



# South Bucks Local Development Framework

Core Strategy: Emerging Approach

## Sustainability Appraisal Report

March 2009 (Amended June 2009)



**South Bucks**  
District Council

## Note

This version of the Core Strategy: Emerging Approach, Sustainability Appraisal Report (first published in March 2009) has been amended to reflect the consultation comments received - in particular, those from Natural England and the Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust.

Deleted text is shown in ~~strike through~~ and additional text is highlighted in yellow.

This version of the Sustainability Appraisal Report has not been updated in other respects (for example, to reflect the amendments that have subsequently been made to the Core Strategy objectives). For the most up to date position, please refer to the latest Sustainability Appraisal Report prepared to accompany the Proposed Submission Core Strategy (March 2010).

---

CONTENTS	PAGE
1.0 Introduction .....	1
2.0 Sustainability Appraisal Process .....	4
3.0 Sustainability Issues in South Bucks District .....	8
4.0 Strategic Spatial Scenarios - Sustainability Appraisal .....	9
5.0 Strategic Sites - Sustainability Appraisal .....	18
6.0 Emerging Spatial Strategy - Sustainability Appraisal .....	22
7.0 Conclusions .....	25
APPENDICES	
1 Sustainability Appraisal Framework	26
2 Core Strategy Objectives	31
3 Summary of Issues, Problems and Challenges	33
4 Sustainability Appraisal of South Bucks Strategic Spatial Scenarios	38
5 Sustainability Appraisal of Strategic Sites	52
6 Sustainability Appraisal of South Bucks Emerging Spatial Strategy	59

---

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Sustainability Appraisal Report has been prepared to accompany publication of the South Bucks Core Strategy: Emerging Approach consultation document (March 2009).
- 1.2 It provides a succinct summary of the sustainability appraisal process to date, the principal sustainability issues facing South Bucks District and the likely environmental, social and economic impacts of pursuing each of the four Strategic Spatial Scenarios outlined in the Core Strategy consultation document (March 2009). The emerging preferred Spatial Strategy is also appraised, and an assessment made of the three Strategic Sites - Wilton Park, Beaconsfield; Court Lane, Iver; and Mill Lane, Taplow.
- 1.3 Further Sustainability Appraisal work will be undertaken to inform preparation of the publication version of the Core Strategy.

### Requirement for Sustainability Appraisal

- 1.4 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires Development Plan Documents (DPDs) to contribute towards the achievement of more sustainable development. The Sustainability Appraisal process has a key role to play in fulfilling this requirement by ensuring that sustainability issues are given full consideration in the preparation and adoption of plans.
- 1.5 European Directive 2001/42/EC requires Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of a wide range of plans and programmes, including DPDs. The Directive requires that authorities must describe the baseline environment and links to other relevant plans and programmes, consider alternatives to their Plans, predict and mitigate the Plan's environmental effects and integrate the results in the decision-making process.
- 1.6 The procedures for SEA are similar to those for Sustainability Appraisal, but the focus is solely on environmental issues. To avoid unnecessary duplication and ensure an integrated approach to the plan making process, the former Office for the

Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) issued guidance<sup>1</sup> to Planning Authorities, confirming that it is possible to satisfy both requirements through a single appraisal process.

### Appropriate Assessment

- 1.7 In addition to the requirement for Strategic Environmental Assessment, European Directive 92/43/EEC (Conservation of Natural Habitats, Wild Fauna and Flora) introduced a requirement for 'Appropriate Assessment'. This European Directive was transposed into national legislation by the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended). These regulations require the relevant Planning Authority (in this case, South Bucks District Council) to assess the impacts of a Development Plan Document (in combination with other relevant plans) against the conservation objectives of any European Site designated for its ecological value, and ascertain whether it would have a **significant effect** on that site.
- 1.8 Where negative effects are identified, alternative strategy and policy options should be considered.
- 1.9 The Appropriate Assessment (AA) of the South East Plan (Scott Wilson / Levett-Therival, October 2006) concludes that Burnham Beeches may suffer from the effects of increased traffic congestion on the A355, resulting from the construction of the motorway service area at Junction 2 of the M40. Furthermore, there may be an adverse effect from urbanisation and increased recreational pressures associated with development identified in the draft South East Plan.
- 1.10 South Bucks District Council has subsequently carried out stage 1 and 2 of an AA for the Core Strategy (May 2007, updated March 2009). This considers the potential impact of the Core Strategy on the Burnham Beeches SAC, as well as the South West London Water Bodies Special Protection Area (SPA), the Windsor Forest Great Park Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Chiltern Beech Woodlands SAC. In summary, the AA concludes:
- Climate Change - The Core Strategy is unable to address near and medium term effects of climate change *per se*, given its scale and coverage, but the Council is conscious of the factors that contribute towards climate change. The Council is already seeking to address climate change issues, through careful consideration of the potential impacts of its decisions, and directly through the policies to be included in the emerging Core Strategy.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents (November 2005).

---

- **Recreation and Human Impacts** - The Core Strategy should consider issues such as locating new development away from European sites, and the provision of new or improved open recreational space elsewhere, to reduce pressure on the relevant sites. The motorway service area will not result in a significant increase in traffic movements on the A355, and there will not therefore be a significant impact on Burnham Beeches.
- **Site Isolation** - The AA identifies opportunities for the Core Strategy to reduce isolation on the local SAC, but not the SAC's / SPA outside of the District boundary. Some examples would be to continue to protect the greenbelt on the west, northern and southern sides of the Burnham Beeches SAC, thereby creating a green buffer to the wider countryside; and taking opportunities through the development process to secure other open space away from the European site.
- **Water** - Policy recommendations set out in the Draft South East Plan AA suggest that existing water resources need to be conserved. The Core Strategy addresses this issue through, for example, by ensuring that all new developments make appropriate provision for waste water recycling.
- **Air Quality** - Whilst the Draft South East Plan AA concluded that air quality was the biggest contributing factor to likely significant effects on European sites in the South East, air quality does not necessarily relate to what is happening (or can be controlled) locally. Activities across the South East, particularly in those areas close to South Bucks District (for example, aircraft movements in and out of Heathrow, and traffic flows on the strategic road network), will have a significant impact on local air quality. The AA prepared by the District Council concluded that the levels of development proposed in the emerging Core Strategy would not significantly impact upon local air quality.
- **Housing** - Whilst the overall impact of future housing development in South Bucks District on the relevant SAC's and SPA is likely to be marginal, the amount of housing development proposed in Farnham Common should be consistent with the protection of Burnham Beeches.

## 2.0 SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL PROCESS

2.1 The Sustainability Appraisal process is a way of ensuring that all plans and programmes, which relate to the development and use of land, are compatible with the aims of sustainable development.

### Meaning of Sustainable Development

2.2 At the heart of sustainable development is the simple idea of ensuring a better quality of life for everyone, now and in the future. The UK Government<sup>2</sup> defines sustainable development as:

- Living within environmental limits;
- Ensuring a strong, healthy and just society;
- Achieving a sustainable economy;
- Promoting good governance; and
- Using sound science responsibly.

2.3 No one of these objectives is more important than another. Whilst there may be tensions between them, in the long term, success is dependent upon simultaneous delivery of all five objectives.

### Broad Approach to Sustainability Appraisal

2.4 Sustainability appraisal is an iterative process that identifies and reports on the likely significant effects of a plan, including whether implementation will achieve the social, environmental and economic objectives by which sustainable development is defined.

2.5 The principal elements of the sustainability appraisal process can be summarised as follows:

---

<sup>2</sup> The UK Strategy for Sustainable Development 'A Better Quality of Life', March 2005.

- Collecting and presenting baseline information;
- Predicting the significant effects of the plan and addressing them during its preparation;
- Identifying reasonable plan options and their effects;
- Involving the public and authorities with social, environmental and economic responsibilities as part of the assessment process; and
- Monitoring the actual effects of the plan during its implementation.

### Sustainability Appraisal of the South Bucks Core Strategy

- 2.6 At an early stage in the plan making process, South Bucks District Council prepared a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report (May 2005). This identified links with other relevant plans, programmes and sustainability objectives (including the Community Strategy / Sustainable Communities Strategy), established the baseline conditions in South Bucks District (with reference to social, environmental and economic issues) and identified some of the main current and future sustainability issues to be addressed in the District (see Section 3.0 below).
- 2.7 The Scoping Report has been subject to stakeholder and public consultation in May 2005. In December 2007, all consultees were contacted again, asking whether there was any additional evidence or new issues they wanted to bring to the attention of the Council. Officers were able to use the Scoping Report in deciding upon the main issues to be addressed in the South Bucks Core Strategy.
- 2.8 A series of Sustainability Appraisal objectives and indicators were drafted (the “Sustainability Appraisal Framework”) to be used in describing and comparing the sustainability effects of alternative options for the Core Strategy. The objectives were drafted by a joint working party made up of Officers from Buckinghamshire County Council and its constituent District Councils. These draft objectives and indicators have been refined through subsequent discussions between Officers and Members at South Bucks District Council, and as a result of comments received on the Scoping Report.
- 2.9 The Sustainability Appraisal Framework used in the sustainability appraisal of the South Bucks Core Strategy is included at **Appendix 1**. The “significant effects” indicators, used to monitor the District’s progress towards delivering sustainable development (including through preparation and implementation of the South Bucks Core Strategy), will be subject to review.

2.10 Early work on the Core Strategy resulted in a range of potential “policy” options. These were subject to Sustainability Appraisal (between November 2005 and February 2006), using the objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal Framework. This was an iterative process, whereby the Options and policy choices were developed and revised, to take into account the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal. The objective of the exercise was to highlight the different advantages and disadvantages of each Option.

2.11 The symbols used to record the performance of each Option against each appraisal objective, were as follows:

Major positive	++	Minor negative	-	Neutral	o
Minor positive	+	Major negative	--	Uncertain	?

2.12 Given the nature of the Core Strategy, which sets the broad framework for preparation of other more detailed Development Plan Documents (DPDs), the Sustainability Appraisal focused on significant effects, and the likely direction of change (i.e. a qualitative approach to the appraisal process).

2.13 The findings of the Core Strategy Options appraisal assisted the District Council in drafting the Core Strategy: Preferred Options (September 2006). The Preferred Options were subject to further sustainability appraisal work between February and July 2006, with a particular focus on the likely significant effects of the proposed spatial strategy, and scope for mitigation of the adverse effects identified. The Preferred Options Sustainability Appraisal Report was published for consultation alongside the Core Strategy Preferred Options in September 2006.

2.14 The main findings of the Core Strategy Preferred Options Sustainability Appraisal included:

- For the housing, employment and retailing options, there was a trade-off to be made between higher density development (intensification of existing uses) and the potential need for development on greenfield land. The design policies to be included in the South Bucks Local Development Framework would have an important role to play in ensuring that new housing, employment and retail schemes do not adversely impact upon townscape character.
- In terms of the locational strategy for South Bucks District, the main options were to focus development on the larger settlements, or to adopt a strategy of dispersal. A focus on the larger settlements would mean higher density

development and a greater degree of change in these areas. By dispersing development, new housing and employment land provision would need to be accommodated in less accessible locations, where access to public transport is generally limited.

- In relation to employment land, tensions were identified between making more efficient use of developed land and addressing local amenity issues, and the importance of maintaining a balanced portfolio of employment sites and job opportunities.

2.15 Following consultation on the Core Strategy Preferred Options, the Council had then intended to work towards preparation of a Submission Draft Plan. However, following independent advice from the Planning Officer's Society and proposed changes in the regulations governing the preparation of Local Development Frameworks, the Council took the decision to revisit its options for the Core Strategy. The resulting Core Strategy: Emerging Approach document (March 2009) has been subject to sustainability appraisal, with a particular focus on the likely impacts of pursuing each of the alternative Strategic Spatial Scenarios, and the emerging preferred Spatial Strategy.

2.16 The objectives of the Core Strategy: Emerging Approach document are presented at **Appendix 2**. These objectives were drafted taking into account other relevant plans and programmes, in particular the emerging Sustainable Community Strategy. It is recognised that many plans and programmes (including those prepared by the Primary Care Trust, Education and Highway Authorities) will have an important role to play in implementing aspects of the Core Strategy.

2.17 The findings of the latest sustainability appraisal work are presented in Sections 4.0, 5.0 and 6.0 of this report.

### 3.0 SUSTAINABILITY ISSUES IN SOUTH BUCKS DISTRICT

3.1 In order to gain an understanding of the current environmental, social and economic conditions that prevail in South Bucks District, an initial characterisation exercise was undertaken (May 2005). This initial work has been further developed to take on board the comments received from stakeholders and other interested parties. A summary of the main issues, problems and challenges is included at **Appendix 3**.

3.2 From this longer list of sustainability issues, nine strategic spatial issues for South Bucks have been identified:

- Where to accommodate a minimum of 94 new dwellings per annum, of the right type, and with the necessary supporting infrastructure.
- How to accommodate further development whilst protecting the character of our towns and villages.
- Where and how to provide more affordable housing.
- How to support the local economy, whilst seeking to maintain a broad balance between local job opportunities and the size and skills of the resident workforce.
- How to ensure that existing and new development is made more sustainable, helping to tackle the causes and adverse effects of climate change.
- How to conserve and enhance the natural environment, in particular Burnham Beeches.
- How to improve sustainable transportation options in the District to reduce traffic congestion, and address the associated adverse impacts on environmental quality and quality of life (for example, at Iver).
- How to address demographic change, in particular the issues arising from an increasingly elderly population.
- How to address the causes of crime and the related fear of crime.

3.3 The Council was mindful of these issues in appraising the new Spatial Strategy Scenarios.

3.4 The Council places considerable importance on protection of the Green Belt. Further work is required to assess the potential impact of seeking to accommodate more than the minimum South East Plan housing requirement of 1,880 units. The findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will be used to inform this assessment, alongside the proposed Settlement Character Study, which, amongst other matters, will consider the impact of urban intensification on townscape character.

## 4.0 STRATEGIC SPATIAL SCENARIOS - SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

4.1 A significant amount of detailed work had previously been undertaken on the potential impacts of different policy options (for example, the percentage of affordable housing and the approach to protecting employment land). The latest sustainability appraisal work takes a step back, looking at the likely significant effects of four alternative Spatial Strategy Scenarios<sup>3</sup>. These scenarios embrace the scale, form and location of future housing development and the approach to be taken to local economic development and future retail provision. In addition, at the settlement level, consideration has been given to the potential impact of the alternative Scenarios on the Green Belt, development density and settlement character.

4.2 In summary, the four Spatial Strategy Scenarios are:

- **Scenario 1 - Urban Intensification**

This scenario would result in a pattern of development in South Bucks broadly similar to that experienced in recent years. It would seek to accommodate future housing and other development within the existing settlements excluded from the Green Belt.

- **Scenario 2 - Focus on Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross**

This scenario would see future development focused on the two largest settlements of Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross. LDF policies would give greater encouragement to the reuse of previously developed land in these larger settlements, where new residents would have access to a wider range of local facilities and services.

Although there would still be some limited development in other settlements, there may be insufficient land within settlements to meet the District's housing requirement and other development needs in the period to 2026. Therefore, a small number of 'contingency locations' would be identified adjacent to Beaconsfield and / or Gerrards

---

<sup>3</sup> Unlike the Spatial Strategy options considered in the July 2006 Sustainability Appraisal Report, the new strategic spatial scenarios consider a fuller range of matters in addition to the distribution of housing development, including likely development densities and the approach to new retail and employment land provision.

Cross - with the precise site boundaries to be defined and the land released from the Green Belt for development, only if required to meet the District's housing requirement and other development needs.

- **Scenario 3 - Focus on Smaller Settlements**

This scenario would result in a more dispersed pattern of development across South Bucks District. In recognition of the amount of development recently permitted in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross (and to a lesser extent, Burnham), particular encouragement would be given to meeting local needs for housing and other development through the reuse of previously developed land within smaller settlements.

There might be insufficient land within existing settlements to meet the District's housing requirement and other development needs in the period to 2026. Therefore, under this scenario, a number of smaller contingency locations would be identified adjacent to villages across South Bucks - with the precise site boundaries to be defined and the land released from the Green Belt for development, only if required to meet the District's housing requirement and other development needs.

- **Scenario 4 - Greater Focus on Settlements near and adjacent to Slough**

This scenario would acknowledge the draw of the Thames Valley for employment, shopping and leisure activities. While some new housing would still be delivered on previously developed land within Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross, the aim would be to maximise the amount of new housing accommodated within settlements in the south of the District, particularly Burnham and Iver / Richings Park.

There might be insufficient land within existing settlements to meet the District's housing requirement and other development needs in the period to 2026. Therefore, a small number of contingency locations would be identified adjacent to Burnham, Iver and / or Slough - with the precise site boundaries to be defined and the land released from the Green Belt for development, only if required to meet the District's housing requirement and other development needs.

4.3 A fuller description of the Spatial Scenarios and their likely effect on issues including the provision of affordable housing, and settlement and landscape character is included in the Core Strategy: Emerging Approach document (March 2009).

**Sustainability Appraisal**

- 4.4 The results of the sustainability appraisal of the four Spatial Strategy Scenarios are presented at **Appendix 4**. The performance of each Scenario has been assessed against the objectives included in the Sustainability Appraisal Framework, with a summary of the main likely social, environmental and economic effects presented under each appraisal table.
- 4.5 The following section provides a comparative analysis of the likely significant effects of the Spatial Strategy Scenarios.

**Table 1: Summary of the Sustainability Appraisal of the Spatial Strategy Scenarios**

Sustainability Objective	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4	Commentary	
Social	1. Housing	-?	+	++	+?	Scenario 1 would provide limited flexibility, and the least amount of affordable housing. Scenarios 2, 3 and 4 all make provision for contingency land, should the District's housing allocation rise or windfall completions fall away.  Scenarios 3 and 4 would deliver the most affordable housing.
	2. Safety	o	o	o	o	In all four scenarios the Council would encourage new development that has been designed so as to minimise criminal activity.
	3. Accessibility	o	++?	-	+?	Scenario 2 would result in the greatest concentration of new housing development in those settlements with the best range of facilities and services and highest levels of accessibility. Scenario 3 would result in the most development in smaller settlements, which in general, have relatively poor accessibility.  Scenario 2 would support improvements in the number and range of shops in Beaconsfield New Town and Gerrards Cross, and Scenario 4 would support improvements in the retail offer in Burnham and Iver.

Environmental	4. Sustainable Transport	+	++	--	+?	<p>With more new development accommodated in those settlements with the highest levels of accessibility, scenario 2 would encourage more trips on foot and by bicycle. Access to public transport (to higher order centres) would be best under scenarios 2 and 4.</p> <p>Scenario 3 would result in development that would have relatively poor access to those facilities and services only found in larger urban areas. In general, there would be a greater propensity for residents of this new development to access higher order facilities by private car.</p>
	5. Water Use	-?	-?	-?	-?	The differences between the scenarios are marginal.
	6. Biodiversity	+	-?	--?	--?	<p>The development of greenfield land would be avoided in scenario 1, helping to protect biodiversity in urban fringe areas. Scenarios 2, 3 and 4 could result in some greenfield development on contingency land, with a potential (albeit localised) adverse impact on biodiversity.</p> <p>Scenarios 3 and 4 could result in more development in the vicinity of Burnham Beeches SAC.</p>
	7. Landscape and Townscape	o	-?	-?	-?	<p>Scenario 1 would do most to protect the landscape character of South Bucks. Less positively, there would be a change in the character of settlements across the District. Scenario 2 would have the greatest adverse impact on the townscape character of Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross, and scenario 3, the greatest adverse impact on the character of smaller settlements.</p> <p>There would be a localised landscape impact, if contingency land was released for development (scenarios 2, 3 and 4).</p>
	8. Historic Environment	-?	-?	+	-?	Scenario 3 would afford a more flexible approach to development density, allowing more flexibility in the design of schemes in sensitive historic areas. Scenarios 1 and 2 would have a potentially adverse impact on the historic areas in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross, and scenario 4 the historic areas in Burnham and Iver.
	9. Climate Change	o	+?	o	+?	The differences between the scenarios are marginal. In relation to scenarios 2 and 4, should one or more areas of contingency land need to be released for development, there would be the

					<p>opportunity to require the provision of on site shared energy technologies.</p> <p>Scenario 3 could result in more journeys by private car, leading to a greater adverse impact on climate change.</p>
10. Waste	o	o	o	o	No direct relationship.
11. Soil Resources	+	-?	-?	-?	Scenario 1 would not involve any greenfield development, and would therefore do most to protect soil quality.
12. Land Use	++	+	-	+	<p>Scenario 1 would encourage the reuse and redevelopment of previously developed land in settlements across the District, at relatively high development densities. Scenario 2 would make the most efficient use of urban land in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross, and Scenario 4, the most efficient use of urban land in Burnham and Iver / Richings Park.</p> <p>Scenario 3 places more importance on protecting settlement character, rather than maximising urban potential.</p>
13. Flood Risk	+	+	+	+	No significant differences between the scenarios. The lower development densities associated with scenario 3 would reduce the cumulative risk of flooding as a result of surface water run-off.
14. Pollution	+	++	-	++	<p>Scenarios 2 and 4 would result in more development in settlements with good local facilities and services, and / or good access to public transport. They would afford more opportunities to use sustainable modes of transport (helping to reduce CO<sup>2</sup> emissions).</p> <p>In contrast, scenario 3 would result in more development in less accessible locations, and would probably lead to more journeys being made by private car.</p>

Economic	15. Economic Growth	-?	++?	+?	++?	<p>The impact of each scenario is mixed and uncertain. Scenario 1 would provide limited scope to replace any employment land lost to alternative uses. It could constrain economic growth. Scenarios 2, 3 and 4 all provide more flexibility in responding to changes in the local economy.</p> <p>Scenario 4 would mean shorter commuter journeys to the jobs available in the Thames Valley.</p>
	16. Economic Diversity	+?	o	o	o	<p>Once again, the impact of each scenario would be mixed. Scenario 1 would do most to promote a local economy based on high value-added activities.</p>
	17. Skills	-?	+?	+	+?	<p>Scenario 1 would deliver the least amount of affordable housing, and would therefore do little to support local key workers. Scenario 3 would probably deliver the most affordable housing, and would therefore do most to support local key workers.</p>

**Social Objectives**

- 4.6 Scenarios 2 and 4 generally perform better against the social objectives. They would deliver more new affordable housing than scenario 1, and would ensure that most new development takes place in those settlements with the best range of facilities and services (scenario 2) or those smaller settlements in the south of the District with a good or reasonable range of local services, and good public transport connections to larger urban areas.
- 4.7 Scenario 2 would support improvements in the number and range of shops in Beaconsfield New Town and Gerrards Cross, and Scenario 4 would support improvements in the retail offer in Burnham and Iver. If deliverable, these improvements would benefit both new and existing residents, with wider positive impacts resulting from a reduced need to travel out of the District for higher order retail and leisure facilities.
- 4.8 Scenario 3 performs strongly in terms of affordable housing provision, but of the new development would be within and adjacent to smaller settlements, and would therefore have relatively poor access to facilities and services.

### *Environmental Objectives*

- 4.9 ~~The performance of each scenario against each of the environmental objectives is more varied.~~ In all four scenarios, the emerging evidence base demonstrates that areas specifically designated for their landscape or ecological importance could be avoided.
- 4.10 Through encouraging development at higher densities across South Bucks, scenario 1 has the advantage of avoiding the need for greenfield development. It therefore scores well in relation to protecting landscape character, conserving soil resources, maintaining biodiversity and making more efficient use of previously developed land. Less positively, scenario 1 is more likely to result in an adverse impact on townscape character.
- 4.11 Scenarios 2 and 4 would do most to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport. Scenario 2 would have the greatest adverse impact on the townscape character of Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross, but the character of other areas would be largely protected. Conversely, scenario 4 would help to protect the townscape character of Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross, but would potentially lead to an adverse impact on the character of Burnham and Iver / Richings Park. The uncertainty associated with the need to release contingency land for development (scenarios 2, 3 and 4) means that the localised impact on landscape character is difficult to appraise.
- 4.12 Scenario 3 would enable a more flexible approach to development densities, helping to minimise the impact of new development on townscape character.
- 4.13 Scenarios 3 and 4 would result in more development in the vicinity of the Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation, with a potentially detrimental impact on this internationally important ecosystem.

### *Economic Objectives*

- 4.14 Scenarios 2, 3 and 4 generally perform better against the economic objectives. They provide some flexibility, by allowing poorly performing employment sites to be redeveloped for other uses, alongside the possibility of some new employment land (on contingency land). Scenarios 3 and 4 would probably deliver more affordable housing, providing more support for local key workers.

- 4.15 Scenario 2 would encourage the redevelopment of more traditional employment sites for high value-added activities.

#### **Conclusion**

- 4.16 This sustainability appraisal has identified the likely significant effects of the alternative scenarios for South Bucks, as set out in the Core Strategy: Emerging Approach consultation document (March 2009).
- 4.17 In deciding upon which approach to take forward, the Council will need to give consideration to the consultation responses received to the latest Core Strategy consultation, advice from statutory undertakers and the findings of the various background assessments and reports prepared to inform the South Bucks Development Framework. It is inevitable that certain objectives will need to be prioritised, as the sustainability appraisal has demonstrated that each of the scenarios will have different advantages and disadvantages.
- 4.18 The Council's emerging view on its preferred Spatial Strategy is described in Section 6.0 of this Report.

#### **Issues and Problems in undertaking the Sustainability Appraisal**

- 4.19 It has proved difficult to assess the likely impact of scenarios 2, 3 and 4, because it is uncertain whether the contingency land would need to be released for development. If contingency land is developed, the localised sustainability issues would be different (for example, the impact on landscape character). Greater weight has therefore been attached to the broad benefits of accommodating development within or adjacent to each settlement within South Bucks - as opposed to the specific (but fairly localised) potential impacts of development on contingency land.
- 4.20 In any event, given the very strong housing land supply position in South Bucks, the Council's emerging view is that contingency land will not need to be released for development to meet the minimum housing requirement of 1,880 units over the plan period.

- 4.21 A further issue has been trying to assess the potential impact of development on townscape character, in advance of completion of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and proposed Settlement Character Study. The Sustainability Appraisal work will be reviewed, to take on board this additional evidence, prior to publication of the Core Strategy in early 2010.

## 5.0 STRATEGIC SITES - SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

- 5.1 The Core Strategy: Emerging Approach document identifies three “Strategic Sites<sup>4</sup>” - Wilton Park, Beaconsfield; Court Lane, Iver; and Mill Lane, Taplow. These have been appraised separately from the Spatial Strategy Scenarios, as the Council has little control over whether, or when the Strategic Sites will come forward for development.
- 5.2 The three Strategic Sites are all in the Green Belt, but contain large areas of previously developed land. It is considered that comprehensive redevelopment of these areas would offer the potential to resolve existing planning problems, and make best use of previously developed land. A range of options have been considered for these sites, before arriving at an emerging view on the preferred policy framework (see Core Strategy: Emerging Approach document).
- 5.3 The Sustainability Appraisal tables at **Appendix 5** summarise the principal sustainability issues for each Strategic Site. These issues are then related to the emerging policy framework.

### Wilton Park, Beaconsfield

- 5.4 There remains some uncertainty over whether (and if so when) this military base may be released for development. Assuming that it is, the Council’s emerging view is that the land should be redeveloped with a sustainable mixed use scheme, comprising at least 300 dwellings and some employment generating development within the existing developed area. A fuller description of the Wilton Park site can be found at paragraph 2.86 of the Emerging Approach document.
- 5.5 The principal findings of the Sustainability Appraisal include:
- Wilton Park could make a substantive contribution to the housing requirement for South Bucks District (including the need for affordable housing).
  - Much of the land is relatively accessible to the District Centre of Beaconsfield New Town and Local Centre of Beaconsfield Old Town, although the severance caused by the A355 will need to be addressed. **Particular emphasis will need to be given to the provision of new pedestrian and cyclist routes.**

---

<sup>4</sup> Referred to in the Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation document (September 2006) as “Areas of Potential Change”.

---

- Wilton Park is relatively unconstrained, and a substantive part of the site comprises previously developed land.
- The size of the Wilton Park Strategic Site means that it could also deliver new jobs, with the land suited to provision of higher value-added activities.
- Retention of the existing recreational facilities at Wilton Park, and the provision of additional areas of public open space, would help address the existing shortage of public open space in Beaconsfield.
- There is scope to provide biodiversity enhancements and gains, linking to nearby woodland and associated habitats.
- Wilton Park is within an area already over abstracted in terms of water resources.

#### Mill Lane, Taplow

5.6 The majority landowner of the Mill Lane Strategic Site is intending to submit a planning application for redevelopment of this area in the near future. The Council's emerging view is that a comprehensive approach should be taken to the regeneration of the Mill Lane site, with a high quality mix of development (including employment, housing and hotel), watercourses and parkland. A fuller description of the Mill Lane site can be found at paragraph 2.94 of the Core Strategy: Emerging Approach document.

5.7 The principal findings of the Sustainability Appraisal include:

- Mill Lane could make a contribution to future housing requirements (including the need for more affordable housing). Access on foot to the facilities and services available in Maidenhead Town Centre is relatively poor, although there is a bus stop on the southern boundary of the Opportunity Site, providing southern part of the Strategic Site has reasonably good access to the public transport services that operate along the A4. Taplow rail station is located about 1.6km by road from the site, whilst Maidenhead rail station is located at a distance of approximately 2.5km from the site.
- The Mill Lane site is highly constrained. It is adjacent to South Lodge Pitt SSSI and an Area of Attractive Landscape, falls partly within a Conservation Area and accommodates a Listed building. Proposed mitigation includes retaining the largely open character of the Mill Lane area, and ensuring that the height and massing of new development result in a reduced visual impact.
- Large parts of this Strategic Site are within Flood Zone 3, and there is therefore a high probability of flooding. However, the Mill Lane area has been identified as a Strategic Site, on the basis that the regeneration benefits outweigh the flood risk issues. The Mill Lane area is environmentally sensitive (with significant scope for enhancement),

has significant historic value and could be a valuable recreational resource for South Bucks and surrounding areas. As mitigation, it is proposed that the residential and hotel development should be limited to those parts of the site in Flood Zone 2, with the employment development in Flood Zones 2 or 3a.

- The size of the development location means it could also deliver new jobs. The land would be potentially suited to the provision of higher value-added activities.

#### Court Lane, Iver

5.8 The Court Lane industrial area lies to the south east of Iver Village, and currently accommodates industrial workshops, open storage, vehicle breaking uses and some long-stay Heathrow parking. The Council's emerging view is that redevelopment of the Court Lane estate for B1 business uses would be most appropriate, subject to the implications for the Green Belt, and further work on market viability. Consideration would also be given to other non-residential land uses, but any development must result in a significant reduction in the number of HGV / commercial vehicle movements in the Iver area. A fuller description of the Court Lane site can be found at paragraph 2.108 of the Core Strategy: Emerging Approach document.

5.9 The principal findings of the Sustainability Appraisal include:

- Court Lane is considered to be an unsuitable location for residential development. The area is isolated from key facilities, including local buses and does not adjoin any settlements. It is situated on the far side of the M25 motorway, partly within the designated Air Quality Management Area where there would be motorway noise, poor air quality and possible contamination issues to assess. Its sole vehicular access is via an uninviting road under the motorway and beyond a major water treatment works.
- Redevelopment of the Court Lane Strategic Site for B1 Office use would help to reduce the number of HGV movements through Iver, in turn helping to reduce air and noise pollution in the village centre, and improve the ambience.
- Redevelopment of Court Lane would also see replacement of more traditional manufacturing and open storage uses, with higher value added, lower impact activities. It would help to provide a better mix of employment opportunities in the Iver area.
- There could be scope to enhance existing habitats and provide biodiversity enhancements and gains, linking to the gravel lakes and associated habitats to the east.
- Redevelopment proposals should ensure improved access to Iver Station and the facilities in Iver Village.

- Potential land contamination issues, along with significant noise and air pollution issues, will have to be assessed and mitigated, for the health and well being of site users.

#### Impact of each Strategic Site on the Spatial Strategy Scenarios

- 5.10 In general, development on the Strategic Sites will help to reduce the pressure for further development within existing settlements. For example, the more new housing that is developed on the Strategic Sites, the lower the level of new housing development that will need to be achieved through urban intensification. The Strategic Sites are also able to help address particular issues in nearby settlements.
- 5.11 The redevelopment of Wilton Park would provide particular support for Scenario 2 (Focus on Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross). The new housing would help support improvements in the range of shops and services in Beaconsfield New Town, and any employment development would provide new local job opportunities. The redevelopment of Wilton Park would also deliver new accessible areas of open space, close to Beaconsfield, which is currently deficient in parks and gardens.
- 5.12 The Mill Lane Strategic Site lies to the west of Burnham, very close to the village of Taplow. The redevelopment of this Strategic Site would do most to support Scenario 4 (Greater Focus on Settlements near and adjacent to Slough), as it would result in new employment and housing development in the south of the District. New residents would have reasonably good access to the employment opportunities in Slough and Maidenhead, with the potential to use the public transport services that run along the A4, and the train services that operate from nearby Taplow Station.
- 5.13 The improved access to the River Thames would benefit local residents, particularly those in Taplow Village.
- 5.14 Both Wilton Park and Mill Lane provide the opportunity to deliver a range of housing types (including new family housing and affordable housing).
- 5.15 Redevelopment of Court Lane, Iver, would do most to support Scenario 3 (Focus on Smaller Settlements) and Scenario 4 (Greater Focus on Settlements near and adjacent to Slough). This is because more new housing would occur in Iver under these two Scenarios, meaning that more local residents would benefit from a reduction in the number of HGV movements through the village centre, and enhanced access to the open countryside to the east of the Court Lane site.

## 6.0 EMERGING SPATIAL STRATEGY

6.1 The Council's emerging view on its preferred Spatial Strategy has been informed by the sustainability appraisal of the Spatial Strategy options (see Section 4.0) and Strategic Sites (see Section 5.0). Before deciding upon its final strategy, the Council will need to consider the comments received on the Core Strategy: Emerging approach document. In addition, the Council will need to take into account the conclusions of the final Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, and the findings of the Settlement Character Study.

6.2 At this time, the Council's emerging view on the Spatial Strategy it intends to pursue, is that:

- Brownfield land within settlements will be the principal source of housing land supply. More development will take place in the settlements of Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham because these have more redevelopment opportunities, and because new residents would have access to the widest range of facilities, services and jobs.
- As it is anticipated that together, the Strategic Sites will deliver at least 300-400 new homes, average development densities within settlements could be lower than assumed in Scenario 1, providing greater scope to protect settlement character.
- The Council will develop and implement strong design policies to protect the character of all settlements in South Bucks, and in particular those areas with a special townscape character.
- The Council will enable the development of affordable housing on Rural Exception sites in appropriate circumstances and locations, alongside some limited development in smaller settlements to support local services.
- Due to the strong housing land supply position at present, the release of land from the Green Belt for housing will not be required. However, the Core Strategy needs to be able to cope with changing circumstances, such as a revision of the South East Plan, and so a small number of broad locations in the Green Belt will be identified as long term contingency areas at Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and / or Burnham. If required to be released, alongside new market housing, these contingency sites would provide additional affordable housing.
- The Council will seek to manage the housing supply through annual monitoring and taking action where the supply is significantly above or below the expected levels. Currently the supply position is running ahead of what is required by the Government in the South East Plan.
- Employment land will be generally protected from redevelopment for other uses, although some limited releases may

be acceptable in special circumstances. The more intensive use of existing employment sites will be generally supported, with encouragement given to those types of businesses that are more likely to use the skills and experience of the local workforce.

- Improvements in the range of shops and services available in Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham will be supported, with qualitative improvements also sought in Burnham, as well as in Iver Village.
- The Council will seek to conserve the natural environment (in particular, areas of designated landscape and biodiversity importance), and deliver biodiversity enhancements and gains.

6.3 The Sustainability Appraisal of the emerging Spatial Strategy is presented at **Appendix 6**. In summary, the likely significant effects of the emerging Spatial Strategy include:

- Protection of the Green Belt boundary.
- Protection of Burnham Beeches, with the enhanced recreational facilities at Wilton Park and Mill Lane, going some way to reducing the public use pressure on Burnham Beeches.
- Delivery of biodiversity enhancements and gains.
- Continued focus on the re-use of previously developed land.
- Protection of settlement character, particularly those areas with special townscape character.
- More affordable housing provision and a better mix of housing types.
- Some limited new housing development in smaller settlements (including on Rural Exception sites) to help sustain local communities.
- Scope to address public open space deficiencies in Beaconsfield. The Mill Lane Strategic Site will also provide opportunities for new and improved parkland and rights of way. More generally, the scale of development proposed within existing settlements will not necessitate the redevelopment of existing areas of open space.
- Improvement in the range of shops and services in Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham, with qualitative improvement to Burnham and Iver Village.
- Development in larger settlements will ensure residents have good access to the widest range of facilities and services.
- Most existing employment sites protected from redevelopment. Some new employment provision on the strategic sites.
- A local economy that remains diverse, but with an increasing focus on higher-value added activities.

- Potential to encourage more sustainable travel (for example, greater use of the rail stations at Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross, Taplow and Burnham).
- The appropriate consideration of climate change issues in planning and delivering new developments.

## 7.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 The emerging Spatial Strategy performs relatively strongly against the Sustainability Appraisal objectives, when compared with the four Spatial Strategy scenarios. It is acknowledged, however, that in absolute terms, the emerging spatial is not 'perfect'. For example, it will deliver well below the identified need for affordable housing, and is unlikely to maximise the potential for local economic growth.
- 7.2 The emerging Spatial Strategy seeks to strike a considered balance - by providing some new affordable housing and allowing for some local economic growth, but at the same time protecting the high quality local environment and Green Belt boundary.

### Future Work

- 7.3 Further sustainability appraisal work will be required over the coming months to consider the scope for further mitigation of the adverse impacts associated with the preferred spatial strategy. The findings of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment will be particularly important, as this will provide a better understanding of the distribution of development opportunities, the development densities required to avoid development in the Green Belt and the potential impact of future development on settlement character.
- 7.4 In addition, once the preferred Spatial Strategy has been agreed, further work will be needed to determine which areas of land should be identified as "contingency locations". The current intention is to briefly review all of the Green Belt sites submitted by landowners and developers, but focus in on those areas that would fit best with the emerging Spatial Strategy (i.e. the potential greenfield sites around Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham). Further work will also be required on the potential impact of seeking to accommodate more housing than the South East Plan minimum requirement of 1,880 dwellings.
- 7.5 The publication version of the Core Strategy will be accompanied by a single Sustainability Appraisal Report, which will bring together all of the sustainability appraisal work undertaken in preparing the Core Strategy.

APPENDIX 1

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK

Social Objectives and Indicators	
1. To provide residents of South Bucks with the opportunity to live in a decent home.	1. Proportion of vulnerable people in decent homes.
	2. Housing completions, allocations and permissions.
	3. Number of empty homes per annum.
	4. House price / earnings affordability ratio.
	5. Cumulative number of housing completions that are affordable.
	6. Number of households on the housing register.
	7. Number of homeless households.
	8. Proportion of annual housing completions are that social rented / intermediate tenures.
	9. Housing quality - 'Building for Life' assessments - Core output indicator H6.
2. To reduce anti-social activity, including crime and the fear of crime, through the creation of safer places to live and work.	1. Recorded crimes per 1,000 population for domestic burglaries, violent offences and vehicle crimes.
	2. Police survey results on the Fear of Crime.
	3. Number of fatal and serious road accidents occurring in a particular year.
3. To improve accessibility to essential services and facilities to provide opportunities to obtain good access to high	1. Percentage of new residential development within 30 minutes public transport time of a GP, hospital, schools, employment and a major shopping centre.
	2. Amount and percentage of permitted and completed retail development which is in town (District) centres and within Local or Neighbourhood Centres.

<p>quality health, education, and recreation and other community facilities and services.</p>	<p>3. Amount and percentage of completed leisure development which is in Town Centres.</p>
<p><b>Environmental Objectives and Indicators</b></p>	
<p>4. To encourage the use of sustainable and integrated methods of transport to reduce negative effects on the environment.</p>	<p>1. Percentage of schools with a School Travel Plan in South Bucks.                  2. Annual average flow (per 1,000km) of traffic on the principal roads in South Bucks.                  3. Percentage of major developments with a Travel Plan.                  4. Percentage of new housing that is within 400m (in urban areas) or 800m (in rural areas) of a half hourly bus or train service.                  5. Percentage of commuters who travel by car.</p>
<p>5. To provide for sustainable levels of water use, supply and management.</p>	<p>1. Water leakage rate from mains and customer pipes.                  2. Amount of water use and availability of future supplies.</p>
<p>6. To maintain and enhance biodiversity.</p>	<p>1. Achievement of Buckinghamshire Biodiversity Action Plan targets, delivered through the Biodiversity Opportunity Areas.                  2. Condition and area of SSSIs and SACs (hectares).                  3. Area of the District covered by Ancient Woodland and covered by Woodland Grant Schemes (hectares).                  4. Extent of Local Nature Reserves, County Local Wildlife Sites, National Nature Reserves and Regionally Important Geological / Geomorphological Sites.</p>
<p>7. To conserve and enhance the landscape</p>	<p>1. Number of developments permitted in the AONB.                  2. Number of relevant actions implemented in the Colne Valley Action Plan.</p>

and townscape character of South Bucks and in particular, those areas of designated importance.	3. Proportion of schemes granted planning permission which affect the setting of the River Thames and which bring about improvements to that setting.
8. To conserve and enhance the historic environment.	1. Listed buildings (total and at risk).
	2. Loss or damage to scheduled ancient monuments (number) & historic parks and gardens (hectares).
	3. Progress made with Conservation Area reviews.
9. To reduce contributions to climate change through: a) Reducing energy consumption, b) Sustainable building practices c) Maximising the potential for renewable energy and energy conservation.	1. National Indicator NI186 - Per capita reduction in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions in the District.
	2. Energy use per household (gas and electricity).
	3. Renewable energy capacity installed by type.
10. Minimise waste and then re-use or recover it through recycling, composting or energy recovery.	1. Proportion of household waste which has been recycled or composted each year.
	2. Per capita household waste per year.
11. To conserve soil resources and quality.	1. Loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a) to development.
	2. New and converted dwellings on previously developed land (Core output indicator H3).
12. To improve the efficiency of land use through the re-use of existing buildings and developing on previously developed land (PDL).	1. New and converted dwellings on previously developed land (Core output indicator H3).
	2. Percentage of new dwellings completed at different densities, in different areas (for example, townscape character areas, town centres etc).

<p>13. To minimise the risk of flooding in relation to both new and existing development including existing infrastructure.</p>	<p>1. The number of planning permissions granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on the grounds of flood risk.</p> <p>2. New housing development built in Flood Zone 1.</p>
<p>14. To reduce pollution of the air, water and soil and also combat sources of noise and light pollution.</p>	<p>1. Number of sites in the District where there was an exceedance of the UK Annual Mean objective for Nitrogen dioxide.</p> <p>2. Amount of pollution sensitive development granted planning permission in AQMA.</p> <p>3. Rivers and chalk streams of 'Good' or 'Fair' chemical and biological water quality.</p> <p>4. Number of incidents of major and significant water pollution occurring in a particular year.</p> <p>5. Potentially contaminated sites investigated and remediated.</p> <p>6. Number of noise and light complaints received from members of the public.</p>
<p><b>Economic Objectives and Indicators</b></p>	
<p>15. To encourage economic growth and competitiveness, whilst achieving a broad balance in the distribution and growth of housing, population &amp; employment.</p>	<p>1. Net change in the total of VAT registered businesses in the District.</p> <p>2. Commuting flows and the balance between local employment opportunities and the resident workforce.</p> <p>3. Total amount of additional floorspace by type (Core output Indicator BD1).</p>
<p>16. To encourage a diverse economy which is focused on higher value added, lower impact activities.</p>	<p>1. Number and proportion of employees in knowledge based sectors.</p>
<p>17. To develop and maintain a skilled workforce to support long-term competitiveness of the District.</p>	<p>1. Percentage of 15 year old pupils in schools maintained by the local education authority achieving five or more GCSEs at grades A* - C or equivalent. (County level data).</p> <p>2. Percentage of population qualified to National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) level 3 or equivalent.</p>

	3. Percentage of adults with no qualifications.
	4. Proportion of people of working age who are unemployed.
	5. Proportion of people of working age out of work for more than a year.

## APPENDIX 2

### CORE STRATEGY OBJECTIVES

1. Provide sufficient homes to meet the housing requirement for the District (as set out in the South East Plan) and seek to ensure that most residents can live in a property that is appropriate to their needs in terms of size and type.
2. Increase the amount of affordable dwellings provided throughout the District, particularly social rented units.
3. Conserve and enhance the high quality environment of the District's towns and villages by ensuring that all new development is designed to a high standard and maintains and enhances the character and 'sense of place' of individual settlements.
4. Promote a balanced local economy in terms of jobs, skills and the local labour supply, and support existing businesses and small start-up businesses.
5. Maintain (and where appropriate enhance), the range and quality of shops in the District Centres of Beaconsfield New Town and Gerrards Cross, and the Local Centres of Beaconsfield Old Town, Burnham, Farnham Common, Iver and Denham Green.
6. Take steps to mitigate, and adapt to, the impacts of climate change through sustainable construction and by increasing energy efficiency and maximising the potential of renewable energy.
7. Reduce water consumption and waste production and minimise pollution to air, water and soil.
8. Protect and enhance high quality natural features in South Bucks, especially those areas of designated importance, such as Burnham Beeches, the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the water environment, including the River Thames.

9. Enhance biodiversity in urban and rural areas of the District, including in the 'biodiversity 'opportunity areas'<sup>5</sup>, and seek to minimise the impact of new development sites on fauna and flora.
10. Avoid releases of undeveloped sites in the Green Belt.
11. Ensure that new or improved physical, social and green infrastructure resources (including healthcare, education, recreation, social and cultural facilities), is provided where it is needed to support appropriate new development, address demographic change, or to make good existing deficiencies.
12. Focus new development in accessible locations, e.g. close to town centres, to make best use of existing infrastructure, facilities and services.
13. Ensure that new developments are designed in such a way as to minimise crime.
14. Encourage more sustainable forms of transport and increase travel choice to help address congestion, particularly in Beaconsfield, Iver and along the A355 and A4.
15. Mitigate the environmental impact of transportation, in particular the effects of noise, odours and emissions associated with freight movement.
16. Increase accessibility for those in rural areas.

---

<sup>5</sup> The Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Biodiversity Partnership have identified the areas across the county, including in South Bucks District, where the greatest gains for biodiversity can be delivered.

---

## APPENDIX 3

### SUMMARY OF ISSUES, PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES

#### Climate Change

- Climate change is a major cross-cutting issue and impacts on most aspects of the LDF. Appropriate mitigation and adaptation strategies will need to be developed accordingly and will include meeting the requirements of the Code for Sustainable Homes and maximising the use of renewable energy.

#### Demographic Change

- Almost a fifth of the population is aged 65 and over. By 2026<sup>6</sup>, this age group is expected to have risen to over a quarter of the population. This will have implications for health care, social care, housing provision and leisure requirements.
- The working age population (16-64) is expected to fall from around 39,900 to around 37,500 over the same period which may result in increased levels of in-commuting.

#### Accessibility to housing

- House prices in South Bucks are among the highest in the country. In the second quarter of 2007, the average price of a property in South Bucks was £508,000 compared to £216,000 nationally<sup>7</sup>. As a result, most first time buyers have difficulty getting on to the housing ladder. Average private rental costs are also extremely high, at over £1,100 per month<sup>8</sup>.

#### Affordable Housing

- The total number of affordable homes that can be provided in the District will be constrained by the size of District's housing allocation (at least 1,880 dwellings, 2006-26).

---

<sup>6</sup> Buckinghamshire Population Projections, 2007

<sup>7</sup> Land Registry (2007)

<sup>8</sup> Bucks SHMA, 2008

- The proportion of affordable homes needs to increase significantly to comply with policies in the South East Plan but most housing developments in the District fall below the current size threshold for the provision of such homes.
- The type and size of affordable homes needs to reflect the requirements of an ageing population.

### Residential Character and Urban Intensification

- Strong commitment to the protection of the Green Belt has resulted in the majority of new housing in the District being built on previously developed land within existing settlements.
- Further urban intensification could pose a threat to the residential character of some residential areas, particularly those urban areas with low housing densities such as Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross.

### Transport

- Congestion on strategic routes forces large volumes of traffic, including HGVs, onto local roads;
- Perceived congestion / heavy traffic hotspots at Beaconsfield, Burnham, Farnham Common and Farnham Royal (on the A355), Richings Park (which is located close to Heathrow), Stoke Poges and on the stretch of the A4 between Maidenhead and Slough;
- HGV traffic problems at Iver, with lorries using the High Street to and from a number of industrial areas;
- High quality links to London are not matched by links to the north e.g. to Aylesbury;
- The Richings Park area is used by some traffic as a shortcut to Heathrow;
- An Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) was declared in 2004 along a corridor of land along the length of the M4, M25 and M40;
- Dorney Lake has been selected to host the 2012 Olympics and Paralympics rowing events, posing a serious challenge in terms of traffic management;
- Bus services could be under pressure if they are not viable, especially in more rural areas of the District;
- Car ownership is high, with 53% of households owning two or more cars, compared to 38% in the South East and 29% nationally.

### Local Economy

- The economy of the District needs to grow without creating a demand for additional labour or employment land;
- High levels of in and out-commuting imply a mismatch between the skill levels of local residents and the jobs available in District;
- Expansion of some businesses in the District is constrained by the Green Belt.
- The relationship between some of the larger industrial estates in South Bucks and nearby settlements.

### Infrastructure

- Urban intensification puts pressure on existing infrastructure but small 'brownfield' developments limit the scope to secure 'developer contributions' towards infrastructure improvements.
- Appropriate funding will need to be secured to support the infrastructure required for strategic sites.

### Deprivation

- South Bucks is generally very affluent, but there are pockets of relative deprivation in the District (at Burnham, Denham and Iver). Two areas (both in Burnham) are ranked in the lower half of all areas in England in terms of overall deprivation<sup>9</sup>.

### Town and Village Centres

- A significant proportion of spending on comparison goods takes place in nearby higher order shopping centres, and therefore does not benefit the local economy.

### Historic Environment

- South Bucks District has a rich and diverse historic environment. There are 732 Listed Buildings, 17 Conservation Areas, 12 Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and 11 Scheduled Ancient Monuments in South Bucks.

### Natural Environment, Resources and Landscape Character

- There is one Special Area of Conservation in South Bucks (Burnham Beeches) and there are 9 Sites of Special Scientific Interest.
- There are 3 Regionally Important Geological Sites, 4 Local Nature Reserves, 19 Local Wildlife Sites and over 100 Biological Notification Sites which are in the process of being assessed against Local Wildlife Sites criteria.
- Four Regional Biodiversity Opportunity Areas have been identified in South Bucks (covering over half of the District's area) where the greatest gains for Biodiversity can be delivered.
- Parts of the District have been damaged by mineral extraction and waste disposal activities and pressure for further development is likely to continue.

---

<sup>9</sup> Indices of Multiple Deprivation, 2007

- Some areas of nature conservation and landscape importance are under pressure from climate change e.g. the Chilterns AONB, Burnham Beeches SAC and Stoke Common SSSI.
- The River Thames flows along the south-western boundary of the District for approximately 12 kilometres, from Cliveden to Boveney Lock.
- A substantial part of the District lies within the regionally important Colne Valley Regional Park, including Denham, Iver and Black and Langley Parks. It covers 43 square miles of countryside from Rickmansworth to Staines, and acts as the strategic gap between the larger settlements in South Bucks and Greater London.
- The Colne Valley Park also includes the Colne, Alderbourne and Misbourne rivers, Farlows Lake, Black Park, Denham Country Park and Langley Park.
- There are important areas of ancient woodland in the District and many historic parks and gardens, including at Bulstrode, Cliveden, Hall Barn, Langley and Stoke Park.

### Flood Risk

- Some areas have a high risk of flooding, in particular Taplow/ Dorney to the west and New Denham and Willowbank to the east.

### Community Safety

- Burglary and vehicle crime are above the national and Buckinghamshire average, due to high property values and affluent residents;
- Hotspots for property crime are concentrated in Burnham, Iver and Gerrards Cross
- Violent crime is highest in Beaconsfield and Burnham.
- Levels of fear are also quite high. Vehicle crime, burglary and violence were the crimes that most people were concerned about<sup>10</sup>, although anti social behaviour is another major community concern.<sup>11</sup>

### Health

- South Bucks' residents are generally healthier than the national average with 23 of 32 health indicators being significantly better than the England average<sup>12</sup>. Good health though is not shared equally across all groups and in all areas.

---

<sup>10</sup> South Bucks Community Safety Strategy 2005-08

<sup>11</sup> South Bucks Community Plan

<sup>12</sup> South Bucks Health Profile 2008, Department of Health, 2008

- Life expectancy varies across the District, and is lower in less wealthy areas such as Denham North (75 years) than in more affluent areas such as Gerrards Cross South (86 years)<sup>13</sup>.
- About one person in five is obese and only one in eight people take enough physical activity<sup>14</sup>.
- The rate of road injuries and deaths is higher than the England average.
- There are no NHS hospitals in the District and residents rely on hospitals in High Wycombe, Slough and Hillingdon for acute care.
- Doctor's surgeries tend to be small and, in most cases, are not equipped to take on a wider role to support a transfer of functions from acute care to the Bucks Primary Care Trust (PCT). The PCT seeks rationalisation of GP services into well located health centres instead of numerous small GP and branch surgeries.
- Gerrards Cross lacks a doctor's surgery, although there are surgeries in nearby Chalfont St Peter.

### Education and Training

- There are no areas in South Bucks district that are projected to have surplus school capacity.
- Secondary schools within the South Bucks district are projected to have a shortfall in capacity.
- Primary schools in the Beeches and Ivers planning area are projected to be at capacity, whilst those in Gerrards Cross and Beaconsfield are projected to have a shortfall in capacity.
- In the absence of further education establishments in the District residents look to Slough College, Bucks New University, Wycombe and Amersham College to meet their needs.

### Sport, Recreation and Tourism

- There are many opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation in South Bucks District, with 291 sites covering a total of 3,636 hectares. 98% of the provision is comprised of parks and gardens (including Black, Langley and Denham Country Parks), natural and semi-natural green space (including Burnham Beeches) and sports facilities.
- In terms of accessibility, there are deficiencies in certain types of facility in some of the settlements in the District (including Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross).
- Of the seven sport halls located in the District, only two offer full public access (at Beaconsfield and Iver).
- None of the four swimming pools in the District provide public access - all are limited to 'registered membership' or 'community / club use'.

---

<sup>13</sup> Primary Care Trust data, 2005

<sup>14</sup> South Bucks Health Profile 2007, NHS

APPENDIX 4

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF SOUTH BUCKS STRATEGIC SPATIAL SCENARIOS

This section includes a detailed appraisal of each of the Spatial Strategy Scenarios for South Bucks District.

Spatial Strategy Scenario 1 - Urban Intensification

Sustainability Appraisal

Sustainability Objective		Urban Intensification	
		Rating	Commentary
<b>Social Objectives</b>			
1	To provide residents of South Bucks with the opportunity to live in a decent home.	-?	<p>This scenario should enable South Bucks District Council to deliver the emerging South East Plan housing requirement of 1,880 dwellings, although there is little flexibility (with no contingency land proposed), should the District's housing allocation rise or windfall completions fall away.</p> <p>It is likely that most sites under this scenario will be small, resulting in fewer development schemes that would be above the threshold for affordable housing provision. Of the four scenarios, Scenario 1 would probably deliver the least affordable housing, well below the regional average target of 35% affordable housing.</p> <p>The focus on smaller sites would mean there would probably be less scope to influence the mix of dwellings (in terms of size and type). In relative terms, this scenario would probably result in more flats and fewer new family homes.</p>
2	To reduce anti-social activity, including crime and the fear of crime, through the creation of safer places to live and work.	0	No direct relationship. The Council will encourage new development that has been designed so as to minimise criminal activity and support development proposals aimed specifically at improving community safety.
3	To improve accessibility to essential services and facilities to provide opportunities to obtain good access to high quality health, education, and recreation and other community facilities and services.	0	<p>This scenario would result in all new housing development being located <u>within</u> existing towns and villages, in close proximity to the available facilities and services. More development would take place in Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham, those settlements with the highest levels of accessibility and best range of facilities and services - see the Accessibility and Infrastructure Study (2006) and the Settlement Hierarchy Study (2008). There would, however, still be some new housing in other settlements, where the available range of facilities and services is relatively poor.</p> <p>The limited increase in retail floorspace envisaged under this scenario would limit the scope to significantly enhance the retail and leisure offer in South Bucks District. Furthermore, as it is likely that most new housing sites under this scenario will be small, few (if any) development schemes will be of sufficient size to justify the direct provision of new community facilities.</p> <p>There would be little scope to address the deficiency in public open space in Beaconsfield.</p>

Sustainability Objective		Urban Intensification	
		Rating	Commentary
<b>Environmental Objectives</b>			
4	To encourage the use of sustainable and integrated methods of transport to reduce negative effects on the environment.	+	<p>This scenario would result in more new housing development being located in Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham, those settlements with the highest levels of accessibility and best range of facilities and services - see the Accessibility and Infrastructure Study (2006) and the Settlement Hierarchy Study (2008). New residents would have relatively good access to facilities and services on foot, and by bicycle, with other facilities and services available in the larger settlements outside of the District accessible by public transport.</p> <p>Less positively, the new housing development in other settlements would have relatively poor access to those facilities and services only found in the larger settlements. Some of the smaller settlements in South Bucks have relatively good public transport accessibility (for example, Farnham Common) enabling access to higher order facilities by public transport. In other smaller settlements, with poor public transport accessibility, the residents of any new housing development would be more likely to access higher order services by private car.</p>
5	To provide for sustainable levels of water use, supply and management.	-?	<p>The Environment Agency has confirmed that the north of the District (including Gerrards Cross) is presently over abstracted and that Beaconsfield, Iver Heath and the Iver area are over licensed but not presently over abstracted. However, the Environment Agency has also confirmed that it is the origin of the water supply rather than the location of housing which is of concern to them, as water can be piped in from other parts of the network if needed.</p> <p>The limited availability of new water resources, combined with high existing demand and new development, will place considerable strain on water supply in the South East region. South Bucks District Council will consider water efficiency when developing development management policies and determining planning applications. As this scenario is unlikely to involve the development of larger sites, it may be more difficult to encourage developers to make provision for sustainable drainage and water recycling.</p>
6	To maintain and enhance biodiversity.	+	<p>The Council will aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>With no Green Belt contingency land identified, this scenario should help to protect biodiversity in urban fringe areas (including those areas of designated importance). Less positively, there might be some loss of urban biodiversity, through the redevelopment of derelict or underutilised sites, and potentially, as a result of new housing development on areas of poor quality public open space.</p>
7	To conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character of South Bucks and in particular, those areas of designated importance.	0	<p>This scenario would avoid development on greenfield land adjacent to settlements, helping to conserve landscape character. Development in the ANOB would be avoided.</p> <p>Less positively, this scenario would necessitate higher development densities within existing settlements, resulting in a potentially adverse impact on townscape character. The loss of public open space (albeit poor quality open space) would also have an adverse impact on townscape character.</p> <p>Poorly performing employment sites (including those creating local amenity issues) could be redeveloped for housing, resulting in localised improvements in townscape and / or landscape character.</p>
8	To conserve and enhance the historic environment.	-?	<p>Under each of the scenarios, the Council will aim to protect and preserve the District's historic heritage.</p> <p>Less positively, this scenario would necessitate higher development densities within existing settlements, resulting in a potentially adverse impact on the historic environment.</p>
9	To reduce contributions to climate change through: (a) Sustainable building practices; (b) Maximising the potential for renewable energy	0	<p>The Council will consider the need for sustainable building practices when developing development management policies and determining planning applications. In relation to maximising the potential for renewable energy and energy conservation, the smaller sites associated with this scenario are less likely to be suited to shared renewable energy technologies.</p>

Sustainability Objective		Urban Intensification	
		Rating	Commentary
	and energy conservation		
10	To minimise waste and then re-use or recover it through recycling, composting or energy recovery.	0	No direct relationship.
11	To conserve soil resources and quality.	+	This scenario would avoid development in the Green Belt, helping to conserve soil resources.
12	To improve the efficiency of land use through the re-use of existing buildings and developing on previously developed land (PDL).	++	This scenario would encourage the re-use and redevelopment of previously developed land by encouraging urban intensification. The higher development densities associated with this scenario would help to make the most efficient use of urban land.
13	To minimise the risk of flooding in relation to both new and existing development including existing infrastructure.	+?	The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and emerging Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment show that the District's housing requirement can be accommodated outside of areas at risk from flooding. However, higher density development within urban areas will require careful consideration - particularly in relation to the potential (cumulative) impact of surface water run-off.
14	To reduce pollution of the air, water and soil, and also combat sources of noise and light pollution.	+	With more new development in those settlements with the best range of facilities and services, and good public transport accessibility, this scenario provide the opportunity to use more sustainable modes of transport (with lower CO <sub>2</sub> emissions).
<b>Economic Objectives</b>			
15	To encourage economic growth and competitiveness, whilst achieving a broad balance in the distribution and growth of housing population and employment.	-?	This scenario would provide little flexibility, with few opportunities to identify any new sites for employment generating development, should others be redeveloped for housing.  Economic growth may be restricted by the limited scope for provision of new employment sites. Businesses would be encouraged to make smarter use of the factors of production (for example, making more efficient use of space, and introducing more flexible working practices to help increase economic activity rates).
16	To encourage a diverse economy which is focused on high value added, lower impact activities.	+?	This scenario could well result in some traditional (underutilised) employment sites being redeveloped for housing. The more intensive use of existing employment land is likely to favour higher value added, lower impact activities.
17	To develop and maintain a skilled workforce to support long-term competitiveness of the District.	-?	This scenario would produce only moderate amounts of affordable housing. It would provide limited support for key workers. In addition, in seeking to develop at medium to high densities, there would be less scope to deliver new family accommodation. Young professionals would be well catered for, but the supply of new housing for workers with families would be more limited.  More positively, the new jobs created through redevelopment schemes would probably be better suited to the skills of the highly qualified resident workforce. This could help to reduce the current high levels of out-commuting.

Summary
<p><u>Social Objectives</u></p> <p>This scenario should enable South Bucks District to deliver the emerging South East Plan housing requirement, although there is little scope for contingency or flexibility. It would produce only moderate amounts of affordable housing overall (well below the South East Plan regional average target of 35%). In addition, there would be less opportunity to influence the mix of dwellings (in terms of size and type).</p>

The majority of new housing development would be in those settlements with the best range of facilities and services and highest levels of accessibility, although there would still be some new housing in other settlements, where access to facilities and services would be relatively poor. This scenario would provide limited scope to significantly enhance the retail and leisure offer in South Bucks District.

Environmental Objectives

New residents in the new housing development located in Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham would have relatively good access to facilities and services on foot, and by bicycle, with other facilities and services available in the larger settlements outside of the District accessible by public transport. Elsewhere, there would be a greater propensity for residents to access higher order facilities by private car.

This scenario performs positively in terms of protecting landscape character and biodiversity in urban fringe areas. It also performs well in relation to conserving soil resources and making more efficient use of previously developed land. Less positively, the medium to high development densities necessitated under this scenario could have an adverse impact on townscape character, and may limit the scope to encourage developers to incorporate shared renewable energy technologies and sustainable drainage systems.

Economic Objectives

This scenario would provide little flexibility, with few opportunities to identify any new sites for employment generating development. More positively, this scenario would actively encourage the more intensive use of existing employment sites, by allowing more traditional premises to be redeveloped as modern offices. The new jobs created through redevelopment schemes would probably be better suited to the skills of the highly qualified resident workforce.

With limited new affordable housing, this scenario would provide limited support for key workers.

Spatial Strategy Scenario 2 - Focus on Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross

Sustainability Appraisal

Sustainability Objective		Focus on Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross	
		Rating	Commentary
<b>Social Objectives</b>			
1	To provide residents of South Bucks with the opportunity to live in a decent home.	+	<p>This scenario would enable South Bucks District to deliver the emerging South East Plan housing requirement of 1,880 dwellings. The proposed contingency locations provide some flexibility, should the District’s housing allocation rise (as a result of an early review of the South East Plan) or windfall completions fall away.</p> <p>This scenario would probably deliver more affordable housing than scenario 2, although still less than the regional average target of 35%. It would deliver more affordable housing in those areas with the greatest need, particularly if one or more of the contingency locations at Beaconsfield and / or Gerrards Cross needed to be released for development. The release of contingency land for new housing development (if required) would also provide the opportunity to deliver more new family housing.</p> <p>Less positively, there would be limited new affordable housing provision in Burnham and the smaller settlement across South Bucks.</p>
2	To reduce anti-social activity,	0	No direct relationship. The Council will encourage new development that has been designed so as to minimise criminal activity and

Sustainability Objective		Focus on Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross	
		Rating	Commentary
	including crime and the fear of crime, through the creation of safer places to live and work.		support development proposals aimed specifically at improving community safety.
3	To improve accessibility to essential services and facilities to provide opportunities to obtain good access to high quality health, education, and recreation and other community facilities and services.	++?	<p>This scenario would result in the greatest concentration of new housing development in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross, those settlements with the highest levels of accessibility and best range of facilities and services - see the Accessibility and Infrastructure Study (2006) and the Settlement Hierarchy Study (2008). Development in other locations, with relatively poor accessibility, would be limited.</p> <p>This scenario would support improvements in the number and range of shops in Beaconsfield New Town and Gerrards Cross, with the aim of meeting the identified capacity for additional floorspace in the period to 2026. This should help to increase self-containment. If contingency land adjacent to Beaconsfield or Gerrards Cross was released for development, there may be scope to require the direct provision of new community facilities. In the case of Beaconsfield, there would also be scope to address the local deficiency in public open space.</p> <p>Less positively, under this scenario, there would be limited opportunities to enhance access to essential facilities and services in Burnham and the smaller settlements across South Bucks District.</p>
<b>Environmental Objectives</b>			
4	To encourage the use of sustainable and integrated methods of transport to reduce negative effects on the environment.	++	This scenario would result in most new housing development being located in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross, those settlements with the highest levels of accessibility and best range of facilities and services - see the Accessibility and Infrastructure Study (2006) and the Settlement Hierarchy Study (2008). New residents would have relatively good access to facilities and services on foot, and by bicycle, with other facilities and services available in the larger settlements outside of the District accessible by public transport.
5	To provide for sustainable levels of water use, supply and management.	-?	<p>The Environment Agency has confirmed that the north of the District (including Gerrards Cross) is presently over abstracted and that Beaconsfield, Iver Heath and the Iver area are over licensed but not presently over abstracted. However, the Environment Agency has also confirmed that it is the origin of the water supply rather than the location of housing which is of concern to them, as water can be piped in from other parts of the network if needed.</p> <p>The limited availability of new water resources, combined with high existing demand and new development, will place considerable strain on water supply in the South East region. South Bucks District Council will consider water efficiency when developing development management policies and determining planning applications. Thames Water has advised that any significant new development in the Beaconsfield area would be likely to require additional waste water infrastructure.</p>
6	To maintain and enhance biodiversity.	-?	<p>The Council will aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Scenario 2 might result in some greenfield development (on contingency land), with a potential adverse impact on biodiversity in urban fringe areas. There might also be some loss of urban biodiversity in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross, through the redevelopment of derelict or underutilised sites, and potentially, as a result of new housing development on areas of poor quality public open space.</p> <p>Biodiversity in and around Burnham and smaller settlements in South Bucks District should be largely maintained.</p>
7	To conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character of South Bucks and in particular, those areas of designated importance.	-?	<p>This scenario might result in some greenfield development adjacent to Beaconsfield and / or Gerrards Cross, which could have an adverse impact on landscape character. Development in the ANOB would be avoided.</p> <p>Furthermore, this scenario would necessitate higher development densities in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross, resulting in a potentially adverse impact on townscape character. The loss of public open space (albeit poor quality open space) would also have an adverse impact</p>

Sustainability Objective		Focus on Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross	
		Rating	Commentary
			on townscape character.  More positively, the character of Burnham and smaller settlement across South Bucks would be protected.
8	To conserve and enhance the historic environment.	-?	Under each of the scenarios, the Council will aim to protect and preserve the District's historic heritage.  Less positively, this scenario would necessitate higher development densities in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross, resulting in a potentially adverse impact on the historic environment.
9	To reduce contributions to climate change through: (a) Sustainable building practices; (b) Maximising the potential for renewable energy and energy conservation	+?	The Council will consider the need for sustainable building practices when developing development management policies and determining planning applications. In relation to maximising the potential for renewable energy and energy conservation, should one or more areas of contingency land need to be released for development, there would be the opportunity to introduce shared renewable energy technologies.
10	To minimise waste and then re-use or recover it through recycling, composting or energy recovery.	0	No direct relationship.
11	To conserve soil resources and quality.	-?	This scenario might result in some greenfield development adjacent to Beaconsfield and / or Gerrards Cross, resulting in the loss of agricultural land. The quality of the land lost will be dependent upon the area of land released for development.
12	To improve the efficiency of land use through the re-use of existing buildings and developing on previously developed land (PDL).	+?	This scenario would give particular encouragement to the re-use and redevelopment of previously developed land in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross. The higher development densities proposed for these areas would help to ensure the most efficient use of urban land.  In Burnham and the smaller settlements across South Bucks, previously developed land would still accommodate some new housing development, but the emphasis would not be on making the <u>most</u> efficient use of urban land.
13	To minimise the risk of flooding in relation to both new and existing development including existing infrastructure.	+?	The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and emerging Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment show that the District's housing requirement can be accommodated outside of areas at risk from flooding. However, higher density development within urban areas will require careful consideration - particularly in relation to the potential (cumulative) impact of surface water run-off.
14	To reduce pollution of the air, water and soil, and also combat sources of noise and light pollution.	++	With most new development in those settlements with the best range of facilities and services, and good public transport accessibility, this scenario would provide the best opportunity to make more use of sustainable modes of transport (with lower CO <sub>2</sub> emissions).
<b>Economic Objectives</b>			
15	To encourage economic growth and competitiveness, whilst achieving a broad balance in the distribution and growth of housing population and employment.	+++	Some poorly performing employment land within Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross could be released for housing development. In order to maintain a broad balance between local employment opportunities and the size of the resident workforce, new employment land might need to be allocated adjacent to Beaconsfield (and possibly Gerrards Cross). The aim would be to maintain the current economic structure, with land suitable for a range of employment activities.  This scenario would provide greater flexibility, although overall there would be little change in commuting patterns or the number of jobs in the District.
16	To encourage a diverse economy which is focused on high value added, lower impact activities.	0	Some poorly performing employment land within Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross could be released for housing development. In order to maintain a broad balance between local employment opportunities and the size of the resident workforce, new employment land might need to be allocated adjacent to Beaconsfield (and possibly Gerrards Cross). The aim would be to maintain the current economic

Sustainability Objective		Focus on Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross	
		Rating	Commentary
			structure, with land suitable for a range of employment activities.
17	To develop and maintain a skilled workforce to support long-term competitiveness of the District.	+	This scenario would probably deliver more new affordable housing than Scenario 1, providing more support for key workers. If one or more of the contingency locations at Beaconsfield and / or Gerrards Cross were released for development, this scenario could deliver a wider mix of housing types, including new homes for workers with families.

Summary	
<p><u>Social Objectives</u></p> <p>This scenario would enable South Bucks District to deliver the emerging South East Plan housing requirement of 1,880 dwellings. The proposed contingency locations provide some flexibility, should the District's housing allocation rise (as a result of an early review of the South East Plan) or windfall completions fall away. It would probably produce more affordable housing than scenario 1.</p> <p>This scenario would result in the greatest concentration of new housing development in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross, those settlements with the highest levels of accessibility and best range of facilities and services. This scenario would support improvements in the number and range of shops in Beaconsfield New Town and Gerrards Cross, with the aim of meeting the identified capacity for additional floorspace in the period 2026. This should help to increase self-containment.</p> <p><u>Environmental Objectives</u></p> <p>New residents in the new housing development located in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross would have good access to facilities and services on foot, and by bicycle, with other facilities and services available in the larger settlements outside of the District accessible by public transport.</p> <p>Should one or more areas of contingency land need to be developed, this scenario would potentially result in an adverse impact on landscape character and biodiversity in urban fringe areas. There could also be an adverse impact on the townscape character of Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross. More positively, the character of Burnham and the smaller settlements across South Bucks would be protected.</p> <p>In terms of land use efficiency, this scenario would strongly support the re-use and redevelopment of previously developed land in Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross.</p> <p><u>Economic Objectives</u></p> <p>Some poorly performing employment land within Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross could be released for housing development. In order to maintain a broad balance between local employment opportunities and the size of the resident workforce, new employment land might need to be allocated adjacent to Beaconsfield (and possibly Gerrards Cross). The aim would be to maintain the current economic structure, with land suitable for a range of employment activities.</p>	

Spatial Strategy Scenario 3 - Focus on Smaller Settlements

Sustainability Appraisal

Sustainability Objective		Focus on Smaller Settlements	
		Rating	Commentary
<b>Social Objectives</b>			
1	To provide residents of South Bucks with the opportunity to live in a decent home.	++	<p>This scenario would enable South Bucks District to deliver the emerging South East Plan housing requirement of 1,880 dwellings. The proposed contingency locations provide some flexibility, should the District's housing allocation rise (as a result of an early review of the South East Plan) or windfall completions fall away.</p> <p>This scenario would come closest to delivering the regional average target of 35% affordable housing. It would deliver more affordable in smaller settlements to meet local needs, in part, through development on Rural Exceptions sites. The release of contingency land for new housing development (if required) would provide the opportunity to deliver more new affordable housing and more new family housing.</p>
2	To reduce anti-social activity, including crime and the fear of crime, through the creation of safer places to live and work.	0	No direct relationship. The Council will encourage new development that has been designed so as to minimise criminal activity and support development proposals aimed specifically at improving community safety.
3	To improve accessibility to essential services and facilities to provide opportunities to obtain good access to high quality health, education, and recreation and other community facilities and services.	-	<p>The dispersed pattern of development under this scenario would result in many new residents having relatively poor accessibility to the wider range of services and facilities available in the three largest settlements in South Bucks. More positively, new housing development in some of the smaller settlements could help to support the viability of marginal village services and facilities (for example, local convenience stores and certain primary schools).</p> <p>Some new retail floorspace would be permitted in Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham, but less than in scenario 2. If contingency land adjacent to smaller settlements was released for development, there may be scope to require the direct provision of new (small scale) community facilities.</p> <p>Under this scenario, there would be little scope to address the deficiency in public open space in Beaconsfield.</p>
<b>Environmental Objectives</b>			
4	To encourage the use of sustainable and integrated methods of transport to reduce negative effects on the environment.	--	<p>This scenario would result in the least amount of new development in those settlements with the highest levels of accessibility (namely Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham). From many of the smaller settlements in South Bucks, new residents would have relatively poor access to those facilities and services only found in larger urban areas. In general, there would be a greater propensity for these new residents to access higher order facilities by private car.</p> <p>Trips to local village facilities could be made on foot or by bicycle.</p>
5	To provide for sustainable levels of water use, supply and management.	-?	<p>The Environment Agency has confirmed that the north of the District (including Gerrards Cross) is presently over abstracted and that Beaconsfield, Iver Heath and the Iver area are over licensed but not presently over abstracted. However, the Environment Agency has also confirmed that it is the origin of the water supply rather than the location of housing which is of concern to them, as water can be piped in from other parts of the network if needed.</p> <p>The limited availability of new water resources, combined with high existing demand and new development, will place considerable strain on water supply in the South East region. South Bucks District Council will consider water efficiency when developing development management policies and determining planning applications. As this scenario is unlikely to involve the development of larger sites, it may</p>

Sustainability Objective		Focus on Smaller Settlements	
		Rating	Commentary
			be more difficult to encourage developers to make provision for sustainable drainage and water recycling.
6	To maintain and enhance biodiversity.	--?	<p>The Council will aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Scenario 3 would result in some greenfield development adjacent to smaller settlements (on Rural Exception Sites and potentially on contingency land). This development could have an adverse impact on biodiversity.</p> <p>Should any contingency land be identified and then developed at Farnham Common, there could be a detrimental impact on the Burnham Beeches SAC (see Appropriate Assessment 2009). Further development within Farnham Common might also have a cumulative adverse impact on the Burnham SAC.</p>
7	To conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character of South Bucks and in particular, those areas of designated importance.	-?	<p>This Scenario would place particular importance on preserving and enhancing townscape character (in particular, the character of the larger settlements). There would be limited change in the character of Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham. The change in character of the smaller settlements would be relatively pronounced, particularly if one or more contingency sites needed to be released for development.</p> <p>New housing could be provided at a mix of densities to suit the character of different settlements, helping to minimise the impact on townscape character.</p>
8	To conserve and enhance the historic environment.	+	<p>Under each of the scenarios, the Council will aim to protect and preserve the District's historic heritage.</p> <p>The flexible approach to development density would afford more flexibility in the design of schemes in sensitive historic areas (for example, within Conservation Areas).</p>
9	To reduce contributions to climate change through: (a) Sustainable building practices; (b) Maximising the potential for renewable energy and energy conservation	0	<p>The Council will consider the need for sustainable building practices when developing development management policies and determining planning applications. In relation to maximising the potential for renewable energy and energy conservation, the smaller sites associated with this scenario are less likely to be suited to shared renewable energy technologies.</p> <p>Scenario 3 could result in more journeys by private car, leading to a greater adverse impact on climate change.</p>
10	To minimise waste and then re-use or recover it through recycling, composting or energy recovery.	0	No direct relationship.
11	To conserve soil resources and quality.	-?	This scenario would result in some greenfield development adjacent to smaller settlements (for both housing and employment development). The quality of the land lost will be dependent upon the area of land released for development.
12	To improve the efficiency of land use through the re-use of existing buildings and developing on previously developed land (PDL).	-	<p>This scenario would give particular encouragement to the re-use and redevelopment of previously developed land in smaller settlements.</p> <p>Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham would still accommodate some new housing development on previously developed land, but the emphasis would not be on making the <u>most</u> efficient use of urban land.</p> <p>Some urban employment sites that were creating amenity issues would be redeveloped for housing.</p>
13	To minimise the risk of flooding in relation to both new and existing development including existing infrastructure.	+	Preliminary results from the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment suggest that the level of development required can be accommodated outside of areas at risk from flooding.
14	To reduce pollution of the air, water and soil, and also combat sources of noise and light pollution.	-	This scenario would result in more new development in those settlements with relatively poor access to facilities and services, and relatively poor public transport accessibility. As a consequence, this scenario would probably result in more trips by private car (resulting in higher CO <sub>2</sub> emissions).

Sustainability Objective		Focus on Smaller Settlements	
		Rating	Commentary
<b>Economic Objectives</b>			
15	To encourage economic growth and competitiveness, whilst achieving a broad balance in the distribution and growth of housing population and employment.	+?	Under this scenario, some employment sites that were creating local amenity issues could be released for housing development. In order to maintain a broad balance between local employment opportunities and the size of the resident workforce, some small-scale employment development would be permitted adjacent to smaller settlements. Particular encouragement would be given to home working.  This scenario would provide greater flexibility, although overall there would be little change in the number of jobs in the District.
16	To encourage a diverse economy which is focused on high value added, lower impact activities.	0	Under this scenario, some employment sites that were creating local amenity issues could be released for housing development. In order to maintain a broad balance between local employment opportunities and the size of the resident workforce, some small-scale employment development would be permitted adjacent to smaller settlements.  The aim would be to broadly maintain the existing structure of the local economy.
17	To develop and maintain a skilled workforce to support long-term competitiveness of the District.	+	This scenario would deliver the most affordable housing, providing more support for local key workers.

Summary	
<p><u>Social Objectives</u></p> <p>This scenario would enable South Bucks District to deliver the emerging South East Plan housing requirement of 1,880 dwellings. The proposed contingency locations provide some flexibility, should the District's housing allocation rise (as a result of an early review of the South East Plan) or windfall completions fall away.</p> <p>This scenario would come closest to delivering the regional average target of 35% affordable housing. It would deliver more affordable in smaller settlements to meet local needs, in part, through development on Rural Exceptions sites. The release of contingency land for new housing development (if required) would provide the opportunity to deliver more new affordable housing and more new family housing.</p> <p>The dispersed pattern of development under this scenario would result in many new residents having relatively poor accessibility to the wider range of services and facilities available in the three largest settlements in South Bucks. More positively, new housing development in some of the smaller settlements could help to support the viability of marginal village services and facilities (for example, local convenience stores and certain primary schools).</p>	
<p><u>Environmental Objectives</u></p> <p>In general, new development in the smaller settlements across South Bucks would have relatively poor access to those facilities and services only found in the larger urban areas. There would be a greater propensity for the residents of this development to access higher order facilities by private car.</p> <p>This scenario performs positively in terms of protecting the townscape character of Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham. Less positively, greenfield development on the edge of smaller settlements could have a potentially significant adverse impact on character.</p> <p>While this scenario would allow reuse and redevelopment of previously developed land in settlements across the District, development would be at comparatively low densities. This scenario would not therefore make the most efficient use of previously developed land.</p>	

Economic Objectives

Under this scenario, some employment sites that were creating local amenity issues could be released for housing development. In order to maintain a broad balance between local employment opportunities and the size of the resident workforce, some small-scale employment development would be permitted adjacent to smaller settlements. The structure of the local economy would be broadly maintained.

This scenario would deliver the most affordable housing, providing more support for key workers.

**Spatial Strategy Scenario 4 - Greater Focus on Settlements near and adjacent to Slough**

**Sustainability Appraisal**

Sustainability Objective		Greater Focus on Settlements near and adjacent to Slough	
		Rating	Commentary
<b>Social Objectives</b>			
1	To provide residents of South Bucks with the opportunity to live in a decent home.	+?	<p>This scenario would enable South Bucks District to deliver the emerging South East Plan housing requirement of 1,880 dwellings. The proposed contingency locations provide some flexibility, should the District's housing allocation rise (as a result of an early review of the South East Plan) or windfall completions fall away.</p> <p>New affordable housing would be delivered on redevelopment schemes within urban areas across South Bucks, on Rural Exception sites adjacent to smaller settlements in the south of the District, and possibly on 'contingency land'. This Scenario would come closer than Scenarios 1 and 2 to delivering the regional average target of 35% affordable housing - although the majority of future provision would be in the south of the District, not in the north, where the evidence suggests there is a greater need.</p>
2	To reduce anti-social activity, including crime and the fear of crime, through the creation of safer places to live and work.	0	No direct relationship. The Council will encourage new development that has been designed so as to minimise criminal activity and support development proposals aimed specifically at improving community safety.
3	To improve accessibility to essential services and facilities to provide opportunities to obtain good access to high quality health, education, and recreation and other community facilities and services.	+?	<p>This scenario would result in the majority of new housing development being located in the south of the District, in close proximity to the greater range of shops, services and leisure opportunities available in Slough, Maidenhead and Uxbridge. Furthermore, development in Burnham would have good access to a good range of local facilities and services - see the Settlement Hierarchy Study (2008).</p> <p>Development in the smaller settlements in the south of the District would have relatively poor access to local facilities and services.</p> <p>Improvements would be made to the range and quality of shops in Burnham and Iver. If contingency land was released for development, there may be scope to require the direct provision of new community facilities.</p> <p>There would be little scope to address the deficiency in public open space in Beaconsfield.</p>

Environmental Objectives			
4	To encourage the use of sustainable and integrated methods of transport to reduce negative effects on the environment.	+	<p>This scenario would result in the majority of new housing development being located in the south of the District, in close proximity to the greater range of shops, services and leisure opportunities available in Slough and Maidenhead.</p> <p>Although the new development in Burnham would have good access to local facilities and services, with opportunities for walking and cycling, the range of local facilities available in the smaller settlements in the south of the District (including Iver and Richings Park) is more limited. Some of the settlements in the south of the District (particularly Richings Park, Farnham Royal and parts of Burnham) have good public transport services into central Slough and / or Maidenhead.</p>
5	To provide for sustainable levels of water use, supply and management.	-?	<p>The Environment Agency has confirmed that the north of the District (including Gerrards Cross) is presently over abstracted and that Beaconsfield, Iver Heath and the Iver area are over licensed but not presently over abstracted. However, the Environment Agency has also confirmed that it is the origin of the water supply rather than the location of housing which is of concern to them, as water can be piped in from other parts of the network if needed.</p> <p>The limited availability of new water resources, combined with high existing demand and new development, will place considerable strain on water supply in the South East region. South Bucks District Council will consider water efficiency when developing development management policies and determining planning applications.</p>
6	To maintain and enhance biodiversity.	--?	<p>The Council will aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>Scenario 4 might result in some greenfield development (on contingency land), with a potential adverse impact on biodiversity in urban fringe areas. There might also be some loss of urban biodiversity in Burnham and Iver / Richings Park, through the redevelopment of derelict or underutilised sites.</p> <p>Significant amounts of new development relatively close to Burnham Beeches could have an adverse impact on this Special Area of Conservation (see Appropriate Assessment, 2009).</p>
7	To conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character of South Bucks and in particular, those areas of designated importance.	-?	<p>This scenario might result in some greenfield development adjacent to Burnham, Iver and / or Slough, which could have an adverse impact on landscape character. Furthermore, this scenario would necessitate higher development densities in Burnham and Iver, resulting in a potentially adverse impact on townscape character.</p> <p>More positively, the character of Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and smaller settlements in the north of the District would be protected.</p>
8	To conserve and enhance the historic environment.	-?	<p>Under each of the scenarios, the Council will aim to protect and preserve the District's historic heritage.</p> <p>Less positively, this scenario would necessitate higher development densities in Burnham, resulting in a potentially adverse impact on the historic environment.</p>
9	To reduce contributions to climate change through: (a) Sustainable building practices; (b) Maximising the potential for renewable energy and energy conservation	+	<p>The Council will consider the need for sustainable building practices when developing development management policies and determining planning applications. In relation to maximising the potential for renewable energy and energy conservation, should one or more areas of contingency land need to be released for development, there would be the opportunity to introduce shared renewable energy technologies.</p>
10	To minimise waste and then re-use or recover it through recycling, composting or energy recovery.	0	No direct relationship.
11	To conserve soil resources and quality.	-?	<p>This scenario would result in some greenfield development adjacent to settlements in the south of the District (Rural Exception sites and possibly contingency land). The quality of the land lost will be dependent upon the area of land developed.</p>

12	To improve the efficiency of land use through the re-use of existing buildings and developing on previously developed land (PDL).	+	<p>This scenario would give particular encouragement to the re-use and redevelopment of previously developed land in Burnham and Iver / Richings Park. The higher development densities proposed for these areas would help to ensure the most efficient use of urban land.</p> <p>In Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and other settlements in the north of the District, previously developed land would still accommodate some new housing development, but the emphasis would be on protecting townscape character (rather than making <u>most</u> efficient use of urban land).</p>
13	To minimise the risk of flooding in relation to both new and existing development including existing infrastructure.	+	The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and emerging Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment show that the District's housing requirement can be accommodated outside of areas at risk from flooding. However, higher density development within urban areas will require careful consideration - particularly in relation to the potential (cumulative) impact of surface water run-off.
14	To reduce pollution of the air, water and soil, and also combat sources of noise and light pollution.	++	With most new development in settlements in the south of the district, with good public transport links to the larger urban centres of Slough and Maidenhead, this scenario would support the use of sustainable modes of transport (with lower CO <sub>2</sub> emissions).
<b>Economic Objectives</b>			
15	To encourage economic growth and competitiveness, whilst achieving a broad balance in the distribution and growth of housing population and employment.	++	<p>Employment sites in the north of the District would be protected from redevelopment for alternative uses.</p> <p>In the south of the District, existing employment sites would be generally protected, although some poorly performing sites would be released for housing development. New employment land may need to be provided adjacent to Burnham, Iver and / or Slough, but only to replace the urban employment sites that had been redeveloped for housing. The broad aim would be to maintain the number and type of local employment opportunities, to avoid any further pressure on the local labour market.</p> <p>The majority of new housing development would be in the south of the District, resulting in shorter commuter journeys to the jobs available in the Thames Valley.</p>
16	To encourage a diverse economy which is focused on high value added, lower impact activities.	0	The broad aim would be to maintain the number and type of local employment opportunities, to avoid any further pressure on the local labour market.
17	To develop and maintain a skilled workforce to support long-term competitiveness of the District.	+	This scenario would deliver more affordable housing than scenarios 1 and 2, providing more support for key workers.

<b>Summary</b>	
<u>Social Objectives</u>	
<p>This scenario would enable South Bucks District to deliver the emerging South East Plan housing requirement of 1,880 dwellings. The proposed contingency locations provide some flexibility, should the District's housing allocation rise (as a result of an early review of the South East Plan) or windfall completions fall away.</p> <p>New affordable housing would be delivered on redevelopment schemes within urban areas across South Bucks, on Rural Exception sites adjacent to smaller settlements in the south of the District, and possibly on 'contingency land'. This Scenario would come closer than Scenarios 1 and 2 to delivering the regional average target of 35% affordable housing - although the majority of future provision would be in the south of the District, not in the north, where the evidence suggests there is a greater need.</p> <p>This scenario would result in the majority of new housing development being located in the south of the District, in close proximity to the greater range of shops, services and leisure opportunities available in Slough, Maidenhead and Uxbridge.</p>	

Environmental Objectives

Although the new development in Burnham would have good access to local facilities and services, with opportunities for walking and cycling, the range of local facilities available in the smaller settlements in the south of the District is more limited. Some of the smaller settlements in the south of the District do have good public transport services into central Slough and Maidenhead.

This scenario might result in some greenfield development adjacent to Burnham, Iver and / or Slough, which could have an adverse impact on landscape character. Furthermore, this scenario would necessitate higher development densities in Burnham and Iver / Richings Park, resulting in a potentially adverse impact on townscape character. Importantly, significant amounts of new development relatively close to Burnham Beeches could have an adverse impact on this Special Area of Conservation (see Appropriate Assessment, 2009).

Economic Objectives

In the south of the District, existing employment sites would be generally protected, although some poorly performing sites would be released for housing development. New employment land may need to be provided adjacent to Burnham, Iver and / or Slough, but only to replace the urban employment sites that had been redeveloped for housing. The broad aim would be to maintain the number and type of local employment opportunities, to avoid any further pressure on the local labour market.

APPENDIX 5

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE STRATEGIC SITES

This Section includes an appraisal of each of the Strategic Sites.

Wilton Park, Beaconsfield

Sustainability Appraisal

Sustainability Objective		Wilton Park, Beaconsfield	
		Rating	Commentary
<b>Social Objectives</b>			
1	To provide residents of South Bucks with the opportunity to live in a decent home.	++	Wilton Park has the potential to accommodate new housing and could make a significant contribution towards meeting the need for more affordable housing. Indeed, Wilton Park could deliver at least 105 new affordable housing units.  The land could accommodate a mix of housing types.
2	To reduce anti-social activity, including crime and the fear of crime, through the creation of safer places to live and work.	++	The Council will encourage new development that has been designed so as to minimise criminal activity and support development proposals aimed specifically at improving community safety.
3	To improve accessibility to essential services and facilities to provide opportunities to obtain good access to high quality health, education, and recreation and other community facilities and services.	+	Wilton Park is 660m from the Local Centre of Beaconsfield Old Town, although it is not adjacent to the built-up area. The District Centre of Beaconsfield New Town is within reasonable cycling distance.  Access to the strategic road network is very good (via the M40). The emerging policy framework for Wilton Park proposes a new footpath route through adjoining woods to Seer Green station.  The emerging policy framework for Wilton Park seeks retention of the existing recreational facilities, and there may be scope to provide new open space, to address the existing shortage of public open space in Beaconsfield.  The busy A355 severs this development location from the facilities and services available in Beaconsfield Old Town and New Town. Appropriate road crossing facilities would provide some mitigation.
<b>Environmental Objectives</b>			
4	To encourage the use of sustainable and integrated methods of transport to reduce negative effects on the environment.	++	The western part of Wilton Park is within Accessibility Infrastructure mapping Level 9 (see Infrastructure and Accessibility Study, 2006). The eastern part of this development location, which is further away from Beaconsfield, is less accessible. <b>To further improve accessibility, particular emphasis will need to be given to the provision of new pedestrian and cycle routes.</b>  Beaconsfield has good rail links with other areas. Served by Chiltern Railways there are three trains per hour to High Wycombe and London.

Sustainability Objective		Wilton Park, Beaconsfield	
		Rating	Commentary
5	To provide for sustainable levels of water use, supply and management.	-?	Wilton Park is in an area which the Environment Agency has indicated is already over extracted. Thames Water has advised that any significant new development in the Beaconsfield area would be likely to require additional waste water infrastructure.
6	To maintain and enhance biodiversity.	++?	Wilton Park is unlikely to have an adverse impact on any site designated for its ecological importance. Furthermore, <del>it does not contain any known</del> there are no records of protected habitat or species on the site.  With the total area of land available, there would be scope to provide new biodiversity enhancements and gains, as required under PPS9, linking to nearby woodland and associated habitats. <del>areas, possibly linked to the nearby woodland area.</del>
7	To conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character of South Bucks and in particular, those areas of designated importance.	+	Wilton Park is more than 400m from the AONB and not within an Area of Attractive Landscape. It is relatively well screened from public views from south and west.  The comprehensive redevelopment of Wilton Park would provide scope for localised environmental improvements (for example, through removal of the training tower). In addition, the new housing development that could be accommodated at Wilton Park would help to relieve the pressure for further high density development within existing settlements in South Bucks - helping to conserve townscape character.
8	To conserve and enhance the historic environment.	-?	Wilton Park is within 350m of a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) - although on site mitigation is unlikely to be required. Further consideration should be given to any remaining elements of the Wilton Park designed landscape.
9	To reduce contributions to climate change through: (a) Sustainable building practices; (b) Maximising the potential for renewable energy and energy conservation	+?	The Council will consider the need for sustainable building practices when developing development management policies and determining planning applications. The proposed policy framework for Wilton Park requires developers to incorporate renewable, decentralised or low carbon energy technologies into any scheme (unless not viable).
10	To minimise waste and then re-use or recover it through recycling, composting or energy recovery.	0	No direct relationship.
11	To conserve soil resources and quality.	+?	Wilton Park is predominately Grade 3 agricultural land. There are a few potential contamination sources identified. Further investigations will be required.
12	To improve the efficiency of land use through the re-use of existing buildings and developing on previously developed land (PDL).	+	A substantive part of Wilton Park comprises previously developed land.
13	To minimise the risk of flooding in relation to both new and existing development including existing infrastructure.	++	Wilton Park lies within Flood Zone 1. Therefore, there is a low probability of flooding.
14	To reduce pollution of the air, water and soil, and also combat sources of noise and light pollution.	+	Wilton Park is not within 500m of an Air Quality Management Area.  Furthermore, Wilton Park is within reasonable walking or cycling distance of the facilities and services (including public transport services) available in Beaconsfield. This should help to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport (including cycling and walking) - resulting in fewer journeys by private car and lower CO <sub>2</sub> emissions.
<b>Economic Objectives</b>			
15	To encourage economic growth and competitiveness, whilst achieving a	+	The emerging policy framework for Wilton Park proposes some employment development within the existing developed area. This new employment development, alongside the new housing development, would afford the opportunity for people to live and work locally.

Sustainability Objective		Wilton Park, Beaconsfield	
		Rating	Commentary
	broad balance in the distribution and growth of housing population and employment.		The total number of jobs would be determined by the scale and type of employment development.
16	To encourage a diverse economy which is focused on high value added, lower impact activities.	++	Wilton Park would be suitable for high value added, lower impact employment development. There is a highly skilled local workforce and excellent access onto the strategic road network.
17	To develop and maintain a skilled workforce to support long-term competitiveness of the District.	++	The new affordable housing to be provided on Wilton Park would support local key workers.

## Mill Lane, Taplow

### Sustainability Appraisal

Sustainability Objective		Mill Lane, Taplow	
		Rating	Commentary
<b>Social Objectives</b>			
1	To provide residents of South Bucks with the opportunity to live in a decent home.	++	Mill Lane has the potential to accommodate new housing and could make a contribution towards meeting the need for more affordable housing.  The land could accommodate a mix of housing types.
2	To reduce anti-social activity, including crime and the fear of crime, through the creation of safer places to live and work.	++	The Council will encourage new development that has been designed so as to minimise criminal activity and support development proposals aimed specifically at improving community safety.
3	To improve accessibility to essential services and facilities to provide opportunities to obtain good access to high quality health, education, and recreation and other community facilities and services.	+?	Mill Lane is 280m from Taplow (small village) and 1km from Maidenhead Town Centre (outside of South Bucks District). It lies between the built-up areas of Maidenhead and Taplow. Mill Lane is well placed in respect of the strategic road network, although the northern part of the site in particular, is relatively isolated from key facilities and services and public transport provision.  The River Thames would restrict direct access to Maidenhead Town Centre. The Council's emerging view is that the scope to provide an additional pedestrian crossing of the River Thames (in the vicinity of Boulters Lock) should be explored.  The emerging policy framework for Mill Lane supports provision of new recreational uses on the Mill Lane Strategic Site, and improved public access to the River Thames.
<b>Environmental Objectives</b>			
4	To encourage the use of sustainable and integrated methods of transport to reduce negative	+	The majority of this development location is within Accessibility Infrastructure mapping Level 8 or 7 (see Infrastructure and Accessibility Study, 2006). Access on foot to the facilities and services available in Maidenhead Town Centre is relatively poor, although there is a bus stop on the southern boundary of the Opportunity Site, providing good access to the public transport services that operate along the A4.

Sustainability Objective		Mill Lane, Taplow	
		Rating	Commentary
	effects on the environment.		<p>Taplow rail station is located approximately 1.6km by road from the site, whilst Maidenhead rail station is located at a distance of approximately 2.5km from the site.</p> <p>The southern part of the Mill Lane Strategic Site has reasonable access to the public transport services that operate along the A4.</p>
5	To provide for sustainable levels of water use, supply and management.	+	This development location is in an area which the Environment Agency has indicated is not over licensed or over extracted.
6	To maintain and enhance biodiversity.	+?	<p>The Mill Lane Strategic Site lies almost adjacent to South Lodge Pit SSSI, but there are no records of <del>does not contain any known</del> protected habitat or species on the site. With the total area of land available, there would be scope to enhance existing habitats and provide new biodiversity areas- <del>enhancements and gains, as required under PPS9, linking nearby woodland and associated habitats.</del></p>
7	To conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character of South Bucks and in particular, those areas of designated importance.	+?	<p>The Mill Lane Strategic Site lies adjacent to an Area of Attractive Landscape.</p> <p>The proposed policy framework for Mill Lane requires that any redevelopment enhances the character and appearance of the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area and both rivers' settings. Furthermore, development proposals should seek to retain the largely open character of the Mill Lane area, by avoiding a dispersed pattern of development across the whole site. The height and massing of new development should ensure a reduced visual impact.</p>
8	To conserve and enhance the historic environment.	+?	<p>The site sits in an important historic landscape with considerable heritage value and archaeological potential. Overlooked by Taplow Court and the Scheduled Ancient Monument of Taplow Mound, much of the site is included in the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area and there are several Registered Parks and Gardens nearby. The most significant building is the Grade II listed Glen Island House.</p> <p>A fundamental element of the proposed policy framework is that any development must enhance the character and appearance of the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area.</p>
9	To reduce contributions to climate change through: (a) Sustainable building practices; (b) Maximising the potential for renewable energy and energy conservation	+?	The Council will consider the need for sustainable building practices when developing development management policies and determining planning applications. The proposed policy framework for Mill Lane requires developers to incorporate renewable, decentralised or low carbon energy technologies into any scheme (unless not viable).
10	To minimise waste and then re-use or recover it through recycling, composting or energy recovery.	0	No direct relationship.
11	To conserve soil resources and quality.	0?	The Mill Lane Strategic Site is part non-agricultural and part Grade 3 agricultural land. There are a few potential sources of contamination which will require further investigation.
12	To improve the efficiency of land use through the re-use of existing buildings and developing on previously developed land (PDL).	++	<p>A significant part of the Mill Lane Strategic Site comprises previously developed land.</p> <p>The emerging policy framework will seek to ensure that there is no increase in the overall footprint of development in the Green Belt.</p>
13	To minimise the risk of flooding in relation to both new and existing development including existing infrastructure.	-?	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and emerging Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment show that the District's housing requirement can be accommodated outside of areas at risk from flooding.</p> <p>However, it has been decided to include the Mill Lane Strategic Site, on the basis that the regeneration benefits out-weigh the flood risk</p>

Sustainability Objective		Mill Lane, Taplow	
		Rating	Commentary
			issues. The Mill Lane area is environmentally sensitive (with significant scope for enhancement), has significant historic value and could be a valuable recreational resource for South Bucks and surrounding areas. Residential and hotel development should be limited to those parts of the site in Flood Zone 2, with the employment development in Flood Zones 2 or 3a.
14	To reduce pollution of the air, water and soil, and also combat sources of noise and light pollution.	0	This development location is not within 500m of an Air Quality Management Area - although it is sensitively located adjacent to the River Thames and Jubilee River. There are potential contamination issues associated with the former Paper Mill use and Gas holder.  Development proposals will need to ensure that the aforementioned contamination issues are addressed, and that the risk of groundwater pollution is minimised.
<b>Economic Objectives</b>			
15	To encourage economic growth and competitiveness, whilst achieving a broad balance in the distribution and growth of housing population and employment.	+	The emerging policy framework for Mill Lane proposes some employment development, ensuring that there is no net loss of employment (based upon the former range of activities on this strategic site) when in full use.  This new employment development, alongside the new housing development, would afford the opportunity for people to live and work locally.
16	To encourage a diverse economy which is focused on high value added, lower impact activities.	++	Mill Lane would be suitable for some high value added, lower impact employment development.
17	To develop and maintain a skilled workforce to support long-term competitiveness of the District.	++	The new affordable housing to be provided on the Mill Lane Strategic Site would support local key workers.

## Court Lane, Iver

### Sustainability Appraisal

Sustainability Objective		Court Lane, Iver	
		Rating	Commentary
<b>Social Objectives</b>			
1	To provide residents of South Bucks with the opportunity to live in a decent home.	0	Court Lane is considered to be an unsuitable location for residential development. The area is isolated from key facilities, including local buses and does not adjoin any settlements. It is situated on the far side of the M25 motorway, partly within the designated Air Quality Management Area where there would be motorway noise, poor air quality and possible contamination issues to assess. Its sole vehicular access is via an uninviting road under the motorway and beyond a major water treatment works.
2	To reduce anti-social activity, including crime and the fear of crime, through the creation of safer places to live and work.	+	The Council will encourage new development that has been designed so as to minimise criminal activity and support development proposals aimed specifically at improving community safety.
3	To improve accessibility to essential services and facilities to provide opportunities to obtain	+?	Court Lane is 720m from the Local Centre of Iver and it is not adjacent to the built-up area. The M25 and Grand Union Canal restrict access from this development location to the facilities and services available in the Local Centre of Iver.

Sustainability Objective		Court Lane, Iver	
		Rating	Commentary
	good access to high quality health, education, and recreation and other community facilities and services.		The proposed policy framework requires improved access to the nearby facilities at Iver Village and Iver station. In addition, any new development should be coordinated with improvements to nearby open space and water areas in the Colne Valley Park, ensuring that there is public access across the site, linking into the local footpath network.
<b>Environmental Objectives</b>			
4	To encourage the use of sustainable and integrated methods of transport to reduce negative effects on the environment.	+?	The majority of the Court Lane Strategic Site is within Accessibility Infrastructure mapping Level 8 (see Infrastructure and Accessibility Study, 2006). The eastern part of this development location is less accessible.  Iver has good rail links with other areas. Served by First Great Western there are two trains per hour to Reading and London.
5	To provide for sustainable levels of water use, supply and management.	0	Court Lane is in an area which the Environment Agency has indicated is over licensed for extraction, but is not actually over extracted at present.
6	To maintain and enhance biodiversity.	+?	Redevelopment of the Court Lane site is unlikely to have an adverse impact on any site designated for its ecological importance. Furthermore, <del>there are no records of the Court Lane site does not contain any known</del> protected habitat or species <del>on the site</del> .  There could be scope to <del>enhance existing habitats and provide biodiversity enhancements and gains, as required under PPS9, linking to the gravel lakes and associated habitats to the east, part of the Colne Valley Biodiversity Opportunity Area. provide new biodiversity areas, possibly linked to the disused gravel lakes to the east.</del>
7	To conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character of South Bucks and in particular, those areas of designated importance.	++	Court Lane is not within the AONB or an Area of Attractive Landscape. The site does however lie within the Colne Valley Park, and any future development proposals would need to contribute to the aims of the Park, in maintaining and enhancing the landscape and waterscape character.  The proposed policy framework for the Court Lane Strategic Site requires any new development to be of a high quality design. Furthermore, to help minimise the visual impact of any new development, careful consideration would need to be given to the siting and height of any new buildings.  The redevelopment of Court Lane for B1 uses (or another use that would result in a significant reduction in HGV movements) would help reduce HGV movements through Iver village, improving the ambience.
8	To conserve and enhance the historic environment.	-?	There is one Listed Building within the Court Lane site. It is likely that the Listed Building would need to be retained, and the setting treated sensitively.
9	To reduce contributions to climate change through: (a) Sustainable building practices; (b) Maximising the potential for renewable energy and energy conservation	+?	The Council will consider the need for sustainable building practices when developing development management policies and determining planning applications. The proposed policy framework for Court Lane requires developers to incorporate renewable, decentralised or low carbon energy technologies into any scheme (unless not viable).
10	To minimise waste and then re-use or recover it through recycling, composting or energy recovery.	0	No direct relationship.
11	To conserve soil resources and quality.	+?	The Court Lane Strategic site is largely developed. There are a few potential sources of contamination which will require further investigation.
12	To improve the efficiency of land use through the re-use of existing buildings and developing on	+	A substantive part of the Court Lane Strategic Site comprises previously developed land.

Sustainability Objective		Court Lane, Iver	
		Rating	Commentary
	previously developed land (PDL).		
13	To minimise the risk of flooding in relation to both new and existing development including existing infrastructure.	0	Court Lane lies within Flood Zone 1. Therefore, there is a low probability of flooding.
14	To reduce pollution of the air, water and soil, and also combat sources of noise and light pollution.	+?	<p>The Court Lane Strategic Site lies adjacent to an Air Quality Management Area. It also lies adjacent to a sewage treatment works. <del>Noise from the nearby</del> and the M25 <del>would need to be mitigated</del>. Potential land contamination issues, along with significant noise and air pollution issues, will have to be assessed and mitigated, for the health and well being of site users.</p> <p>More positively, redevelopment of the Court Lane Strategic Site for B1 Office use would help to reduce the number of HGV movements through Iver, in turn helping to reduce air and noise pollution in the village centre.</p>
<b>Economic Objectives</b>			
15	To encourage economic growth and competitiveness, whilst achieving a broad balance in the distribution and growth of housing population and employment.	+?	The emerging policy framework for Court Lane proposes redevelopment of the area for B1 business uses, subject to further work on viability. The new jobs created would support this SA objective, but the majority of new housing development would be in other parts of the District, with limited new housing planned for the Iver area.
16	To encourage a diverse economy which is focused on high value added, lower impact activities.	++	Redevelopment of Court Lane would see replacement of more traditional manufacturing and open storage uses, with higher value added, lower impact activities. It would help to provide a better mix of employment opportunities in the Iver area.
17	To develop and maintain a skilled workforce to support long-term competitiveness of the District.	0	No direct relationship.

APPENDIX 6

SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE EMERGING SPATIAL STRATEGY

This Section provides a detailed appraisal of the emerging Spatial Strategy.

Sustainability Appraisal

Sustainability Objective		Emerging Spatial Strategy	
		Rating	Commentary
<b>Social Objectives</b>			
1	To provide residents of South Bucks with the opportunity to live in a decent home.	++	<p>The emerging Spatial Strategy would enable South Bucks District to deliver the emerging South East Plan housing requirement of 1,880 dwellings. New housing would be delivered within existing settlements, on the proposed Strategic Sites and on Rural Exception sites.</p> <p>The proposed contingency locations provide flexibility, should the District's housing allocation rise (as a result of an early review of the South East Plan) or windfall completions fall away. However, given the very strong housing land supply position, the release of Green Belt land for development is unlikely to be required.</p> <p>The emerging Spatial Strategy would deliver new affordable housing across the District, on urban schemes, on the proposed Strategic Sites and on Rural Exception sites. Less positively, as a result of the amount of development already completed or committed, it is unlikely that South Bucks will achieve the regional average target of 35% of all new housing to be affordable. Overall, affordable housing provision will be well below the identified need in South Bucks.</p> <p>The Strategic Sites could accommodate at least 300-400 dwellings, including new family accommodation. Furthermore, the Strategic Sites will have the effect of reducing the amount of development land that must be found within settlements, potentially allowing more new family accommodation within existing settlements.</p>
2	To reduce anti-social activity, including crime and the fear of crime, through the creation of safer places to live and work.	0	<p>The Council will encourage new development that has been designed so as to minimise criminal activity and support development proposals aimed specifically at improving community safety.</p>
3	To improve accessibility to essential services and facilities to provide opportunities to obtain good access to high quality health, education, and recreation and other community facilities and services.	++	<p>The emerging Spatial Strategy would result in more new development taking place in the settlements of Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham, those settlements with the highest levels of accessibility and best range of facilities and services - see the Accessibility and Infrastructure Study (2006) and the Settlement Hierarchy Study (2008). Development in other locations, with relatively poor accessibility, would be limited.</p> <p>Support will be given to improvements in the number and range of shops in Beaconsfield New Town, Gerrards Cross and Burnham, with the aim of meeting the identified capacity for additional floorspace in the period 2026. This should help to increase self-containment. Qualitative improvements will be sought in Burnham and Iver Village.</p> <p>The Wilton Park Strategic Site could deliver new community facilities, and help to address the public open space deficiency in Beaconsfield. <b>The Mill Lane Strategic Site will also provide opportunities for new and improved parkland and rights of way. More</b></p>

Sustainability Objective		Emerging Spatial Strategy	
		Rating	Commentary
			<p>generally, the scale of development proposed within existing settlements will not necessitate the redevelopment of existing areas of open space, and developer contributions could help deliver improvements to existing areas of open space.</p> <p>New development on Rural Exception sites could provide some support for marginal facilities in certain smaller settlements.</p>
<b>Environmental Objectives</b>			
4	To encourage the use of sustainable and integrated methods of transport to reduce negative effects on the environment.	++	<p>The emerging Spatial Strategy would result in more new development taking place in the settlements of Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham, those settlements with the highest levels of accessibility and best range of facilities and services – see the Accessibility and Infrastructure Study (2006) and the Settlement Hierarchy Study (2008). Development in other locations, with relatively poor accessibility, would be limited.</p> <p>Most new residents would have relatively good access to facilities and services on foot, and by bicycle, with other facilities and services available in the larger settlements outside of the District accessible by public transport. All three of the Principal Settlements are served by frequent rail services. Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross are on local bus routes, including the frequent service that operates between High Wycombe and Heathrow. Burnham is also on several local bus routes, with a regular service to Slough.</p>
5	To provide for sustainable levels of water use, supply and management.	-?	<p>The limited availability of new water resources, combined with high existing demand and new development, will place considerable strain on water supply in the South East region. South Bucks District Council will consider water efficiency when developing development management policies and determining planning applications.</p> <p>Development of the Wilton Park Strategic Site is likely to require the provision of additional waste water infrastructure.</p>
6	To maintain and enhance biodiversity.	+?	<p>The Council's emerging view is that development of greenfield contingency land will not be required. The emerging Spatial Strategy will therefore help to protect biodiversity in urban fringe areas. With new housing development on the Strategic Sites, there will be less pressure to redevelop areas of public open space within settlements.</p> <p>Development of the three Strategic Sites will provide opportunities to maintain and enhance biodiversity.</p> <p>There will be little development within the immediate vicinity of the Burnham Beeches SAC, although Burnham Beeches may still suffer from the effects of increased traffic congestion on the A355. There may also be an adverse effect from urbanisation and increased recreational pressures associated with development in the wider Thames Valley area. The proposals to provide enhanced recreational facilities at Wilton Park and Mill Lane should go some way to reducing the public use pressure on Burnham Beeches.</p>
7	To conserve and enhance the landscape and townscape character of South Bucks and in particular, those areas of designated importance.	++	<p>The Council's emerging view is that development of greenfield contingency land will not be required, helping to conserve landscape character. The proposed policy framework for the Strategic Sites will result in localised environmental improvements (for example, as a result of removal of the training tower from Wilton Park, and the delivery of alternative uses on Court Lane).</p> <p>As it is anticipated that together the Strategic Sites will deliver at least 300-400 new homes, average development densities within settlements could be lower than assumed in Scenario 1, providing greater scope to protect settlement character. There will also be less pressure to redevelop areas of public open space within settlements – again, helping to conserve character.</p> <p>The Council intends to implement strong design policies to protect the character of settlements in South Bucks, and in particular those areas with a special townscape character.</p>
8	To conserve and enhance the historic environment.	++	<p>The Council will aim to protect and preserve the District's historic heritage. As it is anticipated that together, the Strategic Sites will deliver at least 300-400 new homes, average development densities within settlements could be lower than assumed in Scenario 1, helping to protect the historic environment.</p>

Sustainability Objective		Emerging Spatial Strategy	
		Rating	Commentary
			The proposed policy framework for the Mill Lane strategic site places particular importance on any new development enhancing the character and appearance of the Taplow Riverside Conservation Area.
9	To reduce contributions to climate change through: (a) Sustainable building practices; (b) Maximising the potential for renewable energy and energy conservation	+?	<p>The Council will consider the need for sustainable building practices when developing development management policies and determining planning applications.</p> <p>The proposed policy framework for the Strategic Sites requires developers to incorporate renewable, decentralised or low carbon energy technologies into any scheme (unless not viable). Furthermore, it is proposed to seek retrospective energy efficiency enhancements to existing dwellings when they are extended.</p>
10	To minimise waste and then re-use or recover it through recycling, composting or energy recovery.	0	No direct relationship.
11	To conserve soil resources and quality.	+	The emerging Spatial Strategy would largely avoid new greenfield development, helping to conserve soil resources. The only exception being schemes under the Rural Exception sites policy.
12	To improve the efficiency of land use through the re-use of existing buildings and developing on previously developed land (PDL).	+	<p>The emerging Spatial Strategy would give particular encouragement to the re-use and redevelopment of previously developed land in Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham. It would also encourage the reuse of previously developed land on the three Strategic Sites.</p> <p>With the importance attached to preserving townscape character, the emerging Spatial Strategy would not result in the <u>most</u> efficient use of urban land.</p>
13	To minimise the risk of flooding in relation to both new and existing development including existing infrastructure.	+?	<p>The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and emerging Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment show that the District's housing requirement can be accommodated outside of areas at risk from flooding.</p> <p>However, it has been decided to include the Mill Lane Strategic Site in the emerging spatial strategy, on the basis that the regeneration benefits out-weigh the flood risk issues. The Mill Lane area is environmentally sensitive, has significant historic value and could be a valuable recreational resource for South Bucks and surrounding areas.</p>
14	To reduce pollution of the air, water and soil, and also combat sources of noise and light pollution.	++	<p><b>Car ownership in South Bucks District is high, with 53% of households owning two or more cars (compared to 29% nationally).</b></p> <p><b>The planned new development will lead to additional car based trips - although, with most new development proposed in those settlements with the best range of facilities and services, and good public transport accessibility, the emerging Spatial Strategy provides the best opportunity to make more use of sustainable modes of transport (with lower CO<sub>2</sub> emissions). The emerging Spatial Strategy is likely to assist in reducing air pollution, particularly when implemented alongside Government transport initiatives (for example, the variable Road Tax, linked to vehicles emissions) and proposals in the Local Transport Plan.</b></p>
<b>Economic Objectives</b>			
15	To encourage economic growth and competitiveness, whilst achieving a broad balance in the distribution and growth of housing population and employment.	+?	<p>To seek to maintain a broad balance between local resident workers and local job opportunities, existing employment sites will be generally protected from redevelopment for other uses. The loss of existing sites will only be permitted where they are no longer suitable for any form of employment use.</p> <p>No new employment sites are currently proposed, reflecting the fact that many new jobs are already likely to come forward through intensification, permitted development at Pinewood Studios, the Motorway Service Area at Beaconsfield and on the Strategic Sites. In the longer-term, should there be a need for additional employment land, one or more of the contingency locations to be identified may need to be released from the Green Belt for employment development or, depending upon the housing land supply position at that time, mixed-use development.</p> <p>The emerging Spatial Strategy supports new employment generating development on the three Strategic Sites. It should help to reduce</p>

Sustainability Objective		Emerging Spatial Strategy	
		Rating	Commentary
			the high levels of out-commuting, with new employment opportunities better suited to the highly skilled resident workforce.
16	To encourage a diverse economy which is focused on high value added, lower impact activities.	+?	Encouragement will be given to attracting and retaining businesses that require the skills and experience of the resident workforce (in particular, high value-added activities).
17	To develop and maintain a skilled workforce to support long-term competitiveness of the District.	+?	This emerging Spatial Strategy will deliver more new affordable housing, providing more support for key workers.

Summary	
<p><u>Social Objectives</u></p> <p>The emerging Spatial Strategy would enable South Bucks District to deliver the emerging South East Plan housing requirement of 1,880 dwellings. New housing would be delivered within existing settlements, on the proposed Strategic Sites and on Rural Exception sites. The proposed contingency locations provide flexibility.</p> <p>The emerging Spatial Strategy would deliver new affordable housing across the District, on urban schemes, on the proposed Strategic Sites and on Rural Exception sites. Furthermore, the Strategic Sites will have the effect of reducing the amount of development land that must be found within settlements, potentially allowing more new family accommodation within existing settlements.</p> <p>The emerging Spatial Strategy would result in more new development taking place in the settlements of Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham, those settlements with the highest levels of accessibility and best range of facilities and services. Development in other locations, with relatively poor accessibility, would be limited. Support will be given to improvements in the number and range of shops in Beaconsfield New Town, Gerrards Cross and Burnham, with the aim of meeting the identified capacity for additional floorspace in the period 2026. This should help to increase self-containment. The Wilton Park Strategic Site could deliver new community facilities, and help to address the public open space deficiency in Beaconsfield.</p> <p><u>Environmental Objectives</u></p> <p>Residents of new housing development would have relatively good access to facilities and services on foot, and by bicycle, with other facilities and services available in the larger settlements outside of the District accessible by public transport.</p> <p>The Council’s emerging view is that development of greenfield contingency land will not be required. The emerging Spatial Strategy will therefore help to protect biodiversity in urban fringe areas, landscape character and soil quality. Development of the three Strategic Sites will provide opportunities to maintain and enhance biodiversity. There will be little development within the immediate vicinity of the Burnham Beeches SAC, although Burnham Beeches might still suffer from the effects of increased traffic congestion on the A355. There may also be an adverse effect from urbanisation and increased recreational pressures associated with development in the wider Thames Valley area. The proposals to provide enhanced recreational facilities at Wilton Park and Mill Lane should go some way to reducing the public use pressure on Burnham Beeches.</p> <p>As it is anticipated that together the Strategic Sites will deliver at least 300-400 new homes, average development densities within settlements could be lower than assumed in Scenario 1, providing greater scope to protect settlement character. There will also be less pressure to redevelop areas of public open space within settlements - again, helping to conserve character.</p> <p>The emerging Spatial Strategy would give particular encouragement to the re-use and redevelopment of previously developed land in Beaconsfield, Gerrards Cross and Burnham. With the importance attached to preserving townscape character, the emerging Spatial Strategy would not result in the most efficient use of urban land.</p>	

Economic Objectives

To seek to maintain a broad balance between local resident workers and local job opportunities, existing employment sites will be generally protected from redevelopment for other uses. The loss of existing sites will only be permitted where they are no longer suitable for any form of employment use.

No new employment sites are currently proposed, reflecting the fact that many new jobs are already likely to come forward through intensification, permitted development at Pinewood Studios, the Motorway Service Area at Beaconsfield and on the Strategic Sites. In the longer-term, should there be a need for additional employment land, one or more of the contingency locations to be identified may need to be released from the Green Belt for employment development or, depending upon the housing land supply position at that time, mixed-use development. The emerging Spatial Strategy supports new employment generating development on the three Strategic Sites. It should help to reduce the high levels of out-commuting, with new employment opportunities better suited to the highly skilled resident workforce.





**South Bucks**  
District Council

