (DPRTP 00141) Princes Risborough Steering Group (DPRTP 00267) Oxfordshire County Council (DPRTP 00367)						
Number of Representations:	5	Objection:	0	Support:	0	Comment:	5

Summary of issues/comments:

Commenting

Sport

- Guidance provided on the cost of facilities, useful to inform the draft Plan which is updated regularly so an up-to-date indication of the latest costs for the provision of sport facilities is provided.

Appendix C

- Many of the infrastructure items have indicative costs assigned to them but do not have a delivery mechanism; this is especially the case with some of the most expensive items: new railway crossings, the relief road and the secondary school.
- Other items are apparently to be funded partly by Section 106 contributions and partly through Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) although the criteria for determining the split between these two is not identified; the lack of any clear mechanism is another indication of impending difficulties over deliverability.
- There has been little evidence that either have been actively promoting the delivery of these crossings over the last 15 years when the 2004 Local Plan was first mooted.
- Pressure will need to be applied on railway provider to provide improved crossings with the threat of compulsory purchase if these negotiations do not work.
- The infrastructure schedule is not clear about who is actually responsible for delivery of the road infrastructure.
- The item relating to the relief road only refers to part of the relief road.
- It omits the critical lengths up to and including the new terminal junctions on the A4010 at Shootacre and Little Kimble.
- The requirements for schools should be clarified.

Map 2

- Option 17 is not included on Map 2 as a safeguarded route. This omission implies that WDC has already decided that only route option 11b will proceed and this is in advance of evaluating all of the feedback from the public consultation.

Further work areas:

- Update glossary
- Revise infrastructure schedule and delivery mechanisms
- Finalise relief road alignment
- Achieve Memorandum of Understanding with Network Rail

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: Figures

Respondents:	Rectory Homes (DPRTP 00064) Halsbury Homes Ltd. (RPS) (DPRTP 00121) BBWOT (DPTRP 00123) Historic England (DPRTP 00139) Harbour Castle Ltd (DPRTP 00141) K Yates (DPRTP 00223) Princes Risborough Steering Group (DPRTP 00267)						
Number of Representations:	8	Objection:	2	Support:	0	Comment:	6

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

- Following points welcomed:
 - The buffer cited and the recognition in the text of the need to protect the hydrology of the Local Wildlife Site (LWS); hydrological work will be needed to assess if this will be sufficient to ensure no adverse hydrological impact on the LWS.
 - Proposed use of a buffer for nature conservation.

Objecting

- Strong objection to the inclusion (part) of the land area to the immediate south east of Lower Icknield Way as a Green Buffer; consequently, the expansion area should be scaled back from the boundary with Longwick.
- The figure on p.122 does not even recognise any impact to Shootacre Lane and Picts Lane or Horsenden of the proposals, which is appalling.
- The map on p.123 clearly safeguards Shootacre Lane and does not even consider a new road via Culverton Crossroads.

Commenting

- As far as the Concept Plan itself is concerned there is no proposed policy that relates to it apart from PRTP2 which only refers to general principles.
- Notwithstanding the view that the level of detail associated with the Plan and Policies PRTP5 and PRTP6 should be deferred to a detailed master plan, the following comments are made in relation to the overall approach:
 - There is no clear indication of the constraints that have been taken in to account in preparing the Concept Plan.
 - There is insufficient emphasis on the role of Longwick Road as the principal route in to the existing urban area for all forms of transport and travel.
 - Any additional grade separated crossing of the railway cannot be a requirement of development but can potentially be facilitated by it. The Mount Way crossing should be permanently closed.
 - There is no explanation in relation to the proposed dispersed approach to community facilities, including education provision, and how that approach relates to the evidence base.
 - The location of a school within the Park Mill Farm site is not justified in operational or land-use terms and is not, in any event, fixed by the plan.

- There is no coherent strategy for the provision of structural open space, and
- There is no explanation or assessment of alternative approaches.
- These are fundamental issues affecting the land-use and urban design principles upon which the draft plan is based.
- It should be noted that the south-western boundary would not appear to be sufficiently far from the town if an outer bypass option for the A4010 is selected.
- The Concept Plan on page 38 incorrectly shows the alignment for option 17 where it runs through the development; previous plans have shown option 17 running through the development much closer to the Lower Icknield Way. The plan on page 38 should therefore be amended to show the previous (correct) alignment.

Environment/Ecology/Green Belt/AONB

- An increased buffer of at least 50m all the way around is needed to protect the Local Wildlife Sites from the impacts of development:
 - The concept plan should be amended to pull back the development around the LWSs with a 50m minimum buffer shown.
 - Furthermore, without hydrological work to assess impact on the LWSs, even with the 50m buffer the scale of the development may conflict with the integrity of the LWSs and may need to be reduced accordingly.
 - The plan should also include the hedgerow network and show the inclusion of a 10m buffer along the hedgerows.
 - The text should be amended to clarify the need for managed access to only parts of the Crowbrook stream corridor in order to ensure it can contribute substantially towards the net gain for wildlife that is needed.
- Concern regarding the dense development placed around edges of Alscot Conservation Area (CA), and harmful impact this will have on the area's character and appearance.
- Options to minimise or avoid harm to the CA, including its setting, should be explored, including the placement of green open space and less dense development in key position to reduce potentially harmful impacts.

Movement Principle Concerns (refer to separate Analysis Plan)

- The Concept Plan is deemed flawed and the lack of constraints mapping to underpin the concept plan are criticised. Strategic comments made in relation to movement, land use and landscape principles.
- The proposed link road alignment has a contrived appearance and acts as a bypass road, instead of an integrated street - this does not represent good urban design practice. The alignment passes through 3rd party land, which inevitably would harm this route's deliverability, and to which no analysis or explanation of delivery is set out. There is also no explanation of how the options as set out in the Tibbalds Study have been explored and a preferred option established. Table 1 and Figure 5 only set out a highway and cost based approach, not a review of how a road could be positively incorporated within the expansion area.
- The optional link road passes directly through the employment area, which is a poorly resolved solution, and appears to be a different alignment to those set out in Fig. 5.
- The existing public footpath appears to be aligned to encourage its use, which, due to the spatial constraints of existing buildings, cannot deliver a safe crossing. There is no specific guidance as to the principles advocated for this matter.
- The proposed underpass solution will be expensive to build (the PRTP has not investigated its cost or deliverability), creates a negative, and potentially unsecured environment, and its delivery cannot be guaranteed due to the railway line.
- Longwick Road is a direct, main connection to Princes Risborough town centre:

- Far more should be made of this route in the Town Plan, as it has passing trade and is a relatively wide highway corridor.
- It should include community/retail facilities and create a pedestrian/cycle spine.

Land-Use Principle Concerns (refer to separate Analysis Plan)

- The proposed south-western school location is poorly conceived:
 - Community facilities should be grouped at the heart of the neighbourhood, along with other mixed-use land, to engender a sense of community and place, encourage cross fertilisation of use, and maximise viability prospects.
 - This location fails to deliver both of these principles, and as a result demonstrates poor urban design.
 - It is recognised that this location has changed from previous draft Framework Plans without explanation.
- The retail / mixed-use area should be grouped with community and education uses - Longwick Road is a good location for this, as identified on the previous draft Framework Plan, which has changed without explanation.
- Changing density either side of a street is poor urban design and creates development separated by a road, not a high capacity street. Where this is suggested to the north of the link road should be considered more robustly in respect of the character of this route and the built form requirements to deliver this.
- Local centre & community uses are illustrated as grouped to the northern new community, but not maximising use & visibility without a presence on Longwick Road.
- Green space to the north east of the PRTP area is not considered to be sufficiently meaningful to reinforce the sense of separation between Princes Risborough and Monks Risborough, as intended in the Tibbalds study.
- Single sided development promoted to the north east of the PRTP area would 'back on' to the countryside, representing poor urban design.
- Development parcels regularly have sharp corners or shapes:
 - Unlikely that these shapes can be successfully translated into built form;
 - they should be illustrated in a robust matter to be realistic about where development parcels could be successfully delivered.

Landscape Principle Concerns (refer to separate Analysis Plan)

- Local Open Space appears to have been dropped in to the Framework Plan to make up an overall policy compliant quantum.

Further work areas:

- Ongoing revision of Concept Plan

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: Supporting evidence

Respondents:	C Sturgess (DPRTP 00018) C Courtney (DPRTP 00068) Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) Gladman Developments (DPRTP 00104) J Farnell (DPRTP 00116) Aylesbury Vale DC (DPRTP 00118) Bloor Homes (Savills) (DPRTP 00119) Chiltern DC (DPRTP 00120) Halsbury Homes Ltd (RPS) (DPRTP 00121) K Roberts (DPRTP 00137) Harbour Castle Ltd (DPRTP 00141) D Carrington (DPRTP 00199) G Ingram (DPRTP 00203) K Yates (DPRTP 00223) Persimmon Homes North London (DPRTP 00274) J Mackreath (DPRTP 00302) T Plant (DPRTP 00354) C Plant (DPRTP 00355) Thames Water (Savills) (DPRTP 00358) Environment Agency (DPRTP 00365) Natural Environment Partnership (DPRTP 00366) Oxfordshire CC (DPRTP 00367)						
Number of Representations:	22	Objection:	5	Support:	0	Comment:	17

Summary of issues/comments:

Objecting

General

- Emergency and vital services will not cope due to cuts.
- The Plan is fundamentally unsound since it is not founded on or accompanied by a proper evidence base.

Methodology

- There is no evidence or analysis within the draft document that considers or tests whether the infrastructure promoted within it is viable or necessary.
- Within the document viability is claimed at many points, but is not supported by evidence.
- Development Plan document needs to outline detailed infrastructure phasing requirements to support the delivery of the PRTP content.
- This is essential information to support policy PRTP2 and without such guidance within the DPD, there is no clarity as to what meaningful role this document could possibly have to the delivery of growth in this area.
- Document lacks constraint mapping considering:

- Ecology
- Arboriculture
- Drainage
- Movement
- Utilities
- Acoustics
- Air quality
- Land use
- Landscape and visual constraints.

Environmental assessment and long term impact on residents

- Plan is not satisfactory:
 - Inadequate consideration of light, noise & pollution levels impact on Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);
 - Impact on residents is not mentioned;
 - No assessment of whether further works will be needed to preserve or replace the wildlife habitat that is the current hedge along Shootacre Lane.

Transport

- Evidentiary base and general conduct of dismissed highway options are both weak.
- Several categories used to score route options in the Transport Study are heavily overlapping, particularly those relating to economic considerations.
- This systemic issue with the process results in an unjustified weighting for those considerations over others, in addition to being inappropriate prioritisation considering that the wider development sits in the setting of the Chilterns AONB. If these categories were aggregated appropriately then the overall score would be different.
- Given that options excluded from consideration score extremely close to options taken forward, it is likely that a properly-conducted sensitivity analysis would allow both sets of options to go forward for detailed.
- Particularly pertinent for options 11a & 11b, separated by a single point on the existing metrics yet only one is taken forward for more detailed consideration.
- Regarding environmental impact and impact on the setting of the Chilterns AONB:
 - Bypass Option 11a > 11b.
 - Bypass Option 15b > 15a.
- Transport Study options scoring relatively highly on the grounds that some agencies were in favour should not be taken as a true consensus.
- Existing through route should be improved over new road build.

Commenting

General

- The lack of clarity over what constitutes the evidence base to the plan, and the fact that some studies seem to have been concomitant to it, is strongly criticised.
- Should question Central Govt.'s basis for deciding 15,000 homes needed in district.

AONB/Green Belt/Environmental concerns

- More clarity needed on how employment proposals relate to overall balance of employment land provision across Wycombe in the light of the HEDNA/FEMA conclusions and the need to redistribute employment growth to Aylesbury Vale.
- More clarity needed on retail provision which needs to be justified in the light of the overall balance retail development/proposals across Wycombe.
- Progression of the Green Belt Assessment work should be reflected in future versions of the plan when possible, especially for the potential site in Princes Risborough.
- Evidence base needs updating with changed EA Climate Change allowance figures.
- Relevant documents on biodiversity & planning should be referenced/aligned with in the Local Plan and included in any Bibliography of relevant documents.
- Key documents regarding Bucks environment and economic growth should be referenced in Local Plan and included in any Bibliography of relevant documents.

WDC Local Plan: Options Consultation Document published in January 2014:

- The Sustainability Appraisal also concerns growth at Princes Risborough and a number of options to deliver this, but does not however provide any background context to the decision of WDC to pursue the AAP regarding Princes Risborough.
- SA introductory section should set out the background process to WDC selecting to pursue growth at Princes Risborough in advance of preparing the full Local Plan.
- Proposed Draft Plan Boundaries, as illustrated by the Concept Plan, provide for development on sites not subject to SA assessment, notably land west of Parcel 2 and land north of Parcel 3. These should be subject to SA assessment process.

Princes Risborough Area Action Plan

- No specific supporting evidence for it.
- The evidence base should be similar for the PRAAP and the Local Plan; currently appears to separate these two requirements.
- A comprehensive evidence base for the preparation of the Princes Risborough AAP will be required for the examination.
- Paragraph 8.3 references the site's constraints, but not all the WDC's evidence.
- No clarity re. when Archaeological Assessment required to be completed, e.g. at the point of submission of an application.
- No apparent evidence base to set out the existing sporting facilities within Princes Risborough and their associated shortfalls. At present the requirements appear to be a 'wish list' with little evidence to confirm their requirement.
- The requirement for a strategic Sustainable Drainage scheme for the entire site should not be required as each site (and planning application) will need to provide evidence it does not exceed Greenfield run-off rates. Therefore, each site will comply with its own requirements; an overall strategy is not a requirement.

Transport

- Traffic numbers and assessments of the roads do not take full account of other issues i.e. HS2, new builds at Aylesbury. Other issues including emergency services and how to fund the bypass also glossed over (linked to individual policies as well).
- The Jacobs Transport Study does not consider the following negative aspects if the relief road was to come down Shootacre Lane:
 - Air quality;
 - Noise and Vibration;

- Cultural heritage - namely the Hemley Hill Scheduled Monument;
- Safety/risk of death to pedestrians and equestrians;
- Accessing driveways.
- Requests more evidence on housing numbers and traffic studies in light of Buckingham Park development in Aylesbury.
- Askett Rat Run - Cadsden Road – dispute that it's a rat run, although busy.
 - Jacobs Study:
 - does conclude that preventing use of the so-called Askett rat run is dependent upon finding an alternative route;
 - Does not specify whether a permanent alternative route or merely one to be used whilst implementing rat-run reduction measures;
 - Difficult to see where to find an acceptable route.
 - Result might be increased traffic through Upper Icknield Way in Whiteleaf, or using Mill Lane passing by Monks Risborough Primary School.

Flood Risk

- AAP contains potential residential allocation sites within areas at risk of flooding.
- WDC must stick to original position of applying sequential test to sites at flood risk.

Wastewater infrastructure study

- The growth at Princes Risborough will require an extensive upgrade to the Sewage Treatment Works, which can be done within the current site's footprint.
- Water provider must monitor the current and future consents levels in relation to water quality and will address upgrades or process amendments to ensure the water quality is not adversely impacted as a result of growth here.
- Any upgrade to the site in respect to growth will be based on an odour neutrality position i.e. the upgrade would be designed not to increase off site odour exposure to sensitive receptors.
- Suitable buffers and screenings at application stage will be required to ensure future residents' amenity is protected.

Duty to Cooperate

- In the interest of ensuring the development potential of the expansion is maximised, greater understanding required in more detail of the methodology for testing and assessing the potential impact upon the AONB, as applied by WDC in the preparation of the DPRTP.
- The results of the ARUP Buckinghamshire Green Belt Assessment Part 1 have now been published. It would be useful to further understand WDC's approach to the recommendations made therein regarding land around Princes Risborough, and so request additional information in this respect.
- Request that the impact of additional traffic generated in Princes Risborough on the highway network in Oxfordshire be assessed and new development fund and deliver any necessary mitigation measures.

Further work areas:

- Continue Duty to Cooperate discussions
- Reference Tibbalds' constraint mapping
- Revise / update Sustainability Appraisal report
- Revise / update viability assessment
- Refine options for alignment of relief road

- Landscape capacity work
- Further SFRA work to include climate change allowances, to inform revised sequential test where necessary
- Test final growth and road infrastructure scenario through traffic forecasting model

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: Issues

Respondents:	E James (DPRTP 00006) A&A Hitchcock (DPRTP 00061) C&S Brownlie (DPRTP 00065) A&S Brown (DPRTP 00073) Anonymous (DPRTP 00075) Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) BBOWT (DPRTP 00123) Bledlow-cum-Saunderton PC (DPRTP 00124) R Nelms (DPRTP 00132) A Ankers (DPRTP 00160) P Gallagher (DPRTP 00182) P Purnell (DPRTP 00207) A Johnson (DPRTP 00243) T Nicosia (DPRTP 00244) J Mirzoeff (DPRTP 00261) N John (DPRTP 00278) P Summerscales (DPRTP 00293) I Parkinson (DPRTP 00313)						
Number of Representations:	19	Objection:	4	Support:	1	Comment:	14

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

- Support aim for new gain in biodiversity, but more detail is needed.
- Residents in surrounding communities use facilities in Princes Risborough, improving these facilities would be beneficial to people in the surrounding districts also.

Objecting

General

- Objection to proposals of any underpasses in the scheme.
- Concern over:
 - Possible lack of mitigation to existing residents regarding the transformation of the character/nature of the area.
 - Treatment towards residents that may wish to relocate – lack of compensation may be legal but not fair.
 - The increase in traffic due to development, with additional noise/pollution.
 - Loss of sense of community; important as town should not be overdeveloped.

Town centre/shops/traffic

- Councils in the past have failed to encourage large and small businesses, meaning people travel out of Princes Risborough to source work; it will make Princes Risborough into a ghost town.
- The railway is at full capacity and local networks are stretched.

- The Aylesbury line acts as a physical barrier, preventing joining the town centre.
- There are few shops that would be large enough for the additional population, and no space in which these too could expand in line with the town population.
- The town centre is too small to service the proposed expanded population, so it is likely that developers would want to incorporate retail within any development. This would inevitably undermine the town centre's viability.
- Areas of likely economic growth are not encouraged by this Plan, thus damaging attempts to gain share of growing Chilterns tourism/leisure market.
- There are a number of successful enterprises whose future in the area is being put in jeopardy by this plan.

Policy overall

- Disagree with the necessity to build thousands of new houses in areas that lack infrastructure, places with good existing infrastructure should be developed for housing.
- The idea that a large-scale planning draft such as this can foresee and indeed mitigate any future needs or challenges is overly-ambitious and unachievable.

Commenting

General

- Not clear how this Plan can enforce its objectives and how it will ensure that any of the road and infrastructure improvement will actually take place.
- There is no demand for housing as demonstrated by the failure of existing planning consents to be implemented and the failure of existing commercial premises to be occupied.
- Build affordable housing in Marlow, Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross instead.
- Serious concern that any Plan proposal will have a similarly poor outcome to previously unimplemented schemes
- Due to the proximity to surrounding areas, projected populations for these surrounding areas need to be taken into account.
- Reuse of existing should be prioritised before new facilities are constructed to maintain the market town character.
- Development opportunities must be considered within existing buildings in town, in order to protect their historic character but ensure their continued usage.
- All proposed development should focus on securing a future for Princes Risborough as a small market town, ensuring housing/facilities for existing/growing community.
- There will always be a commuter element to Princes Risborough's community because of its transport links to London but this is not a suitable area to heavily encourage a larger density of commuters; this would change the face of Risborough forever.
- The wider impact of the development from housing and the increased commercial activity on the traffic flow on the B4009, through Chinnor and the various pinch points that already exist there, would be problematic. WDC must inform neighbouring districts of their development proposals as traffic flows through Chinnor and west to the M40 will be severely affected.

Parking

- Previous planning schemes have failed to be implemented fully with adequate parking and infrastructure provision. Therefore some are sceptical over the Town Plan proposals.

Community facilities/Infrastructure

- The underpass into Wades Park may flood and be too scary to use in poor light and will eat into the green space.
- Use of the waste facility at Wigans Lane will increase with a Princes Risborough population increase, impinging on amount of traffic on smaller roads leading there.

Environmental/landscape/flooding

- Wary of nature of area changing due to wide-scale development rather than maintaining green space.
- Princes Risborough is beautiful largely because of the surrounding green space. It would be a loss to everyone if this disappears.
- Small scale housing development better. These are in keeping with the area/scale of village.
- Worried that villages could just become part of Princes Risborough's sprawl rather than separate settlements.
- Would like brownfield sites to be exploited, such as sites near railway; why destroy unspoiled land when underused areas near developments exist.
- Once development takes place it cannot be undone, will change town forever.
- Building on the flood plain may cause the rise of the water table and increase flooding that is already a nuisance.
- The plan has also encouraged development of Greenfield sites in preference to brownfield against government recommendations.

Impact of affordable housing

- Less than a quarter of the large amount of social housing is for Princes Risborough's needs, which means the rest will be for people being moved into new environments.
- There will be dramatic changes to the population make-up of the area, of which only a few have been attempted to be addressed in the plan with limited levels of success.
- Many will be on low income, so will lead to increased transport costs for low-income families, or take people unemployed further away from potential jobs.
- Inevitably with these numbers there will be residents who are highly dependent on social support networks which have not been included in this plan, so it looks like they will be expected to travel to High Wycombe.

Industry & Business

- This plan is going to accelerate a reduction in the land and opportunities available for industry and local employment, which is in sharp contrast to the situations provided in neighbouring communities and districts.
- With business rates set to be a greater proportion of future Council revenue, encouraging local industry growth should be a keystone of any sensible plan.

- This will also reduce the potential for retail with no encouragement to attract customers to the town centre in contrast to surrounding towns in other districts who will gain the benefit of any new customers.
- Retail is not thriving in Princes Risborough, the High Street must be regenerated
- Plan can only make it more difficult to meet other government targets on greenhouse gases and pollution, traffic flow and health.

Locally Distinctive Design

- One opportunity now available to Princes Risborough is to gain some form of architectural identity, which, given there are so many various building styles to be found within the town, is currently lacking.
- This is the opportunity planners need to identify an appropriate architectural style, and enforce it across the development, (and the town's existing buildings when it comes to renovation), as far as is possible.

Further work areas:

- See revisions to Plan document and other relevant policies.

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: Strategic issues

Respondents:	N Ghafoor (DPRTP 00348) D Hayes (DPRTP 00342) Environment Agency (DPRTP 00365) Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) Mrs C Plant (DPRTP 00355) Mr T Roper (DPRTP 00341) Bucks and Milton Keynes Natural Environment Partnership (DPRTP 00366) K Yates (DPRTP 00223)						
Number of Representations:	8	Objection:	0	Support:	0	Comment:	8

Summary of issues/comments:

Commenting

General

- Producing the Princes Risborough Town Plan ahead of the main Local Plan makes little sense, and means the plan is operating without a strategic context and supporting evidence such as the HELAA and HEDNA.
- The lack of strategic context means the wider impacts of the Plan are not being fully considered.
- The Plan is short-term in its outlook, it is focused too much on addressing the threat of piecemeal development without a strategic context at district level.

Highways

- Addressing only traffic congestion at Princes Risborough without addressing bottlenecks at West Wycombe and Stoke Mandeville is short sighted. Has proper consideration been given to the Brush Hill nature reserve and the Horsenden Conservation Area?

Process

- Neighbouring Parishes should have been invited to be a part of the steering group due to part of the proposals being in their Parish area.
- WDC should consult neighbouring authorities when producing a flood risk policy, particularly in respect of surface water sustainable drainage which will need to be considered and accommodated at the earliest stages of the design process.
- WDC should complete the NEP checklist in the context of the Princes Risborough Town Plan in order to give proper consideration to environmental, ecological, biodiversity, and energy resource management issues.

Further work areas:

- Ongoing Duty to Cooperate activity
- Refine evidence base

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: Duty-to-Cooperate

Respondents:	Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097)						
Number of Representations:	1	Objection:	0	Support:	0	Comment:	1

Summary of issues/comments:**Commenting***General*

- Concern that this plan is running ahead of the district-wide Local Plan; it risks making assumptions about the number of homes that could and should be delivered at Princes Risborough.
- By focussing on the town before addressing the bigger picture, this plan suffers from:
 - lack of a strategic policy context;
 - absence of a new district-wide Wycombe Local Plan to determine the appropriate housing number and distribution for the plan period;
 - inability to test the HEDNA, HELAA and other evidence at district level to inform the appropriate quantum and spatial distribution of development; and
 - risk of adding pressures to road networks outside the town plan area (e.g. B4009 towards the M40), failing to assess impacts in the wider sphere and failing the duty-to-cooperate with neighbouring districts.
- Only through a Local Plan process and Local Plan examination can the strategic issues be properly addressed, providing:
 - required consultation
 - cross-boundary work
 - consideration of alternatives
 - sustainability appraisal and examination.
- It is recognised that the Council is under pressure from speculative planning applications to release unallocated Greenfield sites in advance of the Plan process and that this, and the desire to secure comprehensively planned infrastructure is driving the Town Plan.

NB – Duty-to-cooperate comments were also submitted by other partners through comments on specific policies.

Further work areas:

- Finalise Memoranda of Understanding with key partner agencies

•

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: Process

Respondents:	J Summerbell (DPRTP 00027) T Skeet (DPRTP 0035) C Curtney (DPRTP 00068) M Davis (DPRTP 00076) M Long (DPRTP 00083) Gladman Developments (DPRTP 00104) RPS Planning & Development (DPRTP 00121) Bledlow Cum Saunderton Parish Council (DPRTP 00124) H D Town Planning Ltd (DPRTP 00141) F Elliot (DPRTP 00166) J Baker (DPRTP 00187) P Day (DPRTP 00202) R Norton (DPRTP 00209) K Yates (DPRTP 00223) G & A O'Dea (DPRTP 00239) Princes Risborough Steering Group (DPRTP 00267) P Cline (DPRTP 00287) J Mackreath (DPRTP 00302) Risborough Area Residents Association (DPRTP 00313) Beacon Wood Real Estate Strategies (DPRTP 00315) G Farnell (DPRTP 00316) Great and Little Kimble cum Marsh Parish Council (DPRTP 00328) M Cudd (DPRTP 00335) J Cudd (DPRTP 00337) L Jayatillake (DPRTP 00355) R Jayatillake (DPRTP 00346) C Plant (DPRTP 00355) A John (DPRTP 00356)						
Number of Representations:	28	Objection:	8	Support:	2	Comment:	18

Summary of issues/comments:

Supporting

- Happy to go along with WDC.
- The consultation meetings were considered to be useful.
- Planned development is needed in the town which could economically benefit Princes Risborough.

Objecting

General

- Overall the Area Action Plan (AAP) process is flawed.
- The Plan hasn't been well thought through.
- The PRTP isn't properly justified and ineffective, therefore going against NPPF advice.

- It must be outlined to the public how the decision process works for making changes to the draft Plan.

Housing need

- On the basis of the current approach the Plan is based on, the proposed doubling of Princes Risborough is considered a policy 'vacuum'.
- The Plan provides recent assessments, however, these aren't part of the consultation exercise and there's no indication as to how Princes Risborough relates to any wider housing market area issues .

Duty-to-cooperate

- Lack of evidence to justify the assertion that it is clear Princes Risborough has to double in size to fulfil its duty-to-cooperate. The approach could be interpreted as providing as much housing as possible in advance of the Local Plan to minimise requests to adjoining authorities to accept surplus housing requirements.

Consultation with other parishes

- WDC should review the plans, undertake greater consultation with neighbouring Parish Councils and involve them in the decision making process, and take into account residents wishes generated in their Neighbourhood Plans.
- Neighbouring Parish Councils weren't consulted, even though parts of the Plan will affect other parishes e.g. the proposed bypass. This is unacceptable, and contradicts the Government's localism legislation and the democratic rights of communities.

Residents

- Some residents feel sceptical about the process and that residents views won't be taken any notice of.
- Local people pay considerable tax and so expect their voices to taken into consideration in an open, transparent and democratic manner.

Finance

- Queries over how the costs of this Plan will be met.
- The Plan is a flawed document which has cost time and money. The Council is reminded of previous proposals/exhibitions for the redevelopment of Picts Lane and station area 2006/7 which were shelved.

Consultation process

- A few meetings and directing people toward the Council's website is insufficient and disingenuous given the proposal's scale.
- A leaflet including the map on page 38 should have been issued to residents, especially considering the large proportion of retired inhabitants who lack internet access and may not be able to attend meetings.
- The consultation process has been flawed which has been treated as a ticking box exercise and not integrated into the District Plan.

- Consultation has been limited, feedback and input has been ignored, no alternative plan has been considered, feedback from two years ago and steering group input has been ignored.

Approach

- Objection to the AAP approach of providing major housing allocations in advance of the New Local Plan. This approach involves substantial housing provision without reference to the wider Housing Market Area (HMA) and provides no basis for discharging the duty-to-cooperate because it's not referenced specifically to the determination of Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) and the implications of existing constraints in relation to meeting that need.
- Town Plan shouldn't lead ahead of the Local Plan as they are interlinked and the draft Town Plan needs to take heed of the findings of the Local Plan Green Belt assessment.
- The production of an AAP for Princes Risborough is premature and shouldn't precede the Local Plan. If it follows the Local Plan the housing numbers prescribed might be lower.
- Increasing the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) allocation to Risborough Town Council to 25% is paltry and derisory.

Commenting

General

- WDC should proceed with greater care and diligence.
- Issues need addressing and further work and evaluation is needed before making decisions.
- Current time scales aren't a reason to approve an ill researched set of proposals which don't consider all options and impacts for Princes Risborough.
- A referendum should be held into the possibility of expanding the size of the town, as is the case for neighbourhood planning.

Speed of process

- Speed of consultation and delivering the report is leading to lack of focus on making the right decisions.
- Concern over the speed at which the Plan is being progressed, and the examination process which will be undertaken to assess whether the Plan is sound was questioned and further details regarding this should be provided.
- The speed of the consultation, deliberation and publication have meant insufficient time has been allowed to develop a delivery methodology taking into account existing planning applications/appeals, yet deliver the overall proposal, whilst considering infrastructure needs and fair apportionment amongst stakeholders.

Housing allocations

- PRTP fails to acknowledge that a significant part of the proposed expansion area is identified and allocated for housing in the Wycombe District Local Plan and is incorporated in the housing allocation numbers in the Core Strategy. Parts of the

expansion areas should be developed now to contribute to the 5 year land supply and not delayed by the AAP.

- Pressure from speculative planning applications must be resisted.

Lack of clarity

- The document doesn't set out its role, status, level of control the document is intended to have, and there no clear guidance set on mandatory or discretionary requirements, making it less clear when considering the content of the PRTP on how the information should be interpreted and reduces clarity as to its flexibility.

Consultation process

- Issues with the consultation process with officers dodging questions and no time being taken to give residents the opportunity to shape the Local Plan.
- Sense that residents are being told what will happen rather than being consulted on issues.
- Questions over if the process is truly democratic or just a lip-service.
- Lack of precise detail and sufficient information to be able to comment in full detail at consultations.
- Several pertinent questions raised at consultations haven't been satisfactorily answered.
- There are no longer consultations regarding whether the proposal is in the right place, is of appropriate scale, is suitable, is environmentally responsible, or has been properly thought through.
- The High Street stall consultation event was liked. A small copy of the plans as a handout would have been useful.
- Few residents along Picts Lane received leaflets on these plans. It appears there's been a deliberate avoidance of communication with the roads the will be most affected, which should be investigated.
- The consultation ended on a bank holiday, which is inappropriate for a proposal of this scale.
- Queries over whether residents' views are listened to.
- Questions raised on how the feedback from consultations will be evaluated.

Consultation with other Parishes

- More direct consultation with other parishes regarding the new roads scheme should have been undertaken, and careful consideration should be given of the effects in the whole area, not just Princes Risborough.
- The impact of this scheme, plus HS2, and rail improvements to this corner of Buckinghamshire is significant and all parties involved with the planning of these schemes should be should be in contact with each other and planning cohesively.
- Option 11b affects neighbouring Parish Councils but the Steering Group does not have appropriate representation from the parish, particularly in decision making.
- Decisions are being made affecting the parish without sufficient input or consultation.

Assessments

- Jacobs aren't independent consultants due to having a long term commercial relationship, thus undermining the report they've written.

Technical difficulties

- An officer should be responsible for making sure the government portal is available to check previous planning appeals over the last days of consultation.
- Some respondents couldn't download documents or forms from the website.

Previous Plans

- Inspectors for other AAPs have halted the process after concluding the sustainability appraisal had been carried out in an unsatisfactory manner and the infrastructure objectives couldn't be implemented because of the council's failure to take lead on them. The PRTP appears to suffer from these deficiencies.
- The proposal's structure doesn't address deliverability or delivery. Several applications for planning applications in this area have been put forward in the past and have been rejected which cannot be separated from the current proposals and applications and appeals from developers who are already stakeholders in the area.

Producing the Plan

- Unclear why the Princes Risborough Town Plan needs to be progressed ahead of the Wycombe District Local Plan.
- The bigger picture needs to be addressed before producing a Plan, to avoid problems.
- Concern over the preparation process and content of the AAP.
- The Plan needs to be developed within the wider district context. The draft is already causing concern within the community.
- The AAP doesn't conform to the higher-tier DPDs and is being prepared without district wide context. The scale of development across the district is yet to be determined and it is unwise to prepare the AAP ahead of this determination, since it cannot be assessed whether Princes Risborough is making a satisfactory contribution to the overall housing requirements.
- Lack of compliance with the duty-to-cooperate has resulted in WDC having to accommodate even more dwellings. By progressing ahead with the draft PRTP the council is open to procedural and content related legal challenges.
- What is the justification for creating a single Local Plan for Princes Risborough and making it the only Town Plan to support the Wycombe District Local Plan?

Stakeholders

- Progressing with the Town Plan will require dealing inclusively with stakeholders and balancing short terms demands with long term visions.
- Engagement appears to be only superficial with lack of acknowledgement of current or historic stakeholder requests to integrate these into the Plan.
- The Council needs financial/ HR commitment for the completion of the PRTP and must actively engage stakeholders in the master planning proposes, which could

address many issues raised planning applications and appeals. Without this it's likely the Town Plan will be finished too late to be acknowledged by the existing planning process following the existing approved policies. The likely outcome will be a piecemeal development allowed via the appeal process and limited ability to collect appropriate contributions for the provision of adequate infrastructure. Without sufficient funding the vision in the PRTP will become undeliverable.

- Producing the PRTP with more detailed requirements and a longer time scale than the Neighbourhood Development Plan has frustrated some stakeholders who are keen to progress in the same direction as WDC but on a faster programme.

Further work areas:

- A Consultation Report will be submitted with the publication version of the Plan which sets out how the Plan has responded to consultation and engagement feedback.
- Other work indicated under other topic analysis.

Core Policy/Site/DM Policy/Other: Other policy and suggestions

Respondents:	M Wooster Keyte (DPRTP 00067) Chilterns Conservation Board (DPRTP 00097) C Macleod (DPRTP 00111) Savills (DPRTP 00119) D Garratt (DPRTP 00129) R Nelms (DPRTP 00132) K Nelms (DPRTP 00133) B Nelms (DPRTP 00134) G Wilkinson (DPRTP 00192) V Kearley (DPRTP 00210) P Brooker (DPRTP 00222) C Wilson (DPRTP 00225) W Streule (DPRTP 00235) A Flynn (DPRTP 00240) R Goodman (DPRTP 00246) Princes Risborough Steering Group (DPRTP 00267) S Sheppard (DPRTP 00291) A Turner (DPRTP 00299) N Gomersall (DPRTP 00330) M Cudd (DPRTP 00335) J Cudd (DPRTP 00337) T Roper (DPRTP 00341) L Jayatillake (DPRTP 00345) R Jayatillake (DPRTP 00346) T Davies (DPRTP 00364)						
Number of Representations:	25	Objection:	0	Support:	0	Comment:	25

Summary of issues/comments:

Commenting

General

- More reference to cultural heritage must be made in the Plan.
- Justification for the housing need is in need of detailed review, in light of Buckingham Park development in Aylesbury.
- Tourism potential of Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Horsenden Conservation Areas could be further explored to encourage more local use and visitors.

Alternative locations

- Instead of Princes Risborough, areas closer to the motorway would be suitable alternatives for expansion.
- Business area of Longwick Road should be an option for expansion.

Environment/Landscape

- Crowbrook Stream needs to be renamed either 'Crow Brook' or 'Crow Stream'.
- Proper modelling must be undertaken on the water courses in Princes Risborough to ensure there will be no major flood risk.
- Culvert under the railway line must be rebuilt.

CIL

- CIL contributions should be made to AONB projects.
- CIL could be used to expand the Princes Centre.

Design

- Consideration should be made to the designs of the landowners alongside the Concept Plan.

New Policy suggestions

- Green Infrastructure strategy should be designed for Princes Risborough.
- Special Landscape Designation should be applied to remaining green fields beyond expansion area to protect the views and setting.

Transport infrastructure

- Buses should be removed from the High Street and new shops added to New Road rearing.
- Move traffic lights from outside Marks & Spencers to Jasmine Crescent to allow traffic out of the High Street.
- Extend waiting time for public crossings.
- High Street, Duke Street and New Road should be turned into a one way route, which would work if the relief road is reducing through traffic.
- In line with other European cities, Plan should create a cycling strategy plan to link up cycle lanes to Princes Risborough and Monks Risborough train stations in/out of the town to promote cycling as an alternative method of travel.
- The pavements around the expansion area, especially at Mill Lane, must be widened and improved as part of the expansion development.
- Speed limits around Mill Lane will have to be lowered in light of the expansion area proposals.
- Measures must be put in place to ensure Mill Road, Crowbrook Road and Askett do not become rat-runs.

Community facilities/Business

- Proposals do not mention places of worship, which is anticipated to increase.
- Town Hall should be built on the former Hypnos site.
- An additional supermarket will have to be provided considering the scale of development.
- Rates on the High Street must be reduced to help independent businesses survive.

- Out of date covenants around Princes Risborough market should be reviewed to improve flexibility on what can be offered.

Further work areas:

- Revisions to plan document and policies.