

	<b>South Bucks</b> District Council	<b>South Bucks Core Strategy</b> <b>Development Plan Document (DPD)</b> Publication Stage Representation Form	Ref: <b>49</b> (For official use only)
---	--	---	---

Name of the DPD to which this representation relates:

Please return to South Bucks District Council, by 5pm on Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> May 2010

By post to: Planning Policy Manager, South Bucks District Council, Capswood, Oxford Road, Denham, FREEPOST SCE9630, UB9 4BR or

By e-mail to: LDF@southbucks.gov.uk or

By fax to: 01895 837269

If you have any queries, please contact the Planning Policy Team on 01895 837200.

This form has two parts -

Part A - Personal Details

Part B - Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

## Part A

1. Personal Details*  See note below	2. Agent's Details (if applicable)
---	------------------------------------

*\*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

Title	<input type="text" value="Mr"/>	<input type="text"/>
First Name	<input type="text" value="Euan"/>	<input type="text"/>
Last Name	<input type="text" value="Felton"/>	<input type="text"/>
Job Title (where relevant)	<input type="text" value="Chairman"/>	<input type="text"/>
Organisation (where relevant)	<input type="text" value="Hitcham and Taplow Society"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 1	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Line 2	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Line 3	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Line 4	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Post Code	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
E-mail Address (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>



Important: Please note that your comments and personal details will be available for public inspection and therefore cannot be treated as confidential. Please make sure that you only give information that you are happy for others to see.

## Part B - Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation : Hitcham and Taplow Society

### 3. To which part of the DPD does this representation relate?

Paragraph  Policy  Proposals Map

### 4. Do you consider the DPD is :

4.(1) Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>
4.(2) Sound	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input checked="" type="text" value="X"/>

If you have entered **No** to 4.(2), please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances, please go to Q6.

### 5. Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

(1) Justified	<input type="text"/>
(2) Effective	<input checked="" type="text" value="X"/>
(3) Consistent with national policy	<input type="text"/>

### 6. Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The Society believes Policy 6 lacks effectiveness to support the ambitions expressed in appendix 6 (P113) to improve and expand the Rights of Way network.

(Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

### 7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 5 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Policy 6 makes no specific reference to Public Rights of Way, only referencing them under the general umbrella of Green Infrastructure. We feel this is an omission given the considerable benefit they provide to recreation, health and well-being and that bridleways serve a very large number of residents in this rural area and horse-related activities provide a considerable amount of employment. A more positive statement would be of great benefit, particularly to support the ambitions expressed in appendix 6 P113.

(Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.  
**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

**Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature:

Euan Felton

Date:

12 May 2010

Thank you for your comments.

We also encourage you to complete and return the Equal Opportunities Monitoring form to help us to monitor inclusivity. The information collected on this form will not be attributed to you, as you don't have to provide your personal details.

## Notification Request

Please complete the following if you wish to be notified of any of the following:

I request to be notified of

The submission of the Core Strategy for independent examination

The publication of the recommendations of any person appointed to carry out the independent examination of the Core Strategy

The adoption of the Core Strategy

Please specify the address to which the notification should be sent to if it is different from the one given in the front page.



**South Bucks**  
District Council

**South Bucks Core Strategy  
Development Plan Document (DPD)**  
Publication Stage Representation Form

Ref: **49**  
(For official use only)

Name of the DPD to which this representation relates:

South Bucks Core Strategy

Please return to South Bucks District Council, by 5pm on Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> May 2010

By post to: Planning Policy Manager, South Bucks District Council, Capswood, Oxford Road, Denham, FREEPOST SCE9630, UB9 4BR or

By e-mail to: LDF@southbucks.gov.uk or

By fax to: 01895 837269

If you have any queries, please contact the Planning Policy Team on 01895 837200.

This form has two parts -

Part A - Personal Details

Part B - Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

**Part A**

**1. Personal Details\***



See note below

**2. Agent's Details (if applicable)**

*\*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

Title	Mr	
First Name	Euan	
Last Name	Felton	
Job Title (where relevant)	Chairman	
Organisation (where relevant)	Hitcham and Taplow Society	
Address Line 1		
Line 2		
Line 3		
Line 4		
Post Code		
Telephone Number		
E-mail Address (where relevant)		



Important: Please note that your comments and personal details will be available for public inspection and therefore cannot be treated as confidential. Please make sure that you only give information that you are happy for others to see.

## Part B - Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation : Hitcham and Taplow Society

3. To which part of the DPD does this representation relate?

Paragraph  Policy  Proposals Map

4. Do you consider the DPD is :

4.(1) Legally compliant

Yes

No

4.(2) Sound

Yes

No

If you have entered **No** to 4.(2), please continue to Q5. In all other circumstances, please go to Q6.

5. Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:

(1) Justified

(2) Effective

(3) Consistent with national policy

6. Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the DPD, please also use this box to set out your comments.

### Legal Compliance

The Submission Core Strategy Policy 15 has been materially altered without opportunity for community involvement.

### Justified

There is no evidence of participation of the local community in the alterations

### Consistent with National Policy

Some wording is not consistent with National Policy

(Continue on a separate sheet / expand box if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 5 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Bullet point 2 of Policy 15 is not in conformity with the prior consultation draft. By omission of certain wording and a truncated sentence it materially alters the meaning of the Policy. Bullet 2 has now combined bullets 9 and 10 of the previously issued draft (December 2009).

The current wording is likely to permit materially more development to take place on the Mill Lane site; without any further community consultation having taken place; particularly in the central section of the site, whereas bullets 9 and 10 of the previous draft would have

Signature:

Euan Felton

Date:

12 May 2010

Thank you for your comments.

We also encourage you to complete and return the Equal Opportunities Monitoring form to help us to monitor inclusivity. The information collected on this form will not be attributed to you, as you don't have to provide your personal details.

constrained development on this key area of the site.

We request the re-instatement of the two points which have been omitted instead of the current bullet 2 of the Policy as follows:

(former bullet 9) 'result in no increase in the overall footprint of development in the Green Belt, and retain the largely open character of the site, particularly in the central part of the site;'

(former bullet 10) 'reduce visual impacts in terms of height and massing of development, apart from on the former Mill site, where a high quality design could result in development of a similar(see note below) height to the existing building;

Note on conformity with National Policy.

As bullet 2 stands the second sentence is meaningless out of context and the word 'similar' is not in conformity with PPG 2 Annex C4(c). The non-conformity also exists in former bullet 10. The text could be re-worded to 'not exceeding the height of...'

Attached as supporting evidence:

1. Copy of e-mail to the Society from SBDC Planning Policy 24/12/09
2. Attachment draft policy 15 sent with e-mail of 24/12/09
3. Hitcham and Taplow Society response to e-mail dated 13/01/10

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

**Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

To provide further explanation and evidence of the objection raised

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

**Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

## Notification Request

Please complete the following if you wish to be notified of any of the following:

I request to be notified of

- The submission of the Core Strategy for independent examination
- The publication of the recommendations of any person appointed to carry out the independent examination of the Core Strategy
- The adoption of the Core Strategy

Please specify the address to which the notification should be sent to if it is different from the one given in the front page.

## Equal Opportunities Monitoring - Optional Section

In order to help us to find out whether we are meeting the needs of the whole community, we would be grateful if you could answer the following questions about yourself. This section will be detached from the rest of the representation form.

Age

Are you

Ethnic

White

Other

Do you have any long-standing illness or disability which limits your activities?

Are you without a permanent home?

Do you have a car or a van?

Are you registered as unemployed?

Do you provide unpaid care for another person?

## POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SITES

The Core Strategy identifies three significant development sites in the Green Belt, where comprehensive redevelopment would offer the potential to address existing planning problems:

- Wilton Park, Beaconsfield (Policy 14)
- Mill Lane, Taplow (Policy 15)
- Court Lane, Iver (Policy 16)

These sites are not strategic allocations, as although they are large in South Bucks terms (and their redevelopment would contribute towards meeting the Core Strategy objectives), they are not central to delivery of the Spatial Strategy. Furthermore, there is some uncertainty over the timing and availability of these sites for redevelopment. As a consequence, the sites have been termed “Opportunity Sites”. This status recognises the opportunities for improvement presented by the three sites, and sets the broad policy framework to inform their future redevelopment - ensuring the opportunities for improvement are maximised, if and when redevelopment occurs.

To enable appropriate redevelopment on the Opportunity Sites, they have been designated as Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt, in accordance with PPG2: Green Belts.

There may well be other significant development proposals that come forward over the Plan period, on sites not identified in the Core Strategy (or in another Development Plan Document). Policy 17 provides the overarching framework for consideration of such schemes, and requires developers to prepare Development Briefs in consultation with key stakeholders and the local community, prior to submission of a planning application.

### CORE POLICY 15 - MILL LANE (Opportunity Site)

The Mill Lane site comprises approximately 23 hectares of land in a Green Belt location at Taplow, between the Thames and Jubilee rivers. It sits in an important historic landscape, overlooked by Taplow Court and a Scheduled Ancient Monument, with several Registered Parks and Gardens and a Site of Special Scientific Interest nearby. The site is adjacent to the Grade 1 listed Maidenhead Bridge, and much of it is within the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area<sup>42</sup>, which includes the Grade II listed Glen Island House.

The site lies within a Biodiversity Opportunity Area, and adjacent to a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Biological Notification Site and Area of Attractive Landscape.

The site includes a range of established uses on previously developed land, including a former Paper Mill (which closed in 2006), a paper recycling depot, gas utilities, boatyards, the former Skindles Hotel and several Victorian

---

<sup>42</sup> For further information, see The Taplow Riverside Conservation Area Character Appraisal, adopted 2007.

buildings that were formerly used as 'Gentlemen's residences'. There are also significant areas of open land.

The site is in need of sensitive, comprehensive regeneration. Significant constraints include highway limitations (for example at the junction with the A4 Bath Road), flood risk concerns and the historic nature of the site. Flood risk concerns will limit the development potential of the site, particularly in the high flood risk areas<sup>43</sup>. In accordance with national guidance<sup>44</sup>, the sequential and exception tests<sup>45</sup> have been applied to this site to assess its suitability for development. This found that redevelopment is required to maintain the sustainability of the local community and to facilitate its regeneration, with more vulnerable land uses steered to the areas at lowest flood risk. More details on this justification are given in the Sustainability Appraisal report.

Redevelopment of the site would present an opportunity to enhance its ecological riverside setting and restore natural river banks to the Thames. In so doing, redevelopment must ensure retention and, where possible, an increase in biodiversity resources associated with the river environs (in accordance with Core Policy 9). There is also an opportunity to provide enhanced open space, recreation and public access to the rivers and improvements to public transport and pedestrian / cycling infrastructure.

Developers must clearly demonstrate that there is adequate infrastructure to serve the site, including water and sewerage capacity. They must also demonstrate that they have satisfied the Environment Agency with regard to flood risk concerns prior to any planning application being granted permission.

#### **Core Policy 15: MILL LANE (Opportunity Site)**

The Mill Lane Opportunity site as defined on the Proposals Map (insert) is identified as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt.

A comprehensive approach must be taken to the regeneration of the site, with a high-quality mix of development, watercourses and parkland. Suitable uses on the site would include economic development (for example B1 offices, leisure uses, a café/restaurant, a marina/boatyard), residential (on the site of the former Mill), a hotel/restaurant (on the current Skindles site) and open space. The 'Gentlemen's residences' must be retained and brought back into residential use where appropriate. The gasholder and the sheds on the Severnside part of the site should be removed when possible with the land returned to parkland.

All redevelopment proposals must also adhere to the following principles:

<sup>43</sup> Over half of the site is situated within Flood Zone 2 (medium probability) with some areas falling within Flood Zone 3a (high probability) and 3b (the functional floodplain), particularly at the northernmost part of the site.

<sup>44</sup> PPS25, Development and Flood Risk

<sup>45</sup> See PPS25 para 16 onwards and Annex D for explanations of the sequential and exception tests.

- be sympathetic with the historic nature of the site and its surroundings, including the Taplow Riverside conservation area;
- preserve, and where possible enhance, the character and appearance of the riverside setting, including views to and from the site;
- Deliver a net gain in biodiversity resources and avoid unacceptable impacts on the nearby South Lodge Pit SSSI;
- result in no overall increase in the levels of traffic congestion on the A4 Bath Road (based upon the position when the site was at full use), with highway improvements and other mitigation measures introduced as appropriate;
- improve public access to the River Thames through a new riverside walk and explore options for continuing the footpath across the Thames to Maidenhead in the vicinity of Boulter's Lock;
- ensure that there is no net loss of employment (based upon the former range of activities on this strategic site, when in full use);
- guide development towards areas of lowest flood risk within the site, with no new development in Flood Zones 3a and 3b, and appropriate control systems in place to ensure community safety;
- minimise the risk of groundwater pollution;
- result in no increase in the overall footprint of development in the Green Belt, and retain the largely open character of the site, particularly in the central part of the site;
- reduce visual impacts in terms of height and massing of development, apart from on the former Mill site, where a high quality design could result in development of a similar height to the existing building;
- Incorporate decentralised and renewable or low carbon technologies (for example, combined heat and power), unless it is clearly demonstrated that this is not viable or feasible. This should ensure that at least 10% of the energy needs for the development are secured from these sources, in accordance with Policy CP12;
- demonstrate that the necessary infrastructure can be put in place prior to development commencing.

A Development Brief must be produced for the site by the landowners / developers, in conjunction with the Council, consistent with this policy, prior to a planning application being submitted.



# The Hitcham and Taplow Society

21 Byways, Burnham, Bucks SL1 7EB

13 January 2010

Dear Ms Wallace

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the draft Mill Lane policy for the Core Strategy of the LDF. The Society welcomes the introduction of a specific policy for the area and the potential to regenerate it.

The Society agrees that any regeneration should be comprehensive and carried out in such a way as to preserve the Green Belt. The Green Belt in this area is a very narrow neck of land between Maidenhead and Burnham which is being gradually eroded by more intense development along the A4 corridor and it is essential to its preservation that it retains what is left of its openness.

To this end we would particularly like to see the directions of paragraph C4 of Annex C of PPG 2 repeated in the the Core Strategy Policy. This would give a definite guidance to potential developers, with particular reference to height. We believe that the draft policy, bullet point 10 is too loose in saying "of a similar height". We would also like to see a specific exclusion of the former paper mill chimneys as a height reference, in order to avoid doubt.

The reason that height is of such importance is that currently all the buildings in Mill Lane are subservient in height to the tree canopy and we consider it is of critical importance that any new development is the same in this respect.

In the main Policy statement we would like to see the inclusion of the words "Subject to substantial public access and views being obtained to the River Thames across the central section of the site".

At the southern end of the site, abutting the A4, we would like to see a recognition of the ancient building line which runs from the southern end of Skindles hotel eastwards along the front of VW garage buildings, and a specific Policy point that no building is allowed to take place South of this line.

The reason for this is that views of the approach splay of the listed Maidenhead Bridge will be preserved as will its setting.

We would like to see within the Policy some reference to the need for a particularly sensitive treatment of the Skindles hotel site because of its key setting adjacent to Maidenhead bridge and as a pivotal part of the Riverside Conservation Area and that every consideration should be given to preserving the envelope of the existing building, particularly the pitched roof.

At bullet point 2 we would like to see the words "where possible" deleted as we do not think they have any force and are redundant.

At bullet point 4 the word "legal" should be added in the bracket before "full use". It is known that the Severnside site operated without permission as a waste transfer site for some time which generated massive lorry traffic in excess of the Paper Mill operation, to the great distress of the residents in Mill Lane. The Application by the operators for this use was refused by the County Council.

At bullet point 11 we would like to see recognition of the potential for hydro-electric power generation.

Apart from the matters mentioned above, the Society is very supportive of this draft Policy and hopes that a sensitive application is submitted soon for this site.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

Yours sincerely

Euan Felton  
Chairman

Opportunity to comment on draft policies for the South Bucks Core Strategy  
From: Sabella Wallace [Sabella.Wallace@SouthBucks.gov.uk]  
Sent: 24 December 2009 10:39  
To: anne@hanford-associates.co.uk;  
evalipman@onetel.com;  
euan@efapresentations.demon.co.uk  
Subject: Opportunity to comment on draft policies for the South  
Bucks Core Strategy  
Attachments: 15.pdf

Dear Stakeholder,

As you would be aware from our recent Core Strategy update letter, the Council has been making good progress on the pre-submission version of the Core Strategy, which we intend to publish in March 2010.

We have now reached a stage where we have draft policies available, and wish to undertake a focussed but informal consultation with key stakeholders on those policies which may be of particular interest to their specialty area of expertise and/or interest.

As such, please find attached a draft policy which sets out our proposed approach to the Mill Lane Opportunity Site in Taplow, which may be of interest to the members of the Hitcham and Taplow Society.

I would be grateful if you could please look at this policy and

- \* Indicate whether you would support (or object to) the proposed approach;
- \* Suggest any minor wording changes that in your view would improve their effectiveness;
- \* Indicate any potential practical problems/concerns regarding their implementation.

Please could you provide any comments by 13th January 2010. There will be no need for you to repeat any previous comments made in earlier consultations, we will be aware of these already and have taken them into account in drafting these proposed policies. I should stress that this is an informal consultation providing you with the opportunity to comment before the pre-submission Core Strategy is published formally in March; you will have the opportunity to submit formal representations at that time if you wish.

I would be grateful if you can please forward this on to the various members in the Society who may wish to view and comment.

Many thanks for your help.

Regards,

Sabella Wallace  
Senior Planner - Policy  
South Bucks District Council

Telephone: 01895837298

Save resources and reduce waste - do you really need to print this email?

Visit our website: <http://www.southbucks.gov.uk>

\*\*\*\*\* South Bucks District Council E-mail Disclaimer\*\*\*\*\*

You should be aware that all e-mails received and sent by this Council may be

Opportunity to comment on draft policies for the South Bucks Core Strategy subject to recording and/or monitoring to meet relevant legislative requirements.

They are subject to the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and therefore may be disclosed to a third party. This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, the use of the information by disclosure, copying or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this email in error please notify the system administrator at [postmaster@southbucks.gov.uk](mailto:postmaster@southbucks.gov.uk) . This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.  
\*\*\*\*\*End of Disclaimer\*\*\*\*\*