

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND RELATED OFFICER RESPONSE

B Are there any key challenges that you feel we have missed?

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
<p>General pressure on existing infrastructure (including local schools, roads, medical facilities, hospitals and car parking). (889, 892, 894, 921, 934, 1009, 1144, 1145, 1082, 1187, 1269). To ensure infrastructure improvement to support growth (1008, 1151).</p> <p>Need to address greatly increased demand on services - water, drainage, gas, electricity etc. (918)</p>	<p>The first “key challenge” makes reference to ensuring new housing development is supported by “the necessary supporting infrastructure”.</p> <p>In preparing the Core Strategy SBDC are required to give careful consideration to the new physical and community infrastructure required to support new development, and how and when this will be delivered. Consideration is also being given to the changing age profile of the District’s population, and the implications this will have for the demand for particular facilities and services.</p> <p>SBDC will continue its dialogue with infrastructure providers (including the Education Authority, Primary Care Trust and Highways Authority) regarding the most effective means of addressing existing infrastructure issues, and the issues that are likely to arise as a result of new development and the changing age profile of the District’s population.</p> <p>SBDC is committed to ensuring that new development provides for all reasonable and necessary on site infrastructure to meet the needs of residents or employees and contributes towards to improved facilities in the area. Consideration is being given to whether introduction of a Community Infrastructure Levy can be justified in South Bucks.</p> <p>The fifth “key challenge” makes reference to ensuring that existing and new development is more sustainable. It is proposed to include in the Core Strategy policies that encourage efficient resource use (for example, appropriate provision for waste water recycling and the promotion of renewable energy technologies). SBDC has received responses to the recent consultation from the utility companies, and will use these as the basis for an ongoing dialogue.</p>

<p>Many local schools over-subscribed (892, 893, 906). Provision of sufficient school places - including primary, secondary and senior schools (997, 1156, 1179, 1182, 1184, 1159, 1065, 1192 - Grammar schools). School provision for Wilton Park development (1025).</p>	<p>The first “key challenge” makes reference to ensuring that new housing development is supported by “the necessary supporting infrastructure”. Appendix 3 of the Core Strategy: Emerging Approach document comments upon school capacity.</p> <p>SBDC is aware that there are existing issues in parts of the District, with some parents being unable to access local schooling.</p> <p>SBDC is working with the Education Authority on the likely future demand for school places in South Bucks, and in particular, the implications of the emerging Spatial Strategy. More needs to be done to ensure that new housing development makes appropriate contributions towards local education provision.</p> <p>In responding to the most recent consultation, the Education Authority has expressed concern about the scale of development that might occur at Beaconsfield in the period to 2026 (assuming the Wilton Park Strategic Site is redeveloped) and the limited scope to extend the capacity of the existing schools to accommodate additional pupils. This issue will need to be resolved prior to publication of the Core Strategy (March 2010).</p>
<p>No mention made of hospital facilities (or their lack) at Wexham Park (1030). No doctors or surgery in GX. (1152, 1145).</p> <p>To improve health figures in some areas. (979)</p>	<p>Appendix 3 of the Core Strategy: Emerging Approach document comments upon health care provision in South Bucks. There are no NHS Hospitals in the District and residents therefore rely on hospitals in High Wycombe, Slough and Hillingdon. Although there is no Doctor’s Surgery in Gerrards Cross, there are surgeries in nearby Chalfont St Peter.</p> <p>SBDC is discussing health care issues with the Primary Care Trust, ensuring that the Core Strategy takes into account both existing service issues and any planned, localised improvements.</p>
<p>Limited facilities for young people. Provision for new facilities for young people. (892, 937, 967, 1019, 1038, 1099, 1101, 1191)</p>	<p>Although this was not identified as a key challenge, it is accepted that this is an issue of public concern, one that will be reflected in the emerging South Bucks ‘Sustainable Community Strategy’. The Council has produced a Children’s and Young People’s Plan and a Play Strategy. The Core Strategy seeks to promote access to open space and recreational facilities, and seeks opportunities for creating new or enhanced facilities where possible, especially where there are deficiencies. Further</p>

	work will be carried out on the District's infrastructure needs before the Core Strategy is published.
Impact of Heathrow 3 rd Runway and Heathrow Hub and HS2 Rail Link on District. (895, 1032, 1091) How to integrate local transport with the Crossrail infrastructure post 2017. (939) Need more emphasis on Taplow and surrounding areas for Crossrail (1109).	<p>A brief reference was made to the possible Heathrow Hub scheme in the Core Strategy Emerging Approach document (para. 3.111) although this proposal is at an early stage and it does not yet have firm Government support. However, if further details are made available, these will be taken into account in the next version of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Crossrail was also mentioned (para 3.110), and the Council supports this scheme subject to appropriate environmental safeguards. Further discussions will need to take place at a later date with public transport providers and the Highways Authority to ensure integration between bus services and Crossrail, but this is beyond the scope and detail of the Core Strategy.</p>
Traffic issues (1021). Improve roads and local public transport infrastructure. (898, 921, 1046, 1060) How to improve (and reduce cost) of an effective public transport system. (942, 1045, 1051, 1076, 88, 1189, 1169). To give more attention to traffic, parking and movement between towns and villages (1113).	Traffic congestion and the impact of this on quality of life has been identified as a key challenge in the Core Strategy. There are strategic objectives encouraging more sustainable forms of transport, increasing accessibility to rural areas, increasing travel choice and mitigating the environmental impact of transportation. Parking issues are covered in the section on Accessibility and Transport.
Increasing road usage (966, 1078, 1092). Local traffic congestion, road safety and parking. (900, 903, 927, 934, 943, 1009, 958, 970, 1022 - traffic congestion from J7 M4 to Maidenhead Bridge, 1104 - A4 is very congested and extremely difficult to cross, 1120, 1144, 1071 - Beaconsfield new town, 1089, 1082, 1175 - A4, M4 and railway congestion) Proposals will make the current situation worse. (903, 1132 - for Beaconsfield in particular). Reducing volumes and make the area better suited to	<p>Traffic congestion and the impact this has quality of life has been identified as a key challenge in the Core Strategy. There are strategic objectives encouraging more sustainable forms of transport, increasing accessibility to rural areas, increasing travel choice and mitigating the environmental impact of transportation. Parking issues are covered in the section on Accessibility and Transport.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the traffic hotspots mentioned on the A4 and at Beaconsfield, and is working with the Highways Authority to explore localised solutions.</p>

families / children (1105).	
Provision for cyclists or pedestrians (1105, 88, 1101).	Although not mentioned as a key challenge, provision for cyclists and pedestrians is mentioned in the Core Strategy Emerging Approach document in paragraph 3.115.
Problem of very large heavy lorries on narrow residential road and ineffective traffic management by BCC (1167, 1265, 2100). Managing HGV movements in Iver/Iver Heath/Richings Park (1029, 1102, 797 - development in Court Lane will worsen the problem, 1154 - lorries and all day parking of cars). Relief road to reduce HGV traffic (1100).	<p>The version of the strategic spatial issues listed in the full length Core Strategy Emerging Approach document does specifically refer to the traffic congestion issues in Iver (para 1.38) and this is also referred to in strategic objective 14 (para 1.44).</p> <p>The Council is aware of the strong public feeling on the amount of HGV / commercial traffic in Iver and Richings Park. Recent analysis indicates that whilst this is a real issue, it is not of sufficient magnitude to justify a relief road. However, further work is being undertaken with the Highways Authority to examine this issue in more depth, and explore the options for mitigation. Any redevelopment of Court Lane would have to result in a significant reduction in HGV movements in the area.</p>
New comers to Beaconsfield often work away from the area, and do not therefore support the local businesses. (918) To archive a better match between homes and jobs in each locality. (991) More local employment sites. (1101) Many residents do not work locally, and many commute by car. (934)	<p>High in and out commuting levels are recognised as a key characteristic of the District, and one of the key challenges is to maintain a broad balance between the resident workforce and local job opportunities. The Core Strategy will encourage a greater proportion of South Bucks residents to live and work locally.</p> <p>Employment land will continue to be protected from redevelopment for alternative uses. Although no new employment sites are proposed in the Core Strategy, many new jobs are expected to come forward through schemes already permitted.</p>
Green Belt land and Sports Fields should be protected from development. (924) Continued protection of the Green Belt (964, 1031, 609, 792) and further emphasis on Green Belt immediately around existing settlements (1033, 1034). Green Belt - only intrude as last resort (1082).	The emerging view is that the release of Green Belt land for housing development will not be required due to the strong housing land supply position. One of the plan objectives is to avoid the release of undeveloped sites in the Green Belt. However, the Government will require the Council to identify a small number of locations in the Green Belt as long term contingency sites, but these would only be released as a final resort.
Important to ensure that the preferred strategy "coincides" (or is coordinated) with the strategy for development in adjoining areas (including Slough and Hillingdon). (946, 44, 1269)	Agreed. The Council is working closely with adjoining local authorities to ensure that the Core Strategies are co-ordinated where possible and that cross boundary issues are taken into account.

Preserve the character of existing villages / towns (962, 972, 1042, 1068 - for GX). Retention of rural character and village life (986, 32, 1176).	The protection of local character has been identified as a key local challenge in South Bucks. The emerging view is that the Council will seek to protect the character of its towns and villages. A study on Townscape Character is due to be produced prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy.
Provision of more affordable sheltered housing for the increasing elderly population (969, 984 - in Burnham, 675 - for retirement accommodation in Beaconsfield).	How to address the issues arising from an ageing population has already been identified as a key challenge. The Core Strategy recognises the need for more specialist accommodation for older people. Further consideration is being given to options for providing this, given constraints on land and funding.
Higher priority on security (965). More policing in Holtspur (958). Crime - police to focus (1082).	The Council agrees that local communities should be protected from crime and anti-social behaviour, and that planning has a role to play in this, through measures such as good design and lighting. However, policing levels are outside of the scope of the Core Strategy.
The proposed Pinewood Project which plans for some 1,500 homes on Green Belt land. (985, 1091, 630, 1160)	A planning application has recently been submitted to the Council relating to the Project Pinewood scheme. It was included in the list of sites put forward by landowners/developers (Site 10, Appendix 5).
How to provide land that is not subject to future flooding and not close to motorway (1028). Plan to assist in case of flooding or other disaster scenario (609). Flooding through increased density in some areas (1069).	Comment noted. Although this is not specifically mentioned as a key challenge, flooding is covered in the Core Strategy (page 65).
The changes proposed generate overcrowding for the indigenous population (1054). 1880 new dwellings for this 20 years period is too high (1125, 1122) - 1,880 is too high to protect the environment (1145, 1177). To prohibit any further housing and unnecessary development in South Bucks (1186, 961).	The 1,880 dwelling target for South Bucks (for the period 2006-26) is set in the South East Plan and is mandatory on the Council. Although a large proportion of this target is already accounted for, the recently finalised South East Plan makes it clear that the fact that the target has been met is not a reason in itself for rejecting a planning application. Notwithstanding this, the Core Strategy will include strong policies to protect the environment.
Essential to reduce costs of service delivery by working together (1111). How to obtain funding for changes proposed without burdening existing residents with extra costs	Agree that developer contributions need to be sought in future to a greater extent than at present. Further work is being undertaken on infrastructure needs and consideration will be given to whether a standard charge (Community Infrastructure Levy) can be introduced alongside Section 106 agreements. The Council does not

(1075). S106 agreements to be included in all developments (139).	have the resources to agree Section 106 agreements for all development (nor is this appropriate).
Conserving the natural environment should be at the top of the list (1079, 1089). More consideration on environmental protection issues (457). To avoid endangering local wildlife (604). How to conserve and enhance the natural environment, in particular Burnham Beeches, the Thames/Jubilee rivers. (792)	Conserving and enhancing the natural environment is already one of the key challenges. The list is in no particular order of priority. Burnham Beeches / River Thames are already both mentioned in the list of strategic objectives.

The following other comments were also made:

- Reducing traffic congestion is not the challenge. The challenge is to provide an adequate transport infrastructure, by providing frequent, reliable public transport, ensuring adequate highway/pedestrian infrastructure is provided and requiring all new dwellings have adequate off road parking (1 car space per bedroom as a minimum). (79)
- Need to be more explicit in seeking to reduce green house gases and dealing with likely effects of climate change (1106). Reduce energy use. (979)
- Freedom of choice and flexibility to shoppers. Proposals are too restrictive. (1117)
- Present risk of over-emphasis of accommodation for the over-55s. A more balanced view for housing in Beaconsfield should be given consideration. (1053)
- To bring back the quality of life to the people of South Bucks (accessible by bus, take away restaurants, shops and flowers in public areas). (973)
- Reduction in noise and dust pollution. (996) Pollution control - air, noise, light (1039)
- To make as much use as possible of brownfield sites. (1131)
- Disagree with provision of more affordable housing in this area. (1136)
- Use of gardens as Brownfield land creates future problems. (1142)
- Inner city regeneration should be applied not building in greenfield suburbs. (1145)
- Engaging young people and improving community spirit and respecting authority. (14)
- Acknowledgement and incorporation of individual Parish Plans. (1073)
- Pollutant effects on residents health caused by excess traffic of constant aircraft movements overhead. (1078)

- Avoidance of waste disposal sites from Beaconsfield area & preferably out of South Bucks. (1080)
- A review of Green Belt and its boundary should be included. (302)
- How to stop the Government from keeping itself in work by changing the rules every other year. (1170)
- Potential legacies for post 2012. (1181)
- Sustainability of Burnham village centre. (1185)
- Affordable housing in rural settlements. (165)
- Inadequate public toilet facilities. (894, 949)
- Need to combat the problem of ever increasing litter deposited on our roads and villages. (896)
- Dangerous lorry parking on link dual carriageway from J2 to A40. (1150)
- Provision of a bypass to relieve the North/South road and more off street parking in Beaconsfield. (1158)
- Government refusal to honour pledges to stop compulsory building in Buckinghamshire, post Milton Keynes. (907)
- Protecting trees (woodland) within gardens. (908)
- How to protect local businesses from the power of large companies (e.g. supermarkets). (910)
- To support small business and local produce growers / retailers. (974)
- Poor public transport (particularly after 6:30pm and on Sundays). (934)
- More family homes needed, not more apartment blocks. (919)
- The key challenges list is not in the correct order of priority. (1015)
- Pot holes - roads in general bad condition. (958)

C Do you agree with the emerging Spatial Strategy? If no, please explain why and tell us what approach you think we should have.

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
Infrastructure	
No further development in the District (922, 961, 1024), as local infrastructure already at breaking point (1151, 1081, 1083, 1175) and new development is having an adverse impact on townscape character. (892, 1079) Already	In preparing the Core Strategy SBDC is giving careful consideration to the new physical and community infrastructure required to support new development, and how and when this will be delivered. Consideration is also being given to the changing age profile of the District's population, and the implications this will have for the demand for particular facilities and services.

<p>too much development in South Bucks. (951, 952) New development must be accompanied by appropriate new infrastructure provision. (1025, 1035, 1053, 197, 1151, 1100, 210, 1182). Any further development at Beaconsfield will require extensive improvement to the town's infrastructure. (1143) Little opportunity to expand key infrastructure in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross. (1081)</p> <p>The scenarios do not address the need for additional schools. The document states that there will be no surplus school capacity across the district and Iver will be at capacity. The strategy does not consider a high school in SE of district and assumes it will bus children to schools in NW or outside district. (124)</p>	<p>SBDC will continue its dialogue with infrastructure providers (including the Education Authority, Primary Care Trust and Highways Authority) regarding the most effective means of addressing existing infrastructure issues, and the issues that are likely to arise as a result of new development and the changing age profile of the District's population.</p> <p>SBDC is committed to ensuring that new development provides for all reasonable and necessary on site infrastructure to meet the needs of residents or employees and contributes towards improved facilities in the area.</p> <p>It is recognised that there is a strong local concern that the higher densities and intensification are having a negative affect on local character, for example in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross. The Council will therefore seek to protect the character of its towns and villages, especially those areas with special character. A study on Townscape Character is due to be produced prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>SBDC is aware that there are existing school capacity issues in parts of the District, with some parents being unable to access local schooling. SBDC is working with the Education Authority on the likely future demand for school places in South Bucks.</p>
<p>Housing</p>	
<p>Should refuse to accept the demand from Central Government to provide 1,880 new dwellings. (903, 907, 1079, 1165, 1177) Object should be to slow development and population expansion. (1054) No need for so much new housing. (1079) Disperse the population more, rather than intensifying</p>	<p>The 1,880 dwelling target for South Bucks (for the period 2006-26) is set by Central Government in the South East Plan and is mandatory on the Council. Although a large proportion of this target is already accounted for, the recently finalised South East Plan makes it clear that the fact that the target has been met is not a reason in itself for rejecting a planning application.</p> <p>National planning guidance encourages new development to be built in</p>

development in crowded areas. (1177)	sustainable, accessible locations, which are normally near to town centres. It also seeks more efficient use of previously developed land, which would lead to higher densities in more crowded areas.
The housing targets are not complete and the figure for the number of outstanding permissions is out of date - this does not provide a sound basis for planning. (1035, 197) Based on incomplete and inaccurate information - e.g. SHLAA is not finished. (210, 1265, 1266, 1267, 1268, 792)	The Core Strategy: Emerging Approach document was published shortly before a new year's set of housing figures were made available. Whilst this was not ideal, there is never a perfect time to publish any document as new figures / guidance are constantly emerging. The SHLAA will be completed and published by the time the Core Strategy is published early in 2010. This is consistent with LDF guidance.
Scenarios / where should development go?	
Scenario 1 is the best option (1163, 1167, 1175). It protects the Green Belt and in comparison with Scenario 2, would result in less development at Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross. (1163). Scenarios 1 and 2 are more sustainable. (792)	The emerging strategy is based mainly around scenario 1, along with elements of the other scenarios.
Scenario 4 is the best option. (909, 919, 926, 947, 1004, 1006, 1007, 1192, 979, 1073, 1186, 1187, 1270) New development would be close to the M4 employment corridor and related infrastructure. (947) Provides scope to address the issue of HGV movements through Iver. (979)	The emerging view is that there are advantages and disadvantages of each scenario and that the no single one can address all of the strategic spatial issues. It was therefore decided that the spatial strategy should be broadly based around Scenario 1, with elements of the other scenarios. The main advantages and disadvantages of Scenario 4 are given on page 23 of the full Core Strategy: Emerging Approach document. Although this scenario would help protect the character of Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross, it would not help to sustain services in these settlements, which also have the best existing infrastructure. Scenario 4 could also result in the need to release Green Belt land near Slough, lead to a change in the character of Burnham and Iver and have a greater impact on Burnham Beeches SAC.
Too much development recently in Gerrards Cross and Beaconsfield. (912, 943, 963, 1049, 1143, 1089) More development at Beaconsfield would have a significant adverse impact on its character. (180, 1070, 139,	It is recognised that there is a strong local concern that the higher densities and intensification that have occurred in recent years (largely as a result of revised national planning guidance in PPS3) are having a negative affect on local character, for example in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross. Through the new Core Strategy, the Council will seek to protect the character of its towns and villages, especially

1089)	those areas with special character. A study on Townscape Character is due to be produced prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy.
Scenario 4 not supported. It would result in a "double whammy" for local residents in the south of the District, exacerbating the issues associated with expansion of Heathrow expansion and resulting in the loss of Green Belt land. (1039) Under Scenario 4, A4 Bath Rd would become even more congested. (792) Preferred strategy should focus on Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross only. (1033, 1034) Preferred strategy should focus on developing other areas. (1089)	There are advantages and disadvantages of each scenario - no single one can address all of the strategic spatial issues. The main advantages and disadvantages of Scenario 4 are given on page 23 of the full Core Strategy Emerging Approach document. The Council's emerging view is that the spatial strategy should be broadly based around Scenario 1, with elements of the other scenarios. Further consideration will be given to whether Burnham should be included along with Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross as a main focus for development prior to the Core Strategy being published next year.
No development should be permitted in the Green Belt. (898, 900, 902, 910, 924, 1112, 951, 994, 1049, 1083, 1162, 1184)	The Council's emerging view in the Core Strategy is that the release of Green Belt land for housing development will not be required due to the strong housing land supply position. However, the Government will require the Council to identify a small number of locations in the Green Belt as long term contingency sites, but these would only be released as a last resort.
Other	
Strategy should give greater recognition to the natural environment. (210) Greater significance should be given to the natural environment in terms of recreation, amenity and biodiversity. (1265, 1266, 1267, 1268)	The natural environment is a key element of the Core Strategy - see pages 59 to 63 of the full length version.
Important to consider employment issues alongside housing development. (918) More brownfield employment sites should be redeveloped for housing. (1033, 1034) More space should be allocated to employment and leisure activities to help maintain or indeed reduce the number of vehicle movements throughout the area. (1125)	Agreed. Employment is a key element of the Core Strategy - see pages 55 to 57 of the full length version. The emerging spatial strategy includes a bullet point on employment land. The emerging view is that existing employment sites should generally be protected from redevelopment for other uses, unless they are no longer needed.

<p>Change Taplow Riverside from GB3 to GB1 status (1024, 1128, 1083, 1165).</p>	<p>The Emerging Approach document concentrated on the 'big picture' rather than the finer detail and so did not indicate which settlements would be defined as GB3 settlements. This matter will be clarified in the version that is submitted for Examination.</p> <p>Taplow Riverside is a Conservation Area within the Green Belt and as such will continue to enjoy considerable protection from development.</p>
<p>Do not understand the term "Emerging Spatial Strategy" - too much use of jargon. (906, 1121, 1167) The issues are well set out and explained. (911)</p>	<p>The council sought to use plain English and avoid the unnecessary use of jargon in the document, and many terms are explained in footnotes. However, many expressions were invented by the Government so their use is unavoidable.</p>

The following other comments were also made:

- Develop locations with the best public transport infrastructure. (900, 1042)
- Small villages are "dying". Some additional housing in small villages would encourage the return of facilities (e.g. shops and restaurants). (902) Development required to maintain services. (1171)
- Existing houses are not selling - why build more? Where are all the people coming from who want to live in South Bucks? (1120)
- Rather than building new homes, the Council should buy-up unoccupied housing stock. (1028)
- Affordable housing should be focused in locations with good access to local facilities, services and public transport. (1042)
- Affordable housing should be directed to less "sought after" areas. (943) No affordable housing provision in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross. (1042)
- Stronger emphasis required on affordable housing provision. (988) Disagree that more affordable housing is needed - the attraction of the area is largely due to the limited amount of existing affordable housing. (1136)
- Strategy should encourage mixed housing densities and different sizes of houses and flats. (982)
- Emerging Strategy supported because it "spreads the pain". (1061) Scenarios not mutually exclusive - best approach to combine elements of all four scenarios. (237)
- Why not allow a little development in all settlements and a few small high quality greenfield developments. (962)
- More to be gained by progressing a combination of Scenarios 3 and 4. (917) Support focus on smaller settlements - scenario 3 and 4.
- Scenario 3 spreads the opportunities, creating greater flexibility. (1117) Scenario 3 preferred. (1179)
- Scenario 1 would turn Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross into another High Wycombe or Slough. (1132)

- Crossrail and Heathrow Hub will give rise to development pressures, and therefore the south of the district should have special consideration in the LDF, in consultation with Slough BC. If Scenario 4 is not adopted, then the housing target will be over achieved. (1270)
- Scenario 1 will result in over development, degrading character of the three main towns. I suggest you consider undertaking Neighbourhood Character Assessments, which could form basis of SPD to maintain character and keep densities at an acceptable level. (180)
- Expansion of the largest settlements is incompatible with sustainability and infrastructure capacity. (968)
- More space for development in other parts of the District. (1015)
- New development should be directed to Slough, helping to deliver more facilities and raise wealth. (963)
- Consideration should be given to adjacent centres and facilities. (1030)
- Whilst agreeing that available sites in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross should be utilised, the southern villages and Burnham are currently accommodating much of the new housing development. With poor north / south links, it is important that Burnham provides local facilities and services, helping to minimise car journeys to Slough, Maidenhead and Beaconsfield. (1113)
- More housing in Burnham will exacerbate existing traffic problems. (960) Insufficient consideration has been given to the impact of the Strategic Sites on traffic congestion. (966)
- Emerging Strategy could result in development in the Green Belt adjacent to Burnham. The strategy will result in loss of village identity, with the further merging of Slough and Burnham. (1076) Loss of any Green Belt land around Burnham must be resisted. (457)
- Emerging strategy fails to recognise the challenges resulting from the proximity of Burnham to Slough. (44)
- Concentrating development in the Burnham area is likely to have a significant and negative impact upon Burnham Beeches SAC. (457)
- Why not develop area around Denham, which already has a train station and is close to the M40 / M25? (1071)
- The emerging strategy makes no reference to other proposed projects such Project Pinewood, 3rd runway at Heathrow etc. (1167)
- Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross should not be allowed to encroach on Slough - would be the end of village life for Farnham Common / Royal and other villages. (32)
- The emerging strategy is contrary - suggesting no need to release land from the Green Belt on the one hand, and then proposing three Strategic Sites (in the Green Belt) for development. (1091)
- Strategy of urban intensification broadly supported. (994) Better to spread the intensification across a range of locations. (1056, 1070)
- Infill development and re-use of previously developed land within settlements can deliver future development requirements. (902, 938) Infill development on brownfield or greenfield sites better than development in new locations. (816)

- More information required on what is proposed for the smaller villages (for example, Stoke Poges). (1014) Information provided is quite generalised. (1167) There is no indication of the amount of development envisaged. (1105)
- Further urbanisation of the three largest settlements in the District would erode their “village” character. (932, 1018)
- Relief road needed to rear of Ridgeway Trading Estate to divert traffic from Richings Park and Iver Village. (1032)
- No reference to how the emerging strategy will reduce traffic congestion and its impact on quality of life. (1091)
- Further business development in the Iver area will result in more vehicle movements. Iver is already used as a rat-run. (934)
- Emerging strategy supported if HGV’s removed from Iver Village. (1059)
- Wilton Park should be used to deliver improved access / by-pass for A355. (942)
- Do not support proposals for Wilton Park, and therefore the emerging spatial strategy. Existing housing should be reused, tower block converted to flats, remaining land given over to parkland and A355 diverted. (1172)
- No contingency sites should be identified / released. (1024, 1165)
- Contingency land at Burnham unsuitable for development. Range of reasons cited, including too far from local amenities, unsuitable local road network, site covered in TPO’s and the resultant adverse impact on townscape character. (1191)
- Proposals for the Bishop Centre not supported. (1109)
- Should await decision of MOD on Wilton Park. (1111)
- Equal importance should be attached to the natural environment, the built environment and housing delivery. (1035, 197).
- There has to be a balanced approach to planning - expanding whilst maintaining and enhancing the standards of living for existing residents. (1151)
- Questionable whether land near Taplow Village (Mill Lane), which is at risk from flooding, should be proposed for redevelopment. (1053, 1075)
- Unrest if building densities increase (1063).

D Where do you think the Contingency Sites should be located?

There was a clear correlation between the location of respondents and the preferred location of contingency sites. For example, less than 10% of the respondents who lived in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross supported the provision of contingency land adjacent to their home town. The majority of these respondents suggested contingency land provision at Burnham or on sites adjacent to Slough.

E Suggested additional long term housing contingency sites.

Location	Proposer	Size (Ha)	Comments	Officer Response
Part of Wexham Park Golf Course (Green Course only), Wexham Street.	Individual (909)	15 ha in total		Site in two parts. Access to local facilities and services is relatively poor.
Land south and adjacent to Nuffield Spore Hospital, Wexham Street.				
French Horn Pub, Gerrards Cross	Individual (910)	Less than 1ha	With the built-up area.	Not a suitable contingency site, as it is too small and the Council has no control over when the land comes forward for development.
Police land adjoining the Bishop Centre at Taplow	Individual (1266)	Less than 1ha	Particularly appropriate for affordable housing and it is close to bus route / Taplow station.	Not a suitable contingency site, as it is too small and the Council has no control over when the land comes forward for development.
The Elm and Dingle, at junction of Blackpond Lane and Fairfield Lane, SL2 3EA.	Individual (1271)	1.7 ha	Currently residential and stables. Could provide in fill without detriment to neighbourhood.	Small site adjacent to the built-up area of Farnham Common. Access to local facilities and services is relatively poor.
Fourells Paddock	Individual (124)	4ha	Council states Richings Park has a "poor range of facilities and services" but what is being done to improve the situation? Additional housing will help sustain facilities /services. Site is next to agricultural land (Larbourne Farm).	Site has already been suggested. Unlikely to be suitable as a contingency site as its location is unsustainable and it is not consistent with emerging spatial strategy.
'Tudors', Wood Lane, Iver Heath	Individual (1273)	1.5 ha	Next to a GB3 settlement.	Small site adjacent to Wood Lane Close. The site lies in the Colne Valley Park. Access to local facilities and services is poor.

Note: Some respondents suggested non-specific areas of land, e.g. whole settlements or land adjacent to settlements. These have been excluded from the above table as there is insufficient detail for them to be appraised.

F Do you agree with the emerging approach for each Strategic Site:

Wilton Park

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
Infrastructure	
<p>Further development will place additional pressure on already stretched local infrastructure (including schools and hospitals). (889, 961, 970, 975, 979, 1192)</p> <p>The necessary infrastructure must be provided to support housing i.e. medical centre, primary school. (959, 980, 1126, 1124, 1145, 1061, 1080, 1187)</p>	<p>In preparing the Core Strategy SBDC are required to give careful consideration to the new physical and community infrastructure required to support new development, and how and when this will be delivered. Development at Wilton Park would only be permitted if the necessary infrastructure is provided, for example highways improvements or sewerage facilities.</p> <p>Further discussions will be held with the County Council (as education authority) and the Primary Care Trust before the Core Strategy is published to establish whether schools and health facilities in the Beaconsfield area would be able to cope with the scale of development expected at Wilton Park, or whether additional provision is necessary.</p>
<p>Proximity to A40 and M40 make it attractive. (1124, 1176, 1185)</p>	<p>The Council agrees that Wilton Park is well located in relation to the A40 and M40 roads, although the current access into the site is poor. The Highways Authority are currently examining the traffic impacts of development at Wilton Park in more detail, should it be released by the MOD, including the access arrangements into the site.</p>
Traffic/Access Issues	
<p>Access into Wilton Park needs to be improved. (898, 997, 1019, 1056, 1067, 1073, 1160) Need for effective traffic management. (914) Roundabout access need to be redesigned. (1107)</p>	<p>It is agreed that a new access from the Pyebush roundabout is very likely to be needed as a result of the Wilton Park development, as the existing access from the small roundabout by the Old Town would not be able to cope with the additional traffic. Further discussions are being held with the Highways Authority over access arrangements into the site.</p>

<p>Proposals would increase traffic congestion in Beaconsfield. (892, 943, 945, 951, 970, 974, 975, 1018, 1048, 1127, 1149, 1156, 1161, 1269) Traffic is already very heavy to and from Junction 2 of the M40. (928, 950, 1139, 1065, 1156, 1161)</p>	<p>It is essential that any redevelopment scheme at Wilton Park does not lead to a significant increase in traffic in Beaconsfield. Initial work indicates that the traffic impact of the Wilton Park development would be low at the strategic scale. Further discussions are being held with the Highways Authority over options for reducing traffic problems at Beaconsfield, including examining the impact of development at Wilton Park, should the site be released by the MOD.</p>
<p>Supported only if there is a new by-pass from Amersham Road to Wilton Park roundabout. (931, 942, 958, 972, 1119, 139, 1122, 1269). Relief road is needed now, not at some future time. (1270)</p>	<p>It is essential that any redevelopment scheme at Wilton Park does not lead to a significant increase in traffic in Beaconsfield. Initial work indicates that the traffic impact of the Wilton Park development would be low at the strategic scale. Further discussions are being held with the Highways Authority over options for reducing traffic problems at Beaconsfield, including examining whether a relief road is needed for the town.</p>
<p>Open Space</p>	
<p>Land should be given back to the community as a recreational park. (892, 907, 919, 1030, 1186, 1189) Land should be returned to Green Belt. (926, 1089) Not supported. (929) Redevelopment unnecessary. (902) Large development in this area is unsustainable. (947) Existing green spaces at Wilton Park should be retained. (925) Development at Wilton Park could provide additional parkland, helping to address the lack of parks and gardens in Beaconsfield. (948) Should provide parkland as well as housing. (1013, 1099, 1172)</p>	<p>It is essential that existing recreational facilities at Wilton Park are retained where possible. As Beaconsfield is deficient in some types of open space, there may be scope for some new open space to be created as apart of any scheme at Wilton Park.</p> <p>However, about half of the site comprises previously developed land and it is not realistic to expect the entire site to be used purely as a recreational park. This is because there would be no economic incentive for the landowner to release the site and to resolve existing problems on the site, such as demolition of the tower block.</p>

Good/Bad site	
Best site - as general public have not had any benefit from this area in the past, and won't therefore lose anything through its redevelopment. Good site. (899, 901, 967, 971, 1151, 1166, 32, 630) Good site adjacent to town. (945) Wilton Park seems sensible. (1068)	Support for the redevelopment of the site is noted and welcomed. The Council agrees that if the site is released by the MoD, it would provide an opportunity for a sustainable scheme that can resolve some existing problems in the area.
Good use of previously developed land. (903, 906, 921, 994, 1029, 1063, 1099, 1155, 1181)	Support for the redevelopment of the site is noted and welcomed. About half of the site consists of previously developed ('brownfield') land, and the Council agrees that should Wilton Park be released, the redevelopment of this brownfield element would be appropriate, subject to environmental safeguards.
Not good site - Beaconsfield already busy enough. (1136, 1148, 1149)	It is essential that any redevelopment scheme at Wilton Park does not lead to a significant increase in traffic in Beaconsfield. Initial work indicates that the traffic impact of the Wilton Park development would be low at the strategic scale. Further discussions are being held with the Highways Authority over options for reducing traffic problems at Beaconsfield.
Other Issues	
The tower block should be demolished. (35, 1091, 1153)	Agreed. Removal of the tower block is an important element of the emerging policy framework for redevelopment of the Wilton Park Strategic Site.

The following other comments were also made:

- Wilton Park is large enough to accommodate all the required supporting facilities and services. (899, 1171) Important to ensure provision of suitable amenities. (914)
- Wilton Park can only be considered if developed as a village in own right, Doctors, dentist, school etc. (1008)
- No to development, 300 extra houses would mean extra cars + people with more roads / schools etc. (1132)
- Cycle ways to Beaconsfield. (979)
- Near good shopping centre. (1047)
- Wilton Park has good access to the motorway and train services. It has better infrastructure generally. (934)
- Current infrastructure could not cope with the development e.g. schools, doctors, roads. (1149, 1081)

- Unrealistic to expect people to walk and cycle to the facilities and services available in Beaconsfield. (892)
- The Wilton Park site is huge - where are those people going to drive, park, shop, go to school and get on the train? Beaconsfield doesn't have the capacity! (1070)
- The fact that the MoD acquired the site for government purposes is not in itself an adequate reason to justify redevelopment when transport and sewerage infrastructure indicate otherwise. Development would add a fourth disparate community to Beaconsfield. If there is to be development it should only occur after infrastructure has been provided by developer or county council. (1270)
- More than one entrance into the development. (959, 1160)
- Suggest traffic can access A40 & M40 directly without going towards Beaconsfield. (1009, 1119) Site should be accessed directly from Pyebush roundabout. (1041)
- Only Wilton Park has road network to cope with increased traffic. However, there would be no improvement at the A40 roundabout south of Wilton Park as traffic would be coming in from north side if Wilton Park goes ahead. (966)
- A355 would need re-routing through the proposed site. (1060, 1172)
- What about access to railway for commuters? (1124)
- Releasing Green belt land at Wilton Park will create a town with no public transport links, which is contrary to plans on environmental impact. (124)
- Transport may be an issue. (70)
- Not suitable for parkland, as not integrated within an urban setting. (917)
- Do not believe Beaconsfield has a shortage of parks and gardens. (1111)
- Care should be taken not to harm the existing trees and if possible create space around them. (1037)
- Do not agree that environmental improvements will follow. (963)
- Good site - well screened by existing trees. (946) Almost a 'hidden area' that should be used. (1131)
- Could become an excellent facility for Beaconsfield. (1056)
- The wider 40ha site would provide greater scope for contingency. (895) 40 ha site offers huge potential. (910)
- Redevelopment long overdue. Improved road/rail links to Amersham needed. (940, 340)
- No housing under any circumstance - must be kept for the "military housing". (1054)
- Development would not impose on the character of Beaconsfield Old Town or New Town. (918, 1031)
- MOD should be responsible for addressing any contaminated land issues. (921)
- Believe that site release will be considerably delayed by the military. (956)
- Land shouldn't be used to develop more apartment blocks, which only benefit the developers. (919)
- Too many houses proposed at the expense of recreation land. (1107)
- Only a restricted amount of housing. (995, 1153)

- Houses should be of high quality design. (1043) The design should be sympathetic to the environment and have green infrastructure, and not be impersonal like that at Cliveden. (180)
- Large part of this site should be for affordable housing. (1055)
- Mix of private/affordable housing. (1043, 1051, 1080) Emphasis on affordable housing needed. (1187)
- Any redevelopment should not increase the footprint of development. (925, 1016)
- Need to check whether existing buildings are re-useable due to age and the future of tower block. (1067) Use existing housing and covert tower block into flats if possible. (1172)
- The tower should be kept - it is a landmark. Beaconsfield could also accommodate another tower. (1101)
- There are 16 new houses unsold after a year. Why is development [at Wilton Park] allowed when there obviously is not the need. (1186)
- Sustainability of the urban environment should be a priority - e.g. energy self-sufficiency, green roofs etc. (937)
- It's location (close to motorway but away from station) will encourage use of cars rather than public transport (988)
- Should be built to Code for Sustainable Homes 4+ /BREEAM excellent rating. (1043)
- Good opportunity to build an eco village or community village. (1151) Could you make Wilton Park a local prototype for green, environmentally friendly, affordable housing.(1187)
- Too close to old rubbish dump - smell. (980, 1061)
- Swimming pool should be built on site. (1013, 958)
- If Project Pinewood really needs a site as claimed, this is the size and has sufficient brownfield area for the purpose. (1027)
- Possible campus development. (1030)
- Beaconsfield will lose its appeal as a small town. (1127)
- Seems we have no choice. (1142)
- Would increase traffic flow to Slough, Farnham Common and Royal. (1075)
- Views of local residents are important. (1079)
- Should provide employment. (1099)
- Will step towards continuous development along A40 turning Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross into London suburbs. (1177)
- Wilton Park should be used for parking for the old town & recreational land for young people - such as go-kart tracks, swimming pool, woods "GO-APE" type adventures. (1135)
- Should MoD decide to retain Wilton Park as a School of Languages, this should be supported. (180)

Mill Lane

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
Traffic/Access Issues	
<p>Mill Lane and junction onto A4 would need upgrading to meet residents needs. (966) Concerns about traffic on Bath Road (A4). (1028, 1124, 1126) Development of site should consider more seriously impact on traffic congestion on A4, which is already high, impacting on air quality for pedestrians and residents. Closing Mill Lane at one end would reduce rat running. (1265, 1266, 1267, 1268)</p>	<p>The Council is aware that there is a traffic congestion hotspot on the stretch of the A4 between Maidenhead and Slough, which passes close to the Mill Lane Strategic Site. However, initial work indicated that local roads around the site should have sufficient capacity to cope with the new traffic arising from the development, although any proposal would need to involve junction improvements to the site or provide for a realigned access onto the Bath Road.</p>
<p>Maidenhead Bridge inadequate for increased traffic flow. (1124, 1126) Development will increase pressure on narrow bridge over Thames at Maidenhead. (1269)</p>	<p>The Council is aware that there is a traffic congestion hotspot on the stretch of the A4 between Maidenhead and Slough, including Maidenhead Bridge, which is Grade 1 listed. Initial work indicated that local roads around the Mill Lane site should have sufficient capacity to cope with the new traffic arising from the development, although any proposal would need to involve junction improvements to the site or provide for a realigned access onto the Bath Road.</p>
Good/Bad Site	
<p>Do not develop - already engulfed by overdeveloped Maidenhead and Slough. (1015) Keep village atmosphere. (1054) Development would destroy this attractive area of land. (892) Development would further urbanise rural Taplow. (945)</p>	<p>It will be essential for any development scheme to retain the largely open character of the area and to enhance the character and appearance of the nearby Taplow Riverside Conservation Area. There would need to be no increase in the overall footprint of development in the Green Belt and the height and massing of development would need to be strictly limited to ensure a reduced visual impact.</p>
<p>Develop - a good opportunity. (1113, 967, 970, 979, 1051, 1057, 1090, 1099, 925) Not too big so will not affect larger towns. (951) Underutilised site. (1131, 1142, 1057, 1063, 1075)</p>	<p>The Council agrees that the site presents a good opportunity for a high quality, sustainable scheme that can secure environmental and access improvements.</p>

Flooding	
Flooding issue needs to be addressed suitably. (976, 1028, 1029, 1053, 1119, 1138, 1149, 1076, 139, 1085, 925, 1269) Concern about flood risk. (892, 894, 895, 906, 921, 933, 937, 945) Keep areas of flood risk free from development. (1085) Unsuitable for housing due to liability of flooding. (1009, 1112, 957, 980, 994, 1129, 1137, 25, 1061, 70, 1187, 1194, 1274)	<p>It is acknowledged that there are significant flooding issues on the Mill Lane Strategic Site. These would need to be satisfactorily resolved (to the satisfaction of the Environment Agency) before any scheme could proceed.</p> <p>It is considered that the need to regenerate this key site, with large areas of previously developed land, is sufficient to justify its redevelopment - despite flood risk issues. All development would have to be guided towards those parts of the site that have the lowest risk of flooding within the site.</p>
Housing	
Density needs to be carefully considered. (960, 237, 1169) Buildings should be low rise. (1043)	It will be essential for any development scheme to retain the largely open character of the area. There would need to be no increase in the overall footprint of development in the Green Belt and the height and massing of development would need to be strictly limited to ensure a reduced visual impact.
Improve access to Thames riverside. (609, 1149, 1067, 1076, 1169, 910)	Agree. The redevelopment of the site provides a rare opportunity to improve access to the River Thames through a new riverside walk.
Support para 2.102 re reducing height / massing of development. (1265, 1266, 1267, 1268)	Support is welcomed. The height and massing of development would need to be strictly limited to ensure a reduced visual impact.
An Air Quality Assessment should be submitted in regard to the Mill Lane development. (1265, 1266, 1267, 1268)	Air Quality Assessments need to be submitted for certain types of scheme, especially those close to the Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs) that run alongside the motorway corridors. Further consideration will be given to whether such an assessment will need to be submitted for this site.
Other	
A planning brief for the site is vital and must take Taplow Riverside Conservation Area into account. (197, 210, 1266, 1267)	The applicant will be expected to prepare a development brief for the site, although a planning application has recently been submitted covering much of the Strategic Site. It will be essential for any development scheme to enhance the character and appearance of the nearby Taplow Riverside Conservation Area.

The following other comments were also made:

- Infrastructure is already overstretched. (961, 1161)
- Improve amenities and recreational facilities for the public. (990, 1191)
- Takes advantage of the new Crossrail travel proposals. (1048)
- Good access to local train stations already exists. (1081) Good access to nearby facilities. (1038)
- Direct access to Taplow Station/cycle routes should be incorporated. (979, 1038)
- Keep existing open land. (1112) Retain flood plain as existing open space. (991)
- Demolish gas holder as unsightly. (984)
- Wetland development and strategic planting could contribute towards reducing flood risk. (937)
- Need to address flood risk in design of houses. (974)
- Should be devoted to a retirement village. (1073)
- Should be a mix of residential and commercial. (1067)
- Preserve Glen Island House. (1091)
- High quality design important - should follow general style of area, at a scale appropriate to its rural setting. (237, 792)
- Do not agree that environmental improvements will follow. (963)
- Needs high quality public access with significant environmental enhancement. (1043)
- Green Belt land. (903)
- Need to consider and address any contaminated land. (921)
- Ensure local concerns are addressed. (1012, 1079)
- Burnham should not be subjected to any further development due it's proximity to this site. (197)
- Not good to have more development on the Thames. (894)
- Redevelopment unnecessary. (902)
- Development will benefit Berkshire (Maidenhead and Slough). (903)

Court Lane

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
Infrastructure	
Poor local infrastructure. (980, 1171, 79)	The Court Lane site is isolated from key facilities, and does not adjoin any settlements. This is one reason why it is not suitable for residential

	development. However, redevelopment of the site for B1 business uses or similar would offer the opportunity to improve access to Iver village and Iver station.
Traffic Issues	
Must reduce HGV level through Iver Village, Richings Park and surrounding area. (1001, 974, 1029, 1051, 1052, 1150, 70, 1157, 1167, 630, 921, 930) Fewer HGVs would improve quality of life for local residents. (930)	The Council is aware of the strong public feeling on the amount of HGV / commercial traffic in the Iver and Richings Park area, and the associated impact on people's quality of life. One option for reducing the problem is to allow the redevelopment of Court Lane Strategic Site for B1 business uses (or another use, that does not generate large numbers of HGV movements). It is essential that any scheme at Court Lane should result in a significant reduction in the number of HGV / commercial vehicle movements in the area.
Roads close by are highly congested - redevelopment must address this problem. (966, 971, 979, 987, 1100, 1181, 927, 935, 945, 946) Roads too busy around this area already. (996, 1154)	The Council is aware of the strong public feeling on the amount of HGV / commercial traffic in the Iver and Richings Park area. It is essential that any scheme at Court Lane should result in a significant reduction in the number of HGV / commercial vehicle movements in the area.
Good / Bad Site	
Good site to redevelop. (1011, 967, 970, 987, 1119, 1075, 1090, 1153, 1155) Good use of previously developed land. (892)	The Council agrees that redevelopment of the Court Lane estate (for B1 business uses or similar) would enhance the area, and reduce some of the other problems, including HGV and commercial traffic.
Do not redevelop - Iver already sprawls towards Uxbridge. (980) Area already over developed. (993) Unnecessary. (902)	The Court Lane site contributes to the number of HGV / commercial vehicle movements in the Iver / Richings Park area and its redevelopment would provide an opportunity to reduce this problem. There would be tight controls over the design of any development to ensure that it is of a high quality and minimises the impact on the Green Belt and the Colne Valley Park.
Residential use maybe an improvement to industrial use. (994, 1029, 1091)	As stated in paragraph 2.110 of the Core Strategy Emerging Approach, residential development is not considered to be appropriate for the site as it is isolated from key facilities, situated partly within an Air Quality Management Area where it would be subject to noise, poor air quality and possibly contamination, and next to a water treatment works.

Would support local economy well. (1081, 1802, 1156) Side effect (e.g. S.106) would help improve viability of Iver village. (165)	An appropriate B1 or similar redevelopment scheme should help support the local economy, although this is not the primary reason why Court Lane has been suggested as a strategic site. Redevelopment would offer an opportunity to improve access to Iver village, which would help improve the viability of shops and services in the settlement.
Too close to M25/M4 - pollution issues. (990, 1028, 1047)	Any development scheme at the Court Lane Strategic Site would need to be carefully designed to take account of noise and air quality issues arising from the proximity of the M25 motorway and other nearby uses.

The following other comments were also made:

- Subject to local infrastructure improvements e.g. ring road. (1021)
- Access to Iver station needs to be improved and public transport provision would need to be made. (1103, 1184)
- Close proximity to Iver station. (1091)
- Would fit in with current rail policies. (1187)
- Redevelopment of Court Lane (along with Project Pinewood) would put severe pressure on local community (Iver Heath). (906)
- What will be the impact of expansion of Heathrow, the relocation of Iver Station and Crossrail? (916)
- Flood zone should not be built on. (962)
- Should provide recreation. (1082)
- Not suitable for residential development - too close to M25. (890)
- Site should be redeveloped less densely. (1161)
- Where would existing businesses relocate to? (901) Better to keep industry in this part of district - as opposed to allowing new greenfield development. (910)
- Iver not suited to type of development proposed (due to narrow country lanes). (934)
- Do not agree that environmental improvements will follow. (963)
- Need to address contaminated land issues. (937)
- Protect and enhance areas in the Colne Valley Park. (1039)
- Develop on small scale in keeping with surroundings. (1054)
- Difficult to deliver in certain time frame. (1117)
- Locals should be consulted. (1079)
- Redevelopment will benefit Slough. (903)

G Are there any other potential Strategic Sites

Location	Proposer	Size (Ha)	Comments	Officer Response
Stoke Court (former Miles Laboratory site)	Individual (1269)	12ha	None	Adjacent to Stoke Poges which has, subject to the successful completion of the Bells Hill Centre, a good range of shops, facilities and services and reasonable access to public transport. Constraints include the impact of development on the Listed House, landscape impact and the relatively poor accessibility to facilities and services.

H Do you have any comments on the place shaping section? Are there any local issues specific to your town / village that we need to be aware of?

Beaconsfield

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
INFRASTRUCTURE	
Local infrastructure already stretched - particularly hospitals, doctors, schools and car parking. (889, 892, 893, 894, 925, 948). Pressure on school places (1008). Many children have been unable to obtain places in their catchment area and have to travel out of Beaconsfield. Build schools before the housing. (959, 972, 1061) GP facilities have not kept pace with the increase in local population. (893)	SBDC is aware that there are existing school capacity issues in parts of the District, including Beaconsfield, with some parents being unable to access local schooling. SBDC is working with the Education Authority on the likely future demand for school places in South Bucks. In responding to the most recent consultation, the Education Authority has expressed concern about the scale of development that might occur at Beaconsfield in the period to 2026 (assuming the Wilton Park Strategic Site is redeveloped) and the limited scope to extend the capacity of the existing schools to accommodate additional pupils. This issue will need to be resolved prior to publication of the Core Strategy (March 2010). There are no NHS Hospitals in the District and residents therefore rely on hospitals in High Wycombe, Slough and Hillingdon. SBDC is discussing health

	<p>care issues with the Primary Care Trust, ensuring that the Core Strategy takes into account both existing service issues and any planned, localised improvements.</p> <p>The Council is also aware of public concerns over the level of public car parking in Beaconsfield, particularly in the Old Town. There is some evidence that there is insufficient parking in the Old Town, which could be having an adverse impact on local businesses. This issue will be considered further, in conjunction with the Highways Authority, before the Core Strategy is submitted.</p>
LOSS OF CHARACTER	
<p>Further development at Beaconsfield would adversely impact upon townscape character. (25, 165, 892, 918, 929, 947, 1067) Beaconsfield is "full". (926, 943) Beaconsfield Old & New Towns are losing their charm through over-development and lack of green space. (1054).</p>	<p>It is recognised that there is a strong local concern that the higher densities and intensification that have occurred in recent years as a result of revised national planning guidance in PPS3 are having a negative affect on local character in Beaconsfield. The Council will therefore seek to protect the character of its towns and villages, especially those areas with special character. The Council has recently adopted a Residential Design Guide to encourage high quality design. A study on Townscape Character is due to be produced prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy.</p>
<p>Too much new high density housing. (893, 991). Need a wide range of housing types and sizes - otherwise there is a risk of ghetto development. (980, 1008) Beaconsfield is a town of family homes and 2 storey flats do not work. (972). The housing stock in Beaconsfield is very mixed. (1105) Inadequate safeguards for avoiding high densities in Beaconsfield and overstraining infrastructure. (180)</p>	<p>Residential densities have increased in Beaconsfield and elsewhere in recent years, mainly due to national planning guidance on housing (PPS3), which promotes the more efficient use of land. Well designed higher density schemes can, however, make a positive contribution to an area's character.</p> <p>It is essential that there is a mix of housing size and types to ensure the housing needs of the whole community are met, including larger family properties. The Council will negotiate with developers and housing associations and seek to ensure that the mix of housing types and sizes provided is based on evidence of local needs.</p>
<p>The character of Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross has already been damaged by the construction of excessively large blocks of apartments. (1105, 1065, 139)</p>	<p>Residential densities have increased in Beaconsfield and elsewhere in recent years, mainly due to national planning guidance on housing (PPS3), which promotes the more efficient use of land. The increased amount of flatted development that has been built recently in the town has been consistent with</p>

	<p>the aims of PPS3, and most would almost certainly have been be allowed on appeal if the Council had refused planning permission. However, a mix of dwelling sizes are needed, including family properties as well as flats, although this will vary across the District.</p>
<p>TRAFFIC / PARKING</p>	
<p>Beaconsfield is becoming choked by high traffic volumes. (1105, 1143, 1070) Traffic congestion is a significant and increasing problem. (893) The roads are in poor condition. (918, 943) Congestion in old town becoming worse at peak times and is a problem. Traffic needs diverting. (1043) Urgent need to reduce congestion in London End, Beaconsfield and on A355 especially at rush hour. (180) Congestion is due to poor planning of pedestrian crossing places. (1135) Beaconsfield is becoming busier. The traffic at the Old Town roundabout is awful at peak times, especially the morning. (1127) Parking and congestion in the old town are getting worse with each new development. (1149) Congestion throughout and parking problems. Increased population means Beaconsfield is already at capacity. (1070) Congestion in town centre. Have seen development similar to Wilton Park elsewhere and it was a nightmare. (1071) Beaconsfield roads are very crowded and an increase in traffic should not be contemplated. (1060) Old & New towns are under strain from traffic and further development will increase this to breaking point. (1041)</p>	<p>It is recognised that there is strong local concern about traffic congestion in Beaconsfield, particularly east of the Old Town. Further discussions are being held with the Highways Authority over options for reducing traffic problems at Beaconsfield. This will include examining the traffic implications of the proposed development at Wilton Park.</p> <p>Also, a refresh of the Beaconsfield Transportation Study is being undertaken by the Highways Authority (in conjunction with SBDC and Beaconsfield Town Council) and this will identify proposals that should help to alleviate some of the existing traffic problems, although the scale of these initiatives will be constrained by resource limitations.</p>
<p>Further public car parking required in Beaconsfield Old Town. (910, 925, 929, 974,</p>	<p>The Council is also aware of public concerns over the level of public car parking in Beaconsfield, particularly in the Old Town. There is some evidence that</p>

<p>1043), as it is dying with shops closing due to lack of customers. (1013) Lack of free car parking in Beaconsfield. (949) Parking is becoming increasingly difficult. (1143) Residents in Old Town Beaconsfield suffer from shoppers and restaurant visitors parking outside their houses & blocking. Residents parking needed. (995) More long term parking is also needed in Beaconsfield New Town. Commuters' cars blight residential roads. Parking has changed the visual character of Beaconsfield. (1270) Need to remove commuter parking on residential roads in Beaconsfield. (925) Common land / car parking issues in the old town require attention. (1080)</p>	<p>there is insufficient parking in the Old Town, which could be having an adverse impact on local businesses. This issue will be considered further, in conjunction with the Highways Authority, before the Core Strategy is submitted.</p>
<p>A separate A-road running from the motorway spur road roundabout north and north west to link with the A355 before the railway bridge. The traffic is such even now that to do nothing about this hotspot will lead to significant issues anyway, with or without Wilton Park developed. (950) If it is possible to develop Wilton Park, the plan should include provision of a by-pass to connect A40 roundabout with Ledborough Lane/A355 (new railway bridge) (956) The proposed new road from Ledborough Lane to Pyebush roundabout would help minimise congestion problem. Resulting loss of Green Belt would be justified. This road would be even more necessary if Wilton Park were to be developed for housing. (180) Serious consideration should be given to a bypass, particularly if Wilton Park is developed. (1041)</p>	<p>The Council is aware of the strong public concerns over traffic congestion in Beaconsfield and the long standing demands from some residents for a relief road linking the Pyebush roundabout with the A355 to the north of the Old Town. In the Emerging Approach document, it states that "there is no evidence to indicate that the issue is of such a magnitude to warrant a relief road". Given the strength of public feeling, the Council has asked the Highways Authority to examine this issue in more depth. Much will depend on the scale of development at Wilton Park, and if it were to be of a significant scale, then a full link road (the Wilton Park Diversion) might be required.</p>

The following other comments were also made:

- The need for further educational provision is indicated in the Core Strategy but no provision is made or sites identified in any of the scenarios. It seems likely that a new primary school will be needed in Beaconsfield or Gerrards Cross. If a boys' grammar school is already needed in these areas, it will certainly be a problem by 2026. (1270)
- Drains struggle to cope with rainfall. (918)
- A parks/recreation area could be developed to the east of the A355, which would allow for the by-pass and be a buffer zone between Beaconsfield and Wilton Park. (1151)
- Provision of a public park will not compensate for the negative impact that further development will have on the character of Beaconsfield. (947) Difficult to see where public parks could be located, unless Wilton Park provides an opportunity. (1119)
- Beaconsfield is at infrastructure capacity, especially road and rail. (1081)
- Beaconsfield does not possess a good range of community facilities - far from it. (1089)
- No proposals have come forward from SBDC to remedy deficiencies in Beaconsfield for parks, playgrounds and open spaces. Citizens need these now and not at some distant date. Neither have proposals emerged for an indoor swimming pool. It is a farcical situation which requires residents to use pools out of the district. SBDC should identify the facilities it needs in the LDF via contributions or levy or directly. (1270)
- Character of the town is changing - in the current market developers are struggling to sell new homes, so no need to flood market any further. (1149) Character of Beaconsfield has significantly changed in recent years by developments generally. (1270)
- Over-emphasis on brownfield development. A large garden is not brownfield. (991)
- Excessively large gardens in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross should be bought up and developed at a higher density (1125)
- Character of Beaconsfield New Town was previously defined by its trees, attractive houses and gardens - fast disappearing. (918)
- House prices are high in Beaconsfield because it's nice. If we wanted it to become High Wycombe, we'd move there. Stop expanding it - it can't cope. (1132)
- Beaconsfield is already very busy. Why does it need to be developed at all? I prefer scenario 3 - focus on smaller settlements. (1136)
- Beaconsfield has changed in last 10 years. Please don't make it worse and force residents out. (1148)
- Pulling down large houses must stop. It is ruining the character of the town. (1079)
- Beaconsfield has experienced considerable and highly inappropriate development in recent years. (1089)
- The pattern of development in recent years has destroyed the character of Beaconsfield. (1133)

- SBDC must improve its planning services & take notice of old town residents concerns. The retro planning examples of The George (Crazy Bear) is a case in point. SBDC attitudes have been a disgrace. (1080)
- HGV travel through the town at all hours, and it should not be allowed. Other routes are available. Supermarket lorries are particularly bad. (1043) Beaconsfield New Town is plagued by HGVs at the roundabouts on Station Road. (1270)
- The town centre is congested for much of the day. Beaconsfield's internal road structure is poor because of the railway line. North-south links are bad. The fact that the town has more 2 car owners than other towns is a problem. It may be necessary to consider pedestrianisation in some parts of the town centre. Station Rd / Penn Rd has an usually high number of roundabouts, pedestrian crossings, junctions etc. and this causes conflict between vehicles and pedestrians. (1270)
- Congestion in old town could be eased by allowing west bound access from M40 Loudwater junction. (970)
- Need for a long-term plan to provide better pedestrian and cyclist links between Beaconsfield Old Town and Beaconsfield New Town. (917)
- Beaconsfield is surrounded by countryside but what are needed are improved footpaths similar to that by the flats in Penn Road. (1111)
- There is a need for traffic lights at Wilton Park roundabout. If traffic lights work elsewhere, why not in Beaconsfield? (35)
- Apart from the train service, public transport is dire. It is impossible to get from Beaconsfield to Amersham by public transport, even though it is 4-5 miles away. (1089)
- Public transport is inadequate in Beaconsfield, especially north of the railway line, where there is nothing. Elderly people will not walk 10-15 minutes to town centre, they will drive. No buses serve the Seeleys estate. Frequency of bus services needs to be enhanced. No buses from Beaconsfield serve hospitals/clinics at Amersham, Wexham Park and Stoke Mandeville. (1270)
- No more building should be allowed in Beaconsfield till the problems caused by through traffic have been solved. Parking could be provided at the entrance to Wilton Park for easy access to the Old Town shops. (959)
- The whole of the A355 as far as Ledborough Lane can be a congestion hot spot. Park and Ride outside the town would reduce traffic generally. (1019)
- Beaconsfield does not have a good range of shops. (893, 918)
- The shops at the MSA will modify local shopping patterns, and may lead to demand for more development nearby. (941)
- Sustainable services and shops are essential for future of the Old Town, such as post office, banks and shops. (1080)
- Recent developments in Beaconsfield have increased an ageing population. (1053)
- Further expansion of Beaconsfield should be limited, to ensure it doesn't "merge" with Wilton Park. (910)
- Where will people work if you use industrial land [for housing]? How will houses sell if no one has a job? (1008)
- Is the incinerator for either Beaconsfield or Gerrards Cross being reconsidered in the light of increasing residential densities? (950)

- Beaconsfield stretches into Knotty Green in Chiltern District. It includes open spaces and sports facilities. Surely SBDC should take these areas in account and consider if a change of boundary is merited. (1030)
- Opportunities to save green space have been missed, e.g. Sainsbury's could have had 6 stories of flats/offices above it. New blocks of flats could have been 1 or 2 stories higher. 1101)
- Seems heavy handed towards Beaconsfield. Iver has more potential. (1161)
- Instead of building the MSA - this land could have been used for housing development. (892)

Gerrards Cross

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
INFRASTRUCTURE	
Local infrastructure already stretched - particularly health facilities and schools. (889, 893, 912, 968,1004) GX has a huge problem with secondary education, with a lack of grammar school places. (774, 1056, 1065) Is there an opportunity to combine GX and Fulmer schools? (1056) Gerrards Cross has insufficient places in both junior and senior schools. (1179)	<p>SBDC is aware that there are existing school capacity issues in parts of the District, including Gerrards Cross, with some parents being unable to access local schooling. SBDC is working with the Education Authority on the likely future demand for school places in South Bucks. The Council will consider seeking financial contributions towards school provision from development schemes where there is clear evidence from the education authority that this is needed.</p> <p>There are no NHS Hospitals in the District and residents therefore rely on hospitals in High Wycombe, Slough and Hillingdon. SBDC is discussing health care issues with the Primary Care Trust, ensuring that the Core Strategy takes into account both existing service issues and any planned, localised improvements.</p> <p>Whilst Gerrards Cross has a slightly poorer range of schools and health facilities than Beaconsfield, it is adjacent to Chalfont St Peter in Chiltern District, which supplements some facilities.</p>
TRAFFIC / PARKING	
Traffic congestion. (889, 912, 932, 943)	There is no evidence that there are particular problems with traffic congestion in Gerrards Cross at present.
Inadequate car parking. (889) Dangerous on-road parking, including on corners and along by East Common. (912) Free short term car	There is no evidence that there are particularly severe parking related problems in Gerrards Cross. The price of car parking is not a Core Strategy matter.

<p>parking would be appreciated by locals and shopkeepers. (1068). Problem of illegal parking needs to be addressed. (604) Parking already difficult in Gerrards Cross - more development will make the problem worse. (1152, 1274)</p>	
<p>Potholes in roads a disgrace. (912) Roads and pavements in poor state of repair. (943) Packhorse Road - problems of traffic flow, lack of parking and potholes. (1121) Road conditions in Gerrards Cross are in danger for cyclists. (1180)</p>	<p>The condition of roads is a responsibility of the Highways Authority (Bucks County Council) rather than the District Council. It is not a Core Strategy matter.</p>
<p>Traffic congestion will be made much worse by Tesco, unless accessed via an alternative to Packhorse Road. (932, 1065) Traffic around station / Tesco site in Gerrards Cross. (1056) Congestion in Packhorse Road needs addressing. (1163) Packhorse Road carries a significant volume of traffic through the middle of GX and this will increase sharply, as will pollution from stationary traffic, when the Tesco store opens. The location of new developments needs to take this into account (1160)</p>	<p>The Tesco scheme in Gerrards Cross was granted planning permission at appeal, following the application being refused by the Council. These matters were considered as part of the appeal by an independent inspector, who considered that the traffic and parking impacts of the scheme would be acceptable.</p>
<p>LOSS OF CHARACTER</p>	
<p>The common is the Town "Crown Jewel". (910) It is essential to protect and preserve the integrity of the West and East Commons. (1074) East Common must be protected. (1152) The Common at Gerrards Cross needs clearing (overgrown). (915)</p>	<p>It is agreed that the Common needs to be protected. It is within a Conservation Area (recently reviewed and extended) and this will help prevent poor quality development, although it cannot stop all development, or prevent 'permitted development' that does not require planning permission.</p>
<p>Character of Gerrards Cross is being spoilt. (912, 915, 932). The character is being changed by flats - these should be stopped in favour of in-keeping development. (997, 1068)</p>	<p>It is recognised that there is a strong local concern that the character of Gerrards Cross is changing due to the higher densities and intensification that have occurred recently as a result of national planning guidance in PPS3, which promotes the more efficient use of land. Well designed higher density schemes</p>

<p>The character of Gerrards Cross has already been damaged by the construction of excessively large blocks of apartments. (1105, 1065, 139) Keep character. (165) The current massive change from detached to multiple occupancy apartments is destroying the character of Beaconsfield & Gerrards Cross and should be stopped immediately. Your leaflet says "protecting the character" please take the spin away and deliver. (1122) Too many people in Gerrards Cross since more flats built. (912)</p>	<p>can, however, make a positive contribution to an area's character. The Council has recently adopted a Residential Design Guide to encourage high quality design. The Council will seek to protect the character of its towns and villages, especially those areas with special character. A study on Townscape Character is due to be produced prior to the adoption of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>It is essential that there is a mix of housing size and types to ensure the housing needs of the whole community are met, including larger family properties. The Council will negotiate with developers and housing associations and seek to ensure that the mix of housing types and sizes provided is based on evidence of local needs.</p>
---	---

The following other comments were also made:

- Road infrastructure is insufficient to support further development, especially commercial development. (968)
- Gerrards Cross is at infrastructure capacity, especially road and rail. (1081)
- Gerrards Cross has sufficient access to schools but insufficient bus services to get to them. Poor cycling routes.
- Extensive building has already occurred in Chalfont St Peter WITHOUT increasing schools/hospitals/doctors etc. To increase too much in Gerrards Cross without addressing this would be foolish (1145)
- Please address the problem of a lack of Medical Centre in Gerrards Cross. (1093)
- All day street parking makes it difficult to effectively clean roads and pavements. (912)
- Very conscious of increased traffic and noise in GX. Would be better to spread around development than concentrate of existing centres. (1068)
- Following change of policy allowing intensification and backland development and destruction of family homes, character of GX has changed. Infrastructure (drainage/sewage, highways) is inadequate. (1067)
- Pulling down large houses must stop. It is ruining the character of the town. (1079)
- Gerrards Cross has experienced considerable and highly inappropriate development in recent years. (1089)
- Gerrards Cross is a disgrace to the area - 3rd world conditions. The vitality has gone - thanks to Planning. When are you going to really listen to the public and not to the direction of Central Government? (1121)
- Too many supermarkets in Gerrards Cross. (936)
- The place shaping plan for Gerrards Cross would ensure the viability of shops in the town. (1099)
- Primary and secondary shopping areas in Gerrards Cross should not be increased. (1163)

- Must encourage local people to use local shops in Gerrards Cross. (1152) Use of shopping and rail facilities is becoming unattractive to residents outside central area. (1274)
- The conservation area for Gerrards Cross should include roads around the village centre - the red circle is not correctly marked on the plan. (982)
- Ghastly fluids are seeping out of the landfill site by the Bell House [Wapseys Wood]. No-one seems to care about our health! Reduce our rates while we have to endure Tesco upheaval and breathe contaminated air. Sunglasses have to be worn at all times in GX. (1120) Smell of landfill south of Beaconsfield and between Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross is very bad. Why build houses near these sites? (1061)
- Gerrards Cross is not a town; there is only one in the district, Beaconsfield. You need to find a better place than Tatling End for your offices. You were more approachable when you were based in Slough. (1005)

Burnham

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
INFRASTRUCTURE	
<p>There are capacity issues with the 2 existing primary schools which are oversubscribed. Medical and dental centres are overstretched. Nearest hospital is Wexham Park in Berkshire. Village centre shops are inadequate. A significant expansion of schooling, medical, recreational, transport and shopping facilities would be required and this would alter character of area significantly. (1064) Village school is full. (792) If you want more people to live in Burnham provide more school places and NHS facilities. (957)</p>	<p>SBDC is aware that there are existing school capacity issues in parts of the District, with some parents being unable to access local schooling. SBDC is working with the Education Authority on the likely future demand for school places in South Bucks.</p> <p>There are no NHS Hospitals in the District and residents therefore rely on hospitals in High Wycombe, Slough and Hillingdon. SBDC is discussing health care issues with the Primary Care Trust.</p>
TRAFFIC / PARKING	
<p>Traffic concerns should be addressed to benefit residents who live there. (910). Traffic congestion is bad. (943, 957, 1126). Recent 'improvements' (e.g. at 5 Points) have made it worse. Road near station needs</p>	<p>The problem of traffic congestion at Burnham is noted in paragraph 3.104 of the Core Strategy Emerging Approach document. The Council will work closely with the Highways Authority to explore solutions to existing traffic problems in the Burnham area.</p>

widening. (957). Traffic hotspot would be intensified by further development. (994)	
SHOPPING	
Town Centre has lots of independent retailers. These should be supported in preference to large chain stores. (937) More needs to be done to support shops in the centre of Burnham. (1057, 792)	Whilst local authorities have control over the location, type and scale of retail development, they are not able to specify and control the occupants of units.
Its role as a shopping location is falling because it costs to park at Jennery Rd and the one at Summers Rd is awkward to get to. The departure of Budgens is a major loss, and is due to lack of footfall / parking charges. There should be free parking in both car parks and along west side of High St. (792, 1113). Loss of 30 mins free parking at Summers Road car park will reduce shoppers using the village. (1124)	It is understood that a national retail chain has taken over the lease on the former Budgens store. The charging of public car parks is not a matter for the Core Strategy.
It is not appropriate for the Red Squirrel pub to be a Tesco or similar. Residential uses would be better (1057)	Site of former Red Squirrel public house is in Slough, not South Bucks.
Bishop centre should be retained as a specialist shopping facility. (1266, 1267). If Bishop Centre and Sainsburys are allowed to expand, Burnham High Street will die. (792)	The Bishop centre in Taplow is beginning to age and its redevelopment would be supported by the Council, subject to ensuring that it maintains a scale and role that does not have an adverse impact on Burnham, Slough and Maidenhead town centres. Whilst the Council has control over the location, type and scale of retail development at the Bishop centre, it is not able to specify and control the occupants of units.
LOSS OF CHARACTER	
Any further development in Burnham will alter the character for the worse. (1028) Residential densities are higher than in other parts. (1076, 1126) Burnham is already densely populated and is close to flood plains.	It is recognised that there is a local concern that the higher densities and intensification that have occurred in recent years as a result of revised national planning guidance in PPS3 are having a negative affect on local character in Burnham and elsewhere. However, as existing residential densities are already higher in Burnham than in Beaconsfield or Gerrards Cross, there is less scope for

Any further development would spoil the village nature of Burnham. (1064)	further intensification / infill development than in those settlements. Only a very small part of Burnham is within a medium risk flood zone.
OTHER ISSUES	
Green Belt land around Burnham should be maintained. (165, 938)	There are no proposals to review the Green Belt boundary in South Bucks District.

The following other comments were also made:

- Local infrastructure already stretched - particularly hospitals, schools and car parking. (889) Burnham infrastructure creaks and groans. (1063)
- No transport to Burnham and infrastructure (1022)
- Unfortunate that north Burnham is now deficient in local parks. Burnham Memorial Ground was intended to be held in perpetuity as a play area for the people of Wood Road - but has been partially developed, and the remainder has been appropriated by Burnham Football Club. (891)
- Burnham Park provides open space which can be used by all, including residents north of the village. (960)
- A playground by Wymers Road would be an asset. (1124)
- The village lacks a quality hotel within the village centre or close to Burnham Station and M4 J7. (1185)
- As Burnham is at the extreme southern end of South Bucks, roads are completely ignored, with contractors not finishing job properly. (1020)
- Taplow station could become a transport hub for much of Burnham, with buses / cycleways connecting there - would be good. Is the Bishop centre running efficiently? (979)
- Problem with traffic on A4, also for Mill Lane development. Extra density on A4 near Maidenhead Bridge with HGV lorries. (1165) A4 Bath Road is very congested and at times is at a standstill. (792)
- Most Burnham residents choose to drive to Windsor or Maidenhead for major shopping. A bus service to the new shopping centre in High Wycombe will probably be well used. (960)
- Public transport in Burnham only goes East/West and South into Berkshire. No transport North of village e.g. to Beaconsfield or High Wycombe. (1076)
- Burnham does not have strong links with Slough. Most people use Windsor or Reading for shopping etc. (1106)
- The place shaping plan for Burnham would ensure the viability of shops in the town. (1099)
- Burnham village has a good range of shops and is not in need of environmental improvements. (960, 994)
- Burnham has more of a village feel than Beaconsfield or Gerrards Cross. (994)

- Petty crime and teenage loitering are issues together with a lack of public transport. (1076) Yobs hanging around Burnham - they need somewhere to go. (1085).
- Need more public sector housing for elderly residents - e.g. sheltered housing. (984)
- Broadly in agreement. (993)
- Hunts Wood north of Burnham, Burnham Gore, common rights. Top of Brickfield Lane (common rights) preserve the country walk. (1045)
- Burnham is less well provided for than the north of the District, and prices support this view. Its proximity to Slough should be regarded as a positive, not a negative. We need to be mindful of a wider context - especially Slough (and perhaps Hillingdon & Maidenhead). Developments in Green Lane & the Fairway have been poorly supervised by SBDC. (44) Burnham and Slough should work together for the future planning of the area. (979)
- Burnham has been a dumping ground for social housing and problem families. This group does nothing for the economy. (1185)
- What are the housing advantages of Burnham's close relationship with Slough? (1124)
- The land bordered by Wymers Wood Road and Poyle Lane should not be included. This area of woodland has recently been refused planning permission for development. (1191)
- Site 13 to the west of Burnham separates Slough/Burnham from Maidenhead and it is inappropriate, as it stops settlements from merging.

Other Settlements

Iver / Richings Park

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
HGV & OTHER TRAFFIC	
There is a need for a relief road from the main industrial areas of Iver/Richings Park , Ridgeway, Thorney Business Park and Court Lane) to be included in document (124, 797, 955, 987, 989, 990, 1005, 1021,1027, 1029, 1058, 100, 1114, 1021, 1171, 1194) There is plenty of land. Route could run from the end of the Ridgeway Estate to Mansion Lane or the Red Lion Junction of Wood Lane. (927). There is a	<p>The Core Strategy Emerging Approach document acknowledged that there are problems with HGV and commercial traffic in the Iver and Richings Park area, and clearly this issue continues to be a major public concern. Many people have suggested that a relief road would be a possible solution. The document indicated that whilst traffic flows are higher than would be normally expected, they are not of a magnitude that would justify a relief road.</p> <p>Further work is being carried out by the Highways Authority on this issue, looking at options for reducing the problem and whether a relief road is needed.</p>

<p>longstanding problem of HGVs passing through Iver on unsuitable roads. A relief road for Richings Park and Iver High St is needed now. (1167, 1100) There is a longstanding problem of HGVs passing through Iver on unsuitable roads. A relief road for Richings Park and Iver High St is needed now. (1167) The Council has abnegated its responsibility for effective traffic management in the Iver /Richings Park area by allowing development. This needs to be addressed urgently, for example by providing a relief road from the Ridgeway, Court Lane and Thorney sites. (1052) Traffic problems along North Park / Richings Way are becoming untenable. Former is not even a classified road. I've always believed Green Belt was sacrosanct but not any more, to relief the situation. (990).</p>	
<p>Ridgeway estate requires a rear exit to remove HGV traffic from Iver village and Richings Park. (1002) HGVs go to and from the Ridgeway, day and night through Iver High Street. I cannot get any sleep. (1058) HGV traffic on North Rd and Richings Way is 5 times heavier than it should be for such a road, which underlines need for a back exit to Ridgeway trading estate to avoid Richings Park. (1102)</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there are problems with HGV and commercial traffic in the Iver and Richings Park area, and clearly this issue continues to be a major public concern. Many people have suggested that a relief road would be a possible solution and different routes have been suggested, including a road passing along the canal from the Ridgeway that crosses over the canal and railway towards Slough. However, this would be prohibitively expensive and not viable without allowing significant amount of development to pay for it. Further work is being carried out by the Highways Authority on this issue, looking at options for reducing the problem and whether a relief road is needed.</p>
<p>High Street needs regenerating / redeveloping. (935) No re-shaping of the High Street is possible until the [HGV] problem is solved. (1027) Remove HGVs from High Street (1051)</p>	<p>The Core Strategy Emerging Approach document acknowledges that Iver village High Street is in need of regeneration (para 2.160 and 3.55), including increased retail provision. The Council is working closely with the Highways Authority to examine options for resolving the problem of HGV / commercial traffic in the Iver area, but it is understood that there are currently limited alternative routes to the High Street for such vehicles to use, given restrictions imposed by adjoining authorities.</p>

<p>HGV generating sites should be located where they have direct access to the main road network without passing through residential areas. (797, 955, 987, 1110, 1114, 1029, 1052, 1090, 1091, 1154, 1167)</p>	<p>The Core Strategy Emerging Approach document acknowledged that there are problems with HGV and commercial traffic in the Iver and Richings Park area, and clearly this issue continues to be a major public concern. It is acknowledged that much of the HGV traffic passes through rural and residential areas, but there are limits to managing the routing of such vehicles due to weight restrictions imposed by the London borough of Hillingdon. One option for reducing the problem is to allow the redevelopment of Court Lane Strategic Site for B1 business uses. Whilst there are limits to what can be done in terms of other existing established HGV generating sites, the Council will ensure that any new employment uses do not exacerbate the HGV problems in this area.</p>
<p>Excessive HGV vehicles in Richings Way are a danger to pedestrians. (1032). Without action, there will be a serious accident in Iver involving an HGV. (927, 935)</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that there are problems with HGV and commercial traffic in the Iver and Richings Park area, and clearly this issue continues to be a major public concern. The safety of drivers and pedestrians on roads is a matter for the Highways authority, although the number of people killed or seriously injured (KSI) is understood not to be particularly high in the Iver/Richings Park area.</p>
<p>INFRASTRUCTURE</p>	
<p>Infrastructure in Iver is at breaking point - schools, allotments support local economy. Secondary school children have to be bussed out. (1039) New senior school needed in Iver Village. (1059) A new grammar school and extensions to colleges are needed if new development occurs in the east of the District. (1056) No senior school - nearest is Chalfont Community College, 9 miles away. (1059)</p>	<p>SBDC is aware that there are existing school capacity issues in parts of the District, including Iver, with some parents being unable to access local schooling. SBDC is working with the Education Authority on the likely future demand for school places in South Bucks. The Council will consider seeking financial contributions towards school provision from development schemes where there is clear evidence from the education authority that this is needed.</p>

The following other comments were also made:

- Court Lane, Bardon Estate, Ridgeway and Thorney Business Park need a solution to HGV access for the area as a whole. Should be considered in the context of possible future rail and runway expansion at Heathrow. (895)
- Need strategies to maintain Iver village. Its character has changed. Are you aware of developments in the so called business park? (1005)
- Iver Village has a problem with HGVs as they cannot exit through Hillingdon due to weak bridge on Iver Lane, apparently. (989)

- The management of HGV traffic in the Richings park area is listed as a problem, but no proposals are included in the document to address it. There should at least be a policy of restricting development of proposals involving HGV use to non residential areas. (1103)
- Richings Park experiences 10,000 vehicles daily, many HGVs. (797)
- Richings Park / Iver have a major HGV problem. Once the industrial site at Iver is fully occupied, this will make the problem worse. This has not been considered in the strategy. (124)
- Remove heavy traffic from agricultural roads! (1157)
- Local trading estate has grown out of proportion to Iver village. Reduce or move local industry. (1166)
- The Ridgeway and Bison sites produce large numbers of HGV movements, which cause probably more problems than Court Lane. (989)
- No improvements proposed for Richings Park. Present issues for Richings Park include building work and parking in all roads. (1154)
- Overall this emerging strategy looks very good. It does not address increasing and heavy volumes of road traffic (at least in south of district) and ways to encourage use of public transport. (1057)
- Need affordable transport in evenings and on Sundays. Reinstate public library as a focus for community cohesion. (1051)
- Extremely limited access to green space - particularly for dog walkers.
- Urgent need for local school, more public transport. (1100)
- Iver and Iver Heath need support to keep open small shops, services etc, as there are a lot of elderly people and bus services are poor. (630)
- No decent shops. Nearest supermarket is in Langley. (1059)
- We should take advantage of the Crossrail connections at Iver and Taplow Stations, with local affordable housing and improved transport connections northwards. (939)
- If no reference is made to the need for an HGV exit route from Iver industrial areas (or a relief road) we will not be able to ask for one if or when major infrastructure developments are permitted in the area.(1090, 1091)
- Local people do not all work within the village. The majority that work on the Ridgeway Trading estate travel in from Hillingdon, Slough and Maidenhead. (934)
- Impacts of development outside South Bucks should be taken into account for a joined up approach - e.g. in Richings Park we have Heathrow 3rd runway, M4, M25, Colnbrook incinerator etc. The effect of these on pollution, air quality & road safety should be assessed, in particular as a result of HGV traffic. (1103)
- Any land released for housing in the green belt should be small scale only and NOT of the scale of the proposed Project Pinewood. (1090)

Iver Heath

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
<p>Concern over impact of Project Pinewood. (944, 1001) If Project Pinewood takes place, a new access road off the A412 will be needed. (1160) Project Pinewood has not been mentioned. It is vital that all concerns are aired as it will be contentious. (1181) Project Pinewood will increase local traffic congestion and place additional pressure on local schools. (906)</p>	<p>Project Pinewood is shown in the Core Strategy Emerging Approach document as one of the sites put forward for development by landowners and developers. However, at the time of publication, no planning application had been received. An application has now been received and it is pending a formal decision. It is possible that the final decision will be out of the control of the Council, for example if it were to be 'called in' by the Secretary of State or decided on appeal. Residents concerns over the impact of the scheme are acknowledged. Should permission be granted, then it will be important for the necessary infrastructure to be secured.</p>
<p>Has Project Pinewood been factored into the District Council's assessment of how it will deliver 1,880 dwellings. (906) Are these 1800 homes in addition to the 2000 planned at Pinewood? If not than surely no, don't need both & planning permission on Green Belt land & Pinewood should be refused. (630, 1040)</p>	<p>The Council is highly likely to meet its South East Plan requirement of 1,880 dwellings (2006-26) without Project Pinewood. However, the South East Plan makes it clear that application cannot be rejected solely because the SEP target has been reached. It will therefore need to be decided purely on its merits. Whilst the site is not required to meet the SEP target, it will be necessary for the Council to consider the implications of Project Pinewood on the local infrastructure, so that improvements can be secured should permission be granted.</p>

The following other comments were also made:

- Too many HGV movements, particularly in Church Road. (896)
- Keep small and medium sized settlements as small as possible - otherwise they will be lost forever. (899)
- Developments that will impact upon Iver Heath include Crossrail, Heathrow Expansion, Project Pinewood, relocation of Iver Station, Park and Ride in Iver. (916)
- If Project Pinewood were to deliver high quality low density housing it might be beneficial to the local area. (902)

Farnham Common / Royal

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
Impact of MSA. (900, 1140) MSA traffic should be discouraged from moving south on A355. (1131)	The Motorway Service Area at Beaconsfield was granted permission at a public inquiry and has now been built. The inspector considered traffic impacts arising from the development and considered that these would be acceptable.

The following other comments were also made:

- Traffic on A355. (900)
- Use of local roads for rat-running. (900)
- It is important to provide and encourage off street parking in Farnham Common. Some shops are finding current trading conditions difficult, especially with the arrival of national chains. The policy of allowing a short period of free off street parking should continue. (1116)
- There is a lack of young people's facilities. (675)
- Overdevelopment is affecting Burnham Beeches. (1140)
- Whilst some improvements have been made, anything that increases traffic flows through the village towards Slough will discourage use of the village facilities and increase dangers to shoppers. Hence any new affordable housing will require a new road solution to avoid the Farnhams. (1075)
- Nothing should blur the already small gap between Farnham Royal and Slough. (1084)
- Farnham Royal had 4 or 5 shops when we moved there 30 years ago. Now there is no heart to the village and only a struggling post office. Anyone with a car will drive to Farnham Common, thus adding to pollution, congestion etc. With an ageing population, local facilities should be provided. (1271)

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
Taplow should be recognised as a separate place to Burnham. Maps should show parish boundaries. Strategic sites should not result in development in nearby settlements. (1035, 197,	The Core Strategy does recognise Taplow as a separate place to Burnham. For example, Taplow village and Riverside are both listed as rural settlements on page 40. Parish / ward boundaries were not included on the maps as this would have made them overly cluttered. The Council agrees that Taplow village, which

<p>210, 1265, 1266, 1267, 1268) Taplow should retain its historical identity. (1083)</p>	<p>is a conservation area, should keep its historical identity.</p>
<p>Taplow Village / Riverside are conservation areas and need protection to prevent their character and quality being destroyed. In the previous Core Strategy Riverside's status was changed from GB 3 to GB 1. (197, 1035, 792)</p>	<p>The Council agrees that Taplow village and Riverside, which are both conservation areas, needs protection to keep their historical identity and prevent their character being destroyed. The Emerging Approach document concentrated on the 'big picture' rather than the finer detail and so did not indicate which settlements would be defined as GB3 settlements. This matter will be clarified in the version that is submitted for examination. However, Taplow Riverside will continue to enjoy considerable protection from development.</p>
<p>Taplow Parish has a vast number of leisure facilities which need to be acknowledged. Taplow's Green Belt should be especially protected with further development between Taplow Village and the A4 prohibited. (1265, 1266, 1267, 1268)</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that Taplow parish does include a number of leisure facilities, for example the Thames Adventure play facility and the cricket ground, although the Open Space Strategy indicates that there are some qualitative and quantitative open space deficiencies.</p>
<p>List of rural settlements is incomplete - e.g. Cliveden, Dropmore and Odds Farm. Taplow Village & Riverside are GB1 settlements and should be removed from the list or have their GB status noted. Policy C1 will not provide adequate protection against infilling. (1265, 1266, 1267, 1268)</p>	<p>The list of rural settlements only includes those with over 50 households. Dropmore and Cliveden are one off schemes rather than settlements.</p> <p>The Emerging Approach document concentrated on the 'big picture' rather than the finer detail and so did not indicate which settlements would be defined as GB3 settlements. This matter will be clarified in the version that is submitted for examination. However, as conservation areas, Taplow Village and Riverside will continue to enjoy considerable protection from development.</p>
<p>Pressures on water resources and amenities by doubling population in Taplow should be acknowledged. Deterioration of air quality in M4/A4 corridor should be investigated, and A4 at Maidenhead Bridge should be recognised as a traffic hotspot / congestion zone. (1265, 1266, 1267, 1268)</p>	<p>It is assumed that the reference to 'doubling population in Taplow' refers to the proposed development at the Mill Lane Strategic site. The implications of development on water resources and air quality will be considered in greater detail before the Core Strategy is published.</p> <p>The Council is aware that there is a traffic congestion hotspot on the stretch of the A4 between Maidenhead and Slough, which passes close to the Mill Lane site. However, initial work indicated that local roads around the site should have</p>

	sufficient capacity to cope with the new traffic arising from the development, although any proposal would need to involve junction improvements to the site or consider realigned access onto the Bath Road.
--	---

The following other comments were also made:

- Crime, poor schooling. Need a new bridge over the Thames. (1014)
- Where are the hospitals, schools and infrastructure? (1022)
- Need to acknowledge importance of Green Belt in Taplow which separates Maidenhead from Slough and Burnham. Need to provide land for inexpensive starter homes around villages. (210)
- It is not practical to provide public transport to connect all villages and towns, so cars must be used. You must address facilitating car transport without seeing it as a source of revenue. This merely drives shoppers to free parking retail stores e.g. Sainsburys, Bishops Centre, Slough trading estate retail parks etc. (1113)
- Discouragement of large HGV vehicles using Berry Hill / Cliveden Rd for access to High Wycombe and Beaconsfield and M40 (1095)
- Should be protected from further development due to massive amount recently built at Canadian Red Cross Hospital site and Dropmore, along with proposed Mill Lane site. (1266, 1267)
- Country lanes are already congested and horse riding, cycling and walking are becoming hazardous. (792)
- Natural regeneration in Taplow parish is eliminated by deer, squirrels and rabbits which have increased dramatically due to lack of forest management. The Parish needs biodiversity protection measures. (1266, 1267)
- Taplow - Taplow's Parish Plan should be taken into consideration. (792)

- Denham - We already have a development planned on the old Kingsmill site [William King Flour Mill]. No room for anything else. (998)
- Denham - increased density close to Denham village would increase risk of flooding. (1069)
- Denham - Lack of schools in area. (1155)
- Denham Green - Development has been considerable in past 5 years - e.g. Denham Garden Village. No further large scale development is appropriate. (1046)
- Higher Denham - Need to ensure that development is in communities big enough to support at least local shops - e.g. could Higher Denham be expanded to make it viable? (988)

Dorney

- Concern over continuing development on Dorney Rowing Lake. Needs to be implemented quickly. (1073)

- Village life centres on pub which is dying and the village hall. (902)
- Any increase in development at Gerrards Cross will have an adverse effect on Fulmer due to increased traffic through the village. (1097)
- The unclassified road through Fulmer is already grossly overloaded, especially in rush hour. (1160)

George Green

- Public transport and community facilities are limited. Not a suitable location for future development. (921)

Stoke Poges

- Village has been overdeveloped with a hideous monstrosity on the Former Bells Hill Centre. Loss of library facility. (933)
- SBDC has already destroyed the centre of Stoke Poges. Village centres will only survive if people want to shop there. (1269)
- Council needs to rectify the damage it did when it closed the shopping centre and library. (79)

General comments / District wide

The following comments were made:

- Local infrastructure already stretched - particularly hospitals, schools and car parking. (889, 1128)
- Traffic and speed on local roads. Lack of parking areas. Clogged local roads. Road infrastructure under maintenance strain. (1012) Need more parking in town and village centres. (1122)
- Further developments should not be permitted. (961)

- Place shaping is fine but affordable housing destroys the character of an area and allows developers to profiteer! (609) Is place shaping feasible? I don't think so. (1142)
- A parking policy needs to be developed for all secondary settlements to reduce car travelling and support local infrastructure/economy. (1116). More parking needs to be available during weekdays. (965)
- Overcrowding, bad roads, druggies, lazy scroungers, criminals. (952)
- More recreational facilities needed for young people such as clubs, bowling alleys, dancing. (967)
- Keep character. (976)
- It is very important to keep large areas of Green Belt land - e.g. Black Park - but small scruffy plots should be tidied up by small development. (983)
- SBDC needs to recognise that homeowners have cars and all developments should cater for 2 cars being parked not 1.5!! (1079)
- Be careful on design. Avoid architectural dictatorship. (1082)
- Need to anticipate future infrastructure delivery, not just existing. (1082)
- Very interesting reading. (1170)
- I agree with your analysis. (1178) It seems clear and accurate in its description of these settlements. (1118)
- Create paths for cyclists! (1180)
- Green infrastructure should be regarded as important open space and protected in line with National Guidance PPG17. (197)
- The Green Belt's contribution to leisure and landscape should be properly analysed and protected. Management policies should be in place to protect the character of conservation areas. (1035)

Other Issues

The following questions were only asked on the full response form.

Q2 Have we identified the right strategic objectives?

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
Objective 8 should be expanded to include all parts of the natural environment, which is also important for recreation, employment and amenity. Jubilee River should be included as it is an important nature reserve. Green infrastructure should be regarded as important open space. (1265, 1266,	Objectives need to be succinct and cannot mention all natural assets. The importance of green infrastructure is recognised (see para 3.13 in the Emerging Approach) and is mentioned in objective 11. The term goes beyond just open space, however, and includes biodiversity and the historic environment etc.

1267, 1268) Add to 8 "...and Jubilee River". (792)	
--	--

The following other comments were also made:

- You have placed too much dependence on retail to maintain the vibrancy of town centres. Add waste management to objective 15. (180)
- Objective 5 should include the local centre of Stoke Poges. (79)
- Agree that more affordable housing is needed, but demand is for social rented.

Q10 Do you agree with the emerging approach to design, character and the historic environment; a safe and healthy community and open space, sport and recreation?

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
Management policies should be in place to protect conservation areas. Infilling should not be an automatic right under DC. (1265, 1266, 1267, 1268)	The Council is currently reviewing its Conservation areas and is creating newly designated areas where appropriate. Infilling is not an 'automatic right' in conservation areas (or indeed elsewhere) although in Green Belt Settlements (GB3), limited infilling may be acceptable.

The following other comments were also made:

- The Council should encourage free access to recreational areas and facilities. (79)
- Without a relief road for Iver/Richings Park, they will not be high quality, safe or healthy places to live. (124)
- Important to minimise light pollution in rural areas - e.g. down lighting. Light contributes to Global Warming. (792)

Q11 Do you agree with the emerging approach to affordable housing; size and type of housing and Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople?

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
Do not agree with the use of the Green Belt for specialist housing. (1265, 1266, 1267, 1268)	It is assumed that this is referring to the development of very small sites for 100% affordable housing ('rural exception sites'). Such

	housing would be restricted to people with local connections and remain affordable in perpetuity. This type of scheme is strongly encouraged in PPS3 and the South East Plan and would be a strict exception to normal Green Belt policy and such sites would remain in the Green Belt.
--	---

The following other comments were also made:

- SBDC should only provide the legal minimum accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers (1269) There should be no increase in provision for Travellers (1274)
- Accept need for more affordable housing and mixed affordable/private housing, but developers are reluctant to build them. Therefore some affordable housing will need to stand on its own, and for maintenance reasons, shared ownership is preferred. Most affordable housing should be built in the south of the district, where job opportunities are likely to be greatest. (180)
- The document makes it clear that the housing targets are likely to be met, though I am not clear how the affordable housing target will be met. There is vagueness about the proposals for the siting of affordable housing, though there are several references to Rural Exception sites. Affordable housing should be provided alongside the developments which are funding it in those locations, whichever Scenario is adopted. (1270)
- Affordable housing should be spread evenly across the district, not just at Wilton Park, unless all key workers are expected to move there. (124)
- Affordable housing is essential so younger people stay. (165) Affordable housing should be concentrated on needs of local first time buyers and key workers. (1274)
- We need more sheltered housing and retirement communities for ageing population. (792)

Q12 Do you agree with the emerging approach to maintaining local economic prosperity and healthy and viable town and village centres?

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
Pressures exerted by supermarkets continue to lead to loss of small retail outlets and specialist shops, resulting in a lack of variety. Policies and DC mechanisms should	Whilst local authorities have control over the location, type and scale of retail development, they are not normally able to control the occupants of units, for example to specify that national chains

ameliorate this trend. (1265, 1266, 1267, 1268)	cannot occupy them.
---	---------------------

The following other comments were also made:

- I agree. Trends indicate a decline in small shops. If we suffer from empty shops, we should be sympathetic to applications for these to be converted into dwellings. (180)
- All village centres should be considered not just the already viable ones. Home working should be encouraged. (1271)
- Stagnation will not maintain economic prosperity. We need growth in all centres, not just larger cities. (124)
- Redundant brownfield land should be considered for housing. (165)
- As the working age population is expected to fall, we should not increase employment in the District, as it would encourage in-commuting. (792)

Q13 Do you agree with the emerging approach to Green Belt, landscape and biodiversity?

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
Policies relating to Green Belt, recreation, amenity are not dealt with in sufficient depth. Green Belt is treated like a homogeneous entity but in order to ensure conservation and enhancement it is necessary to identify each part. Otherwise the Green Belt will be eroded. (1265, 1266, 1267, 1268)	<p>There will be further more detailed policies on Green Belt and on other issues within the Development Management policies DPD.</p> <p>The Council agrees that the Green Belt is a policy designation and that it contains many types of landscape rather than being homogeneous. Indeed the Council has produced a Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) of the District and this indicates a number of landscape zones. It is intended that the protection and enhancement of landscape outside of the AONB will be informed by the LCA.</p> <p>http://www.southbucks.gov.uk/documents/south_bucks_landscape_character_assessment_2003.pdf</p>
Needs to be an alignment between policies and delivery to protect environment, as implementation is reliant on private sector and DC. Add Jubilee River to landscape section as a	Agree that there needs to be alignment between policies and delivery. The Delivery sections will be expanded in the next version of the Core Strategy.

<p>feature to be protected and enhanced. Biodiversity / woodland should be protected elsewhere than Burnham Beeches and "other designated sites". (1265, 1266, 1267, 1268, 792)</p>	<p>It is not practical or necessary to mention every river and stream in the Landscape section. More detailed landscape policies will be included in a subsequent DPD. The Council agrees that biodiversity should be protected elsewhere than Burnham Beeches and other designated sites. Indeed it does add the words "and other areas" in the Emerging Approach document to cover this.</p>
---	--

The following other comments were also made:

- The transfer of ownership of Stoke Common to City of London was a step in the right direction. (1269)
- Yes, provided that Green Belt land released for development does not defeat purpose of preventing coalescence with neighbouring settlements or maintaining an attractive environment. (180)
- The document says there will be no need to release land from the Green Belt for housing, yet Wilton Park is in the Green Belt. The site will not be viable if only the built up area is redeveloped with 300 homes. To make it viable, the whole site will have to be released, which is contradictory. If there are plans to release land from Green Belt, Richings Park/Iver area should be included to fund a relief road. (124)

Q14 Do you agree with the emerging approach to pollution, waste and water environment; reducing the risk of flooding and sustainable energy?

Summary of issue raised	Officer Response
<p>Problems arising from lorries carrying biomass should be taken into account. (1265, 1266, 1267, 1268)</p>	<p>The Core Strategy Emerging Approach encourages combined heat and power plants using biomass, which is consistent with national and regional policy on large sites, but the traffic impacts of this would need to be deemed acceptable prior to a planning permission being granted.</p>

The following other comments were also made:

- Need for measures to reduce traffic congestion, off road parking capacity, expansion of medical facilities, sewerage system and cessation of landfill with biodegradable waste at Wapseys Wood and Springfield Farm. (180)
- I like your paragraphs 3.98-101. However, is zero carbon attainable? Do not indulge in promotion of energy using expensive and faddist devices. You should mention the importance of co-ordinating your plans with waste management plans from County Council. (180)
- Low risk uses such as recreation should be moved to flood prone areas, releasing land for housing and industry. (79)
- Reduce flooding by using less hard landscaping. Make householders / commercial properties more accountable. (165)
- Must insist on environmentally sustainable buildings. Be prepared to relax 'in character' requirements to support innovative solutions. (1274)

Q15 Do you agree with the emerging approach to accessibility and transport and infrastructure?

The following comments were made:

- There isn't 'an approach'. It is minimalistic, ignores dreadful state of roads, traffic flows to/from Slough and makes no investment in the future. It does not appear to have involved contact with Slough and relies only on s.106 contributions from developers. (1269)
- All urban developments should embody principles of Green Infrastructure wherever possible. (180)
- The A355 should not be degraded (in capacity or speed limit). It has intersections with M40 and M4 so it will always be the route of choice for residents. It should be improved to make it safer and more in character with its role, and its use encouraged. (79)
- In measuring effectiveness by % of new housing close to public transport, consideration should be given to public transport operating at intervals of no more than 10 minutes between 0600 and 2300, rather than half hourly at unspecified times, which is ridiculous. All major developments should have a travel plan. (79)
- Building houses away from main transport links is not environmentally friendly. Strategic sites are away from transport links. (124)
- Infrastructure is creaking - e.g. sewerage and education (Bucks CC responsibility). (165)
- Local residents need to use their car and need affordable parking solutions. (1274)