

## Stakeholder Responses

Respondent No:	1238
Respondent:	Slough Borough Council
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	None of the proposed Spatial Strategy Scenarios would have a significant impact on Slough. Concern that there is no justification for additional retail provision at the Bishop Centre, Taplow.

Respondent No:	1239
Respondent:	Three Rivers District Council
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	Agree with proposed emerging Spatial Strategy.

Respondent No:	1240
Respondent:	Davenies School
Agent:	N/A
Site:	Davenies School, Beaconsfield
Principal Issues:	Support view that open space for sport and recreation should be protected. However, practical operation of current Local Plan Policy L7 (Green Space), has inhibited proper development of the School. Where development has already taken place, or the Green Space adjoins substantial development, it becomes low value and appropriate development in context of school needs would benefit the community. Davenies should would like to talk to SBDC about i) protection of high quality open space, sports and recreation facilities, and ii) the potential for redevelopment of low value areas, currently zoned as Green Space.

Respondent No:	1241
Respondent:	Chilterns Conservation Board
Agent:	N/A
Site:	Chilterns AONB
Principal Issues:	AONB should be specifically referenced in the sections on "key Characteristics of the District" and "Issues, Problems and Challenges". Support for Strategic Objectives - particularly 6, 7, 9 and 11. Amend Strategic Objective 8 to refer to "conserve and enhance" - to accord with PPS7, NP&AC Act 1949. No growth should take place in the AONB or its setting. Support for Council's emerging view in connection with design, character and the historic environment. Strong support for highest priority being given to the conservation and enhancement of the AONB (para 3.171). Board happy to assist in the delivery of the associated policy.

Respondent No:	1242
Respondent:	Buckinghamshire Fire and Rescue Services
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A

<b>Principal Issues:</b>	<p>Amend Strategic Objective 13 to "Ensure that new developments are designed in such a way as to promote community safety".</p> <p>BFRS need to be satisfied that development within flood risk areas at Mill Lane is necessary. If it is, adequate flood defences must be provided and access facilitated to ensure safety in the event of emergencies.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.9 should include reference to fire suppression sprinkler systems - to demonstrate a further consideration in relation to promotion of community safety. Sprinkler systems help to protect vulnerable occupiers.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.94 should be worded more robustly to ensure there is no development in any areas at risk from flooding without appropriate assessment and mitigation, to ensure community safety.</p> <p>Potential development sites (such as Project Pinewood) have a potentially significant impact on the delivery of emergency services. Suitable policies required to deliver the infrastructure required to ensure community safety.</p>
--------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Respondent No:</b>	1243
<b>Respondent:</b>	CPRE Penn Country District
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	N/A
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	<p>How to control development to minimise overachievement of the 1,880 dwellings.</p> <p>Concern about increasing traffic congestion in Beaconsfield, and limited options for avoiding further deterioration.</p> <p>Support for proposals aimed at delivering more affordable housing.</p> <p>Given the scale of development that might occur in South Bucks over the next 15-20 years, CPRE concerned that the population of the District might increase quite significantly (by between 5,000-12,500).</p>

<b>Respondent No:</b>	1244
<b>Respondent:</b>	The Theatre Trust
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	N/A
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	<p>Reference should be made to cultural facilities at para 3.58.</p> <p>Although there are no dedicated theatres in South Bucks, successful theatrical provision in community halls and local churches should be afforded policy protection.</p> <p>Developer contributions should be sought towards community and cultural infrastructure.</p> <p>Support for preparation of a Developer Contributions SPD.</p>

<b>Respondent No:</b>	1245
<b>Respondent:</b>	Groundwork - Colne Valley
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Colne Valley Park
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	<p>Important to encourage positive management of the Green Belt and provide support to "managers" of the Green Belt (e.g. farmers).</p> <p>No land should be released from the Green Belt for housing development. However, if releases are required, these should not be in the AONB or Colne Valley Park.</p> <p>No support for potential contingency site, to the north east of Gerrards Cross, in the Colne Valley Park.</p> <p>Support for redevelopment of Court Lane, although this must go hand in hand with public access, biodiversity and landscape improvements to the adjacent lakes, rivers and section of the Slough Arm.</p> <p>Section 3.7 should make reference to the CVP historic landscape Characterisations.</p> <p>Provision of Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople accommodation should not conflict with Green Belt policy.</p>

<b>Respondent No:</b>	1246
<b>Respondent:</b>	Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Biodiversity Partnership
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A

Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	<p><b>ADDITIONAL DETAILED COMMENTS FOR ACTION (SEE FULL RESPONSE)</b></p> <p>Need to emphasise importance of conservation and enhancement of the natural environment is a key challenge across the whole of the District.</p> <p>Support for Strategic Objectives 8 and 9, but emerging Spatial Strategy not supported.</p> <p>There should be strong protection for areas designated for their landscape or ecological importance (including ancient woodland) - as well as for BAP habitat on non-designated sites.</p> <p>Importance of Local Biodiversity Sites and Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.</p> <p>The Council's emerging view should place strong emphasis on the maintenance and enhancement of the ecological network to reflect guidance contained in PPS9 - this would also be consistent with the Biodiversity Opportunity Area approach which has been developed to deliver the South East Biodiversity Strategy and the Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Biodiversity Action Plan.</p>

Respondent No:	1247
Respondent:	Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	<p><b>DETAILED COMMENTS FOR ACTION (SEE FULL RESPONSE) SEE COVERING LETTER DETAILED COMMENTS ON SA</b></p> <p>Key challenges section needs to be expanded to incorporate the wealth of important natural environment areas in SBD, not just Burnham Beeches.</p> <p>Whichever development options are selected, biodiversity and the protection and enhancement of the natural environment will need to be considered and (areas avoided) in accordance with the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (Section 40).</p> <p>Recognition of the role of Green Infrastructure supported.</p>

Respondent No:	1248
Respondent:	NFU South East Region
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	Generic response - highlighting issues of concern to NFU.

Respondent No:	1249
Respondent:	The Coal Authority
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	No specific comments.

Respondent No:	1250
Respondent:	Wycombe District Council
Agent:	N/A
Site:	Wycombe District
Principal Issues:	In setting out the strategic planning context, it should be acknowledged that High Wycombe is a Regional Hub in the South East Plan. There should also be recognition of the Regional Coach way Proposal at Handy Cross, as an important sub-regional facility.

Respondent No:	1251
Respondent:	Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A

Principal Issues:	<p>The Mill Lane Strategic Site is located adjacent to the boundary between South Bucks and Maidenhead. Care needed to ensure that redevelopment has no additional impact on the surrounding Green Belt and that the setting of the River Thames is enhanced.</p> <p>Improved access to the river would be strongly supported.</p> <p>Redevelopment should take account of nearby structure of acknowledged importance, including Maidenhead Bridge (Grade 1 Listed).</p> <p>Significant existing congestion on the A4.</p> <p>RBWM would wish to be consulted on any planning application for redevelopment of the Mill Lane area.</p>
-------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Respondent No:	1252
Respondent:	SEEDA
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	<p>South Bucks fall within the Inner South East Economic Contour as identified with the RES. CS Strategic objectives broadly complement the aspirations of SEEDA and the targets contained within the RES.</p> <p>SEEDA recognises that SBD comprises a very high proportion of Green Belt land, but considers it important that businesses within the Green Belt have the ability to intensify their uses in order to remain competitive.</p> <p>Support for approach towards affordable housing and mix of housing types - complements RES Target 9.</p> <p>SEEDA welcomes commitment to retaining employment land in employment use, and allowing the intensification of business uses on existing employment land to meet the needs of the District. Reference should be made to the Smart Growth Targets in the RES.</p> <p>Welcome references to encouraging home-working and provision of incubator units for small firms.</p> <p>SEEDA emphasise the importance of ICT in delivering Smart Growth - in particular next generation broadband. Guidance to be issued on how next generation access can be delivered through planning.</p> <p>Support for references to increasing water use efficiency and recycling rates.</p>

Respondent No:	1253
Respondent:	GOSE
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	<p>Good to see scenarios being tested.</p> <p>Does a lack of a vision at this stage cause any problems?</p> <p>Through discussion with relevant agencies and infrastructure providers, have any show stoppers been identified that rule out or limited the scope of the options / scenario development?</p> <p><b>Guidance on content of CS at Publication stage - see e-mail.</b></p>

Respondent No:	1254
Respondent:	PINS
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	<b>Guidance on process of "Publication".</b>

Respondent No:	1255
Respondent:	English Heritage
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	Pleased that protection and enhancement of historic environment recognised as a key challenge.

	<p>Para 1.22/Appendix 2 should also include the proposed Settlement Character Study (para 3.3).</p> <p>Reference to the historic environment should be made in the section 'Key Characteristics of the District'</p> <p>EH would welcome consideration of the historic environment as a key strategic spatial issue in the same way that conservation and enhancement of the natural environment is addressed.</p> <p>Consideration to the historic environment outside of the settlements needs to be given. Agree with approach to strategic sites but would like more emphasis on protection of individual heritage assets and their setting at Taplow Riverside.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Respondent No:</b>	1256
<b>Respondent:</b>	Natural England
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	N/A
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	<p>Overall 3 comments: need for recognition and measures to address high car use and the very high CO2 emissions in the District.</p> <p>Need for stronger policy on green infrastructure, to better protect existing open spaces, particularly in urban areas, and to recognise the importance of open spaces to biodiversity.</p> <p>The need to ensure landscape issues have been properly considered in each of the Spatial Strategy Scenarios.</p> <p><b>Additional detailed comments and suggestions on each section of Core Strategy and SA</b></p>

<b>Respondent No:</b>	1257
<b>Respondent:</b>	British Waterways
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	N/A
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	<p>Request the following is added to the list of strategic objectives: <i>'Maximise the full potential of the District's unique waterway assets, in terms of sustainability, leisure, tourism, education and improved health and well being'</i>.</p> <p>Court Lane, Iver - Slough Arm of Grand Union Canal abuts the Site and this should be utilised in terms of sustainability, visual amenity and freight opportunities (especially with the need to reduce HGV traffic on local roads).</p> <p>Suggest South Bucks should work with British Waterways to prepare a waterspace strategy. Important to improve setting of Grand Union Canal as well as River Thames.</p> <p>Comment that residential moorings can offer an alternative housing type which can be more affordable and add life to the waterways.</p>

<b>Respondent No:</b>	1258
<b>Respondent:</b>	SEERA
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	N/A
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	<p>Part 2 - could make links with how spatial strategy approach will support the regional hubs of Slough and High Wycombe.</p> <p>Draft submission core strategy should include commitment to meeting housing land requirements set out in draft SEP.</p> <p>Employment - could refer to definition of Smart Growth as in RE5 of draft SEP. Sustainable Construction and Sustainable Energy could be strengthened to reflect the relevant policies in draft SEP.</p> <p>Infrastructure - reference definition of infrastructure as in draft SEP box 6.2 and 6.3.</p> <p>Implementation strategy will need to identify what infrastructure is required to support CS, when required and how delivered. Would support a policy on developer</p>

Respondent No:	1259
Respondent:	Thames Water
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	<p>Localised upgrades may be required due to growth in catchment - especially in smaller catchments.</p> <p>Wilton Park - serious concerns regarding Water Waste Services - sewage treatment and network capacity unlikely to be able to cope with increased demand.</p> <p>Mill Lane, Taplow - concerns regarding Water and Waste Water Services to this site. Further investigation necessary. Development brief for site should include words to this effect (see <a href="#">detailed wording in Response</a>)</p> <p>Court Lane, Iver - concerns regarding Water Waste Services. Investigation works necessary. Development brief for site should include words to this effect (see <a href="#">detailed wording in Response</a>). Odour control needs to be managed and development suitable to location.</p> <p><b>DETAILED COMMENTS FOR ACTION (SEE FULL RESPONSE)</b></p>

Respondent No:	1260
Respondent:	Highways Agency
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	<p>Recommend the Council build on the transport evidence work conducted by Chiltern DC - essential that transport evidence base is completed well before next stage of consultation.</p> <p><a href="#">See further more detailed comments regarding the strategic sites and a number of other issues.</a></p>

Respondent No:	1261
Respondent:	Thames Valley Policy Authority
Agent:	RPS
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	<p>Would encourage inclusion of a similar policy to that of EP6 in 1999 Local Plan.</p> <p>Object to the omission of reference to police as a key infrastructure provider for 3 strategic sites. Recommend that the Police are identified as a key infrastructure provider within CS - will enable Police to request developer contribution or new Police facilities from new development proposals.</p> <p><a href="#">Further generic information included</a></p>

Respondent No:	1262
Respondent:	Homes and Communities Agency
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	<p>Agrees with Council's emerging spatial strategy - that PDL should be principal source of housing land supply - only accessible, sustainable sites in GB should be considered if required level of housing cannot be accommodated on brownfield sites.</p> <p>Contingency sites should be located near Beaconsfield, GX and Burnham. Agree with emerging approach for Wilton Park.</p> <p>Disagree with approach towards affordable housing - para 3.26 should be reviewed to reflect requirement of mixed tenure developments.</p>

Respondent No:	1263
Respondent:	Woodland Trust
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	<p>Climate change is only mentioned once in relation to development - should be broader wording to ensure that full scale of challenges relating to climate change are covered.</p>

	<p>Would strongly object to any development that leads to the loss or deterioration of ancient trees or woodland. In line with PPS9 and policy NRM5 in SEP.</p> <p>Suggests that Council undertakes to update the Ancient Woodland Inventory. Would like the CS to acknowledge that the Districts ancient woodland and tree resources contributes to special character of area and assurances of preservation.</p> <p><b>FURTHER MORE DETAILED COMMENTS - SEE RESPONSE FORM</b></p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Respondent No:	1264
Respondent:	Sport England
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	<p>Welcome attention paid to sport and recreation related issues. Key challenge should reflect Appendix 3 comment highlighting limited access to sports halls and swimming pools.</p> <p>Would encourage development of Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities Study report to produce a local sport and recreation strategy.</p> <p>Wilton Park - audit should be done of existing sports provisions - any reduction through redevelopment should be justified and based on full evidence base.</p> <p>Delivery - note approach of 'open space' delivery through s106, however opportunity to deliver new or enhanced built facilities should be more explicit.</p> <p>Measuring effectiveness (p50) 3rd bullet not necessary as some leisure development may not be appropriate for town centres. Should use participation rates as measure so effectiveness.</p>

Respondent No:	1275
Respondent:	National Grid
Agent:	N/A
Site:	N/A
Principal Issues:	<b>Generic comments</b> - NG should be consulted on any DPD or site-specific proposals that could affect the infrastructure.

Respondent No:	1276
Respondent:	Environmental Agency
Agent:	N/A
Site:	
Principal Issues:	<p>Strategic objectives - include/amend: reducing flood risk through rigorous application so PPS25. Opportunities to remediate contaminated land should be maximised. Amend item no.9 to 'development will not result in a net loss of biodiversity'.</p> <p>Wilton Park - Preliminary Risk Assessment for Controlled Waters required for planning application.</p> <p>Mill Lane, Taplow - OBJECTION - sequential test required for <u>any</u> development on this site. Need to demonstrate the need for development on this site and all development should avoid FZ 3a and 3b. <b>Significant further information received regarding Taplow Mill site.</b></p> <p>Burnham - inconsistencies with flood maps used for SFRA, maps in CS and EA flood maps.</p> <p><b>MUCH MORE DETAILED INFORMATION IN RESPONSE.</b></p>

Respondent No:	1277
Respondent:	British Wind Energy Association
Agent:	N/A
Site:	
Principal Issues:	<p>BWEA strongly recommends the Council produce specific policies designed to deliver greater production of renewable energy and increased levels of energy efficiency. Also inclusion of specific policies on sustainable design and construction.</p> <p>Must be prepared in line with PPS22 and the Climate Change Supplement to PPS1.</p>

Respondent No:	1278
Respondent:	Buckinghamshire County Council
Agent:	N/A
Site:	
Principal Issues:	<p>Scenarios 2,3,4 and the emerging spatial strategy envisage possible release of GB land as contingency sites but BCC does not think there is sufficient evidence to explain why this might be necessary considering that the housing target in SEP is not far of being met already. BCC support in principle the redevelopment of the 3 strategic sites providing redevelopment complies with Annex 2 of PPG2. Should submitted CS include 3 strategic sites then appropriate access would need to be agreed with BCC.</p> <p>BCC generally supports the emerging spatial strategy but impact on schools will need to be addressed as capacity may not be sufficient.</p> <p>Believe that SBDC should set a % target for affordable homes over plan period rather than a number to ensure that this compares with region-wide target of 35% in SEP.</p> <p>Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople section needs to be updated to reflect current situation.</p> <p>SBDC needs to clarify position on landscape designations outside the Chilterns AONB.</p> <p>Developer contributions need to be maximised to help fund necessary infrastructure - CS should set out the mechanisms to be adopted to maximise funding through S106 agreements and CIL (if implemented).</p> <p>BCC objects to inclusion of Thorney Mill Road site being included in any DC LDF documents on basis it is safeguarded for an aggregates rail depot in BCC Mineral and Waste Local Plan.</p> <p><b>SEE RESPONSE FOR MUCH MORE DETAILED COMMENTS.</b></p>

Respondent No:	457
Respondent:	City of London - Burnham Beeches office
Agent:	N/A
Site:	
Principal Issues:	<p>Not enough consideration of environmental protection issues. Loss of any GB land around Burnham must be resisted - would have a negative impact on Burnham SAC. Buffer required to protect Burnham Beeches.</p> <p>Place shaping maps were unclear. How will you prevent speculative development occurring elsewhere in South Bucks?</p>

Respondent No:	1185
Respondent:	Burnham High Street Association
Agent:	N/A
Site:	
Principal Issues:	<p>Key challenge missed - sustainability of Burnham Village Centre. Social housing and low income families a problem in Burnham - not good for economy or social behaviour.</p> <p>Village lacks a quality hotel within village centre with in close proximity to Burnham Station and M4</p>

Respondent No:	1130
Respondent:	Buckinghamshire Community Action
Agent:	N/A
Site:	
Principal Issues:	<p>Other comments - statutory instruments 1997 (625) also allow for SO properties to be built in larger rural settlements identified by maps in SI's. These properties can be protected from right to buy by limiting equity available to purchase to a max of 80%</p>

Respondent No:	36
Respondent:	Iver Parish Council

<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Iver Parish
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	Need some method of relieving traffic in Iver and Richings Park. Court Lane proposals will not help as most HGVs do not emanate from there. Relief road could be along railway line and link up with M4/M25 once Crossrail has finished. Problem will not get any easier and relief road is essential. Agree with Court Lane as a strategic site. Iver High St can be regenerated by moving shopping area off High St. Need funding to buy land to provide a plaza and parking area. Potential to move industrial sites from High St to Ridgeway/Thorney Business Park. Need direct public transport link from Iver to Heathrow. Object to Project Pinewood. Iver Heath would be greatly affected by proposal. Please confirm that there will be no Green Belt development in Iver Heath.

<b>Respondent No:</b>	1279
<b>Respondent:</b>	Hitcham and Taplow Society
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Hitcham and Taplow
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	Add "Jubilee river" to key challenges and objective 8. Do not need to refer to specific (contingency) sites in Green Belt at this stage, as target of 94 dwellings pa has effectively been met. It is highly unlikely that contingency release will be needed. More detail needed on infrastructure requirement and how it will be provided, as housing supply will exceed plan provision. Mill Lane suggestion is excellent as it balances need to improve area with preservation of conservation area and Thames. Close Mill Lane to through traffic. SHLAA is incomplete so settlement hierarchy and scenarios are premature. Rural settlements should not be identified for infilling. Need for affordable housing and this issue is not addressed. Preserve Bishop centre for small shops. Green Belt is not a single entity. Need more refined policies on recreation, traffic reduction etc. Acknowledge role of Parish Plans, which should be SPG.

<b>Respondent No:</b>	338
<b>Respondent:</b>	Taplow Parish Council
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Taplow Parish
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	HGVs using country roads is a problem. Expand objective 8 to include Jubilee river etc. Several studies incomplete and housing figures are out of date. More significance should be given to natural environment, including biodiversity. There are no implementation strategies. The strategy is an exercise in housing location. Delete contingency sites. Police land adjoining Bishop Centre appropriate for affordable housing. Mill Lane scheme must take Taplow Riverside CA into account. Involve local councils in place shaping. Taplow should be protected List of rural settlements is incomplete. Taplow is not part of Burnham. Green Belt is not homogeneous and needs to be protected. Need a levy to provide funds for affordable housing. Do not agree specialist housing should be built in Green Belt. Need more manufacturing industry. Preserve Bishop centre for specialist shops. Investigate problems on A4 - air quality, congestion.

<b>Respondent No:</b>	197
<b>Respondent:</b>	Ellington and District Residents Association
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Ellington and District

<b>Principal Issues:</b>	Core Strategy would have benefited from a more comprehensive evidence base rather than being a response to Government housing targets. Taplow Parish Plan not acknowledged as evidence. HGVs using country roads is a problem. Include Jubilee River in objective 8. Several studies incomplete and housing figures are out of date. More significance should be given to natural environment, including biodiversity. There are no implementation strategies. The strategy is an exercise in housing location. Delete contingency sites. Police land adjoining Bishop Centre appropriate for affordable housing. Brief needed for Mill Lane scheme, which must take Taplow Riverside CA into account. Taplow should be protected from development due to amount already built/planned. It is not part of Burnham. Green Belt is not homogeneous and needs to be protected. Do not agree specialist housing should be built in Green Belt. Preserve Bishop centre for specialist shops. Investigate problems on A4 - air quality, congestion. Taplow Riverside should be protected and not a GB3 settlement. Object to 2031 Green Belt review.
--------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<b>Respondent No:</b>	106
<b>Respondent:</b>	Richings Park Residents Association
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Richings Park
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	Agree with spatial strategy. Bardons site on Thorney Mill Rd could be a contingency site or a strategic site as it would improve HGV problems and site will be vacated. Court Lane will not lead to significant improvements to HGV traffic as some companies have already moved to Bison. Take account of developments outside South Bucks such as Heathrow, Colnbrook incinerator. No proposals to address HGV problem. At least restrict HGVs to non residential roads. Do not agree that relief road not warranted. Roads around Richings Park carry over 1100 HGV movements per day. Roads not built to carry high volumes of traffic. Green Belt land should be used as a special case using Bison site access road.

<b>Respondent No:</b>	223
<b>Respondent:</b>	Beaconsfield Town Residents
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Beaconsfield
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	Our main concern is the apparent use of the Wilton Park Diversion as a device to release development in the Green Belt when it would not be sustainable or meet plan objectives. WP Diversion was not endorsed by Beaconsfield Transport Study or A355 route strategy. Not clear why the Bucks Infrastructure Study accepted its need without challenging Ling Report. Transportation evidence is incomplete. Do not object to Wilton Park redevelopment. Agree that new Pyebush access is needed and existing access point can be closed. Site should remain primarily residential (300 units) but it would remain detached from rest of town. Object to statements in 2.88 & 2.89 re Wilton Park Diversion / A355 relief road. Do not accept need for Green Belt land to be released or contingency sites. Need evidence to justify saying that affordable housing need is greatest in Beaconsfield. Approach to Green Belt and Landscape protection is supported.

<b>Respondent No:</b>	171
<b>Respondent:</b>	Denham Parish Council
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Denham Parish
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	Support spatial strategy. Support Wilton Park and Court Lane as long as infrastructure is provided. Support Mill Lane if flooding concerns as resolved. A new secondary school is needed in eastern part of District. South Bucks should not provide more than its fair share of housing across the County.

<b>Respondent No:</b>	45
<b>Respondent:</b>	Fulmer Parish Council
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A

<b>Site:</b>	Fulmer Parish
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	Add dial a Ride to transport issues. Support Wilton Park but traffic congestion problems must be resolved. Support Mill Lane if flood prevention measures are put in place. Preserve Beaconsfield Old Town character. Fulmer is in Green belt and is a conservation area so care must be taken when assessing applications. Must regularly monitor traveller sites and abuses stamped on. Economic uses more appropriate to larger urban areas. There should be few incursions into the Green Belt unless involving highway safety. Do not allow development in flood risk areas unless preventative measures put in place. Object to Project Pinewood proposals as it conflicts with Core Strategy and South East Plan. Protect Stoke Common as it is an SSSI.

<b>Respondent No:</b>	175
<b>Respondent:</b>	Hedgerley Parish Council
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Hedgerley Parish
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	It is not sustainable to identify areas in Green Belt for future development. Social housing adjacent to Hedgerley Hill would prove extremely unpopular with residents. Need to also protect landscape that is not AONB, Colne Valley Park or next to Thames.

<b>Respondent No:</b>	339
<b>Respondent:</b>	Wexham Parish Council
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Wexham Parish
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	Agree with key challenges, which will necessitate additional investment in public transport and educational facilities. Release of land for development should be at Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross. Existing development structure suits the District well - although future development should come from brownfield sites where possible, expanding small settlements. This approach will require investment in public transport and educational facilities.

<b>Respondent No:</b>	1163
<b>Respondent:</b>	Gerrards Cross Parish Council
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Gerrards Cross Parish
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	Scenario 1 is the best option. It should protect Green Belt land more effectively and reduce pressure on Gerrards Cross and Beaconsfield compared to 2. Shopping areas in Gerrards Cross should not be increased. Need to address traffic congestion in Packhorse Road.

<b>Respondent No:</b>	1154
<b>Respondent:</b>	Richings Park Residents Association
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Richings Park
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	Lorries and all day parking of cars are key challenges for Richings Park and Iver. More yellow lines needed. No improvements proposed for Richings Park to resolve any current problems i.e. building work, parking. Object to Court Lane as it will increase traffic. Bardons site on Thorney Mill Road should be considered as a strategic site. Future HGV generating development should be directed to sites with direct access to main road network.

<b>Respondent No:</b>	1118
<b>Respondent:</b>	Friends of the Colne Valley Park
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Colne Valley Park
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	Place shaping section seems clear and accurate.

<b>Respondent No:</b>	992
<b>Respondent:</b>	Bakers Wood Residents Association
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Bakers Wood
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	The selection of contingency sites should be based on the merits and disadvantages of sites not on the wishes of those who stand to gain financially. Land at Bakers Wood Denham is a case in point. The landowners wish to develop them but they are unsuitable for various reasons.

<b>Respondent No:</b>	1116
<b>Respondent:</b>	Farnham Royal Parish Council
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Farnham Royal Parish
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	Farnham Royal needs off street parking. It is well served by shops but some of these are struggling due to recession and arrival of chain stores. Need more free off street parking. Need a parking policy for all secondary settlements to reduce car travelling and support local economy. Ad hoc infill development will occur. However, if more land needed, emerging spatial strategy is the correct fall back plan. The fact that proposed development sites are near rail stations shows a commitment to reducing commuting by car. Agree that development should be concentrated on primary settlements as this will protect character of district and delay coalescence of small settlements. District Council needs to take a proactive role in regenerating strategic sites to meet needs of District.

<b>Respondent No:</b>	745
<b>Respondent:</b>	Hedsor Parish Council
<b>Agent:</b>	N/A
<b>Site:</b>	Hedsor Parish
<b>Principal Issues:</b>	Historic sites - future heritage identification, environment and climate change are key challenges missed. There are a large number of small sites that could be identified for development. Wilton Park needs to be carefully planned as park is a lung to Beaconsfield. It could be a major asset as a park and for education. Mill Lane needs integration between housing and small shops. Other strategic/contingency sites: Wycombe, Loudwater, Fulmer, Burnham, Stoke Poges. Hedsor should be designated an AONB. Hedsor is preparing a Parish Plan. Too much poor design allowed.