

Our ref: 3/2/447

SOUTH BUCKS D C
DIRECTOR OF SERVICES

- 5 JUL 2010

Douglas Rounthwaite

Ian Motuel
Planning Policy Manager
South Bucks District Council
Capswood Business Centre
Oxford Rd,
Denham,
Uxbridge
UB9 4LH

RECEIVED
DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

02 July 2010

Dear Mr Motuel,

SOUTH BUCKS PROPOSED SUBMISSION CORE STRATEGY

I summarise the situation, following recent discussions. The ETI has been amended since original publication in March 2010 and I confirm I am content with the version sent to us on 18 June 2010. Thank you for your extract from the schedule of proposed changes to the Core Strategy (attached for ease of reference) which you will put to the EIP Inspector; they are acceptable to us. I confirm that the changes address the two declarations in our representations (dated 7 May 2010) that the core strategy is unsound, in other words, the core strategy would no longer be unsound in our opinion.

Yours sincerely

Douglas Rounthwaite
Regional Planning group NDD-SE

Cc L Bradbury Atkins, D Laird BCC; L Shuttleton PB

Extract from Schedule of Proposed Changes relating to Highways Agency objections

<p>Representor - Highways Agency Representation No. 2212</p>	<p>Proposed Change</p>
<p>Pages 54 and 56, Para 3.2.49, Core Policy 7</p>	<p>Replace second sentence of para 3.2.49 with the following: “This concluded that whilst the development proposed in the Core Strategy will exacerbate some existing traffic problems, for example in the Beaconsfield and Iver areas, with appropriate mitigation in place, it could be delivered without an unacceptable impact on the local road network. Furthermore, planned development in South Bucks is not expected to have a significant impact on the motorway links in the District, although it will contribute to traffic pressures at Junction 1 of the M40, which is already experiencing some congestion. Together with the anticipated growth in background traffic levels, and the impact of planned development in locations outside of the District (including in Slough and Uxbridge), the potential number of vehicle movements at Junction 1 of the M40 may result in the need for improvements to the junction. Traffic impacts on the junction will be kept under review, and mitigation measures, including infrastructure upgrades, may be required later in the Plan period (see Appendix 6).”</p> <p>Add new sentence at end of penultimate paragraph of Core Policy 7: “Impacts on Junction 1 of the M40 will be kept under review, with mitigation measures, including infrastructure improvements, potentially being needed later in the Plan period.”</p>
<p>Representor - Highways Agency Representation No. 2213</p>	<p>Proposed Change</p>
<p>Page 110-111, App.6</p>	<p>Add new rows to Appendix 6 (Infrastructure Schedule), under heading of Core Policy 7, as follows:</p> <p>DELIVERABLE: Location: DISTRICT WIDE Infrastructure issue to be addressed: Improve and encourage sustainable travel Project/Scheme: Encourage new and existing employers to produce Travel Plans for their organisations Who: SBDC, BCC, Highways Agency, Developers, others</p>

Possible Funding Sources: Employers

When: Throughout plan period

DESIRABLE:

Location: Denham

Infrastructure issue to be addressed: Congestion at M40 J1 towards end of Plan period.

Project/Scheme: Signalisation improvements to motorway junction

Who: Developers, SBDC, BCC, Highways Agency, others

Possible Funding Sources: TBC - developer contributions, LTP3, DaSTS or CIL

When: 2021-2026

Delete row relating to the M40/A404/M4 Motorway Box from Appendix 6.