

Risborough First

Princes Risborough is positioned on the lower slopes of the Chiltern Hills – it is a hilly area, on a natural spring line, that falls towards the Aylesbury Vale plain, bordered by the Aylesbury railway line. The WDC proposed expansion area sits on this flood plain and will be in clear view of important routes and sites within the Chiltern conservation area.

Risborough Area Residents Association has reviewed the proposed Local Plan for the Risborough Area as published by Wycombe District Council on October 5th 2017 and has judged it against the original objectives together with suggestions of what RARA would be consider a better proposal.

The Local Plan involves building 2646 new homes on high quality farmland, this number rises to 3350, when current developments in Princes Risborough and additional planned developments in the neighbouring settlements of Longwick and Kimble are included.

This represents an almost doubling in the size of the town. In contrast Wycombe is only planned to grow at 12% and Marlow 5% against a district average of 16%. Wycombe and Marlow are where most employment is located, where there is easy access to major transport links (M40) and where there is a greater demand for housing.

- This scale of development will overwhelm the existing settlement(s). It will change the character of the town and destroy its community cohesion.
- The Plan is unsustainable, there is little local employment and poor strategic connectivity.
- The small and compact town centre is a highly constrained conservation area
- There is inadequate retail capacity.
- Affordable homes need to be provided for **local** people.
- It will create a dormitory town.
- It will create significant traffic and transport problems locally and widespread.
- It will create a segregated town bisected by the railway line – planned links are insufficient and inadequate.

Key principles for a Better Town Plan

1. Developing and improving the town of Risborough should be at the centre of any plan. Put the town, its residents and local businesses first, not the District housing allocation.
2. The plan should consult with the residents and listen to their views and concerns and take action based on the feedback from residents – not inform them of a predetermined plan.
3. Housing expansion limited to 1000 new homes, this number to include those homes already planned or built since 2013, in the period of the local plan. This still represents an increase of 30%, twice the district average and compensates for the lower than average growth in previous years.
4. Development priority should be all brownfield sites within the current town boundary, consider relocation of some existing businesses and services to increase options.
5. Residential development west of the railway line should be a last resort and only following further consultation and agreement with those residents most affected. Any development should be contained between Summerleys Rd and Longwick Rd and no further than the Crowbrook stream. This is to ensure the Princes Risborough and Longwick settlements do not merge and Alscot conservation zone is respected.
6. To increase housing density and to bring people into the town centre, one or two bedroomed apartments should be included within all developments.
7. Develop the town centre and New Road frontage where possible with mixed retail and residential usage.
8. Increase parking in the town centre and allow free parking. Consider underground parking to preserve views.
9. Allow Transport for Bucks to develop their road strategy taking into account the wider traffic area. The town plan to focus on making better use of our existing transport infrastructure and providing commuters with better information to allow them to make informed choice on mode and timing of travel.
10. Protect and enhance our existing AONB and Green Belt. Re-designate as Green Belt the 2 parcels of land identified by ARUP (on the opposite side of the railway) as having strong green belt criteria.
11. Provide enhanced and integrated education, healthcare and recreational provision – including a safer environment for cyclists, pedestrians and horse riders.

Objective	Criticism of Draft Plan	A Better Town Plan
1. Create a unified and thriving settlement		
<p>a) Integrate the expanded town with the existing town, through physical connections across the railway line and through the appropriate distribution of services and facilities in the existing and the expanded town</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All three of the previous planning rejections have stated the lack of integration as a major failure for development across the railway line. The planned tunnel would have been inadequate to integrate the 500 houses on Park Mill Farm, let alone the 2,500 which are being planned. • Only one railway crossing place is planned, via the pedestrian tunnel on Wades Park. Three current level crossings for footpath access will be closed. Therefore there will be fewer crossing points than currently. • The proposed underpass may be 18 metres wide but creates a poor social method of access for what will be circa 5000 people leading to more cars on road to avoid using underpass. • The Wades Park underpass may restrict the usage of the park which, as reclaimed marsh, could also prove problematic and expensive to construct. • The proposed relief road is putting another barrier that is preventing integration • Lack of jobs and work (economic sustainability) will create a culture of commuting away from the new part of the town to travel to work leading to less integration and use of the whole town 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be more than one crossing, the current one at the bottom of Mount Way is a link to the Phoenix trail from the town and is busy on pleasant spring/summer weekends. There will need to be another crossing for the estate north of Longwick Rd. • Focus on high density affordable homes on brownfield sites within the existing town boundary e.g. Picts Mede current, potential on New Road at back of High Street – helping to bring life back to our high street. • Potential 2-3 storey apartment development on top of existing car parks at Tesco’s retaining car parking on the ground level. This idea is backed up by the Lepus report Dec 2015 ‘The majority of households consist of one or two people (67.9%)’. This has been done successfully at the Co-op on Bell St. where there are apartments above the store and sold very quickly. • Any underpass must restrict traffic to pedestrians and cycling only to be safer and should be designed to be a light and attractive access route good visibility beyond to encourage people to use it. It will require vision and investment to make it a major attractive artery.
<p>b) Support the existing town centre as the primary destination for shopping and leisure, with increased parking capacity and improvements to the public realm to rebalance the environment towards pedestrians and cyclists</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current town centre is small and constrained by a) the A4010, b) the historic conservation buildings and c) existing and current developments. It consists of two main streets with a mixture of retail, residential and services which offers very little scope for expansion. • There is no evidence within the plan for improved services and facilities within the existing town – there are some aspirational suggestions (back of New Rd) that will be very hard to implement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the buildings in the centre are in private hands so any developments would have to be done in partnership with them, contrasts with Wycombe where the council has bought many shops in the centre. • The Town Council and WDC should actively be applying a plan to buy up space along the New Road and the back of the existing retail areas and using a creative vision for free parking to attract

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals for services and facilities within the expansion zone are vague and inadequate for the scale proposed (ref facilities in towns of similar size) – sports and employment areas are remote from existing and proposed housing, being on the outer edge. Recently WDC have approved the conversion of 24/26 Bell St, 28 Bell St, commercial buildings on Summerleys Rd (opposite station) and the former Black Prince into residential accommodation further limiting retail options within the existing town. The Station area no longer has any retail facilities. The main food retailer, Tesco’s has a medium sized store with a car park that is at 90-95% capacity. Only one small shopping area is planned in the new development. Food retailing alone will be completely inadequate, leading to people getting in their cars to shop elsewhere. The Tibbalds report stated that the residents wanted the town kept concise with the town within walking distance of any new housing, only a small part of the proposed development meets this requirement. Relief Road will contribute to cutting the Town Centre off and redirecting people to other retail outlet and smaller centres. Town Centre’s opportunity to regenerate will be hampered by the relief road. Improved parking facilities not yet clarified. There is no evidence of improvements to the public realm of existing town centre apart from some new cycle and pedestrian routes. The topography of the existing town does not lend itself to great local cycle usage. The remoteness of the town to the strategic highway network and to employment areas inevitably leads to high car dependence. The projected size of the ‘expanded’ town lends itself to an additional substantial retail centre (see Amersham and Beaconsfield, which are of similar size and have 2 centres – other similar sized towns (Marlow, Thame) have significantly bigger and wider market town centres). 	<p>visitors to the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To increase the area of the Town Centre then Bell Street up to the old post office needs to be expanded, difficult because of the above Relocate the two garages to the edge of town and offices to a business/enterprise park. Free parking in the town centre is necessary to encourage town centre usage; this is in line with government recommendations as well as nearby Thame and Wendover car parks. Currently food shopping is only just adequate. If the fire station is moved to the Longwick road or the Princes Estate then a whole area of land is opened up. This would be appropriate for not only a new, medium-sized food shop but could also include multi storey car parking with flats above. The Mount Car Park has very restricted and poor access (via Stratton Rd or Duke St) and is also sited on the Manor of The Black Prince so has important historical and archaeological heritage which should be exploited and enhanced. Increase in capacity here would be very detrimental to existing town centre traffic and to residential areas. Alternatively, the Tesco’s site offers a large area that could incorporate better parking and is very well sited for Wades Park and Town Centre. Relocating Tescos to an improved site within the proposed expansion zone could provide a) better food shopping options and b) a better integrated retail option that can serve both existing town and expansion area. Bell Street should be better incorporated as part of the Town Centre retail option with innovative traffic solutions (e.g. Exhibition Rd, London) and improved pedestrian realms.
c) Improve access to the main railway station,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This would be a distinct improvement. The land opposite the station has remained derelict for at least 8 years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The car parking capacity at the station needs to be vastly increased and cost of parking controlled in

<p>enhancing the approach, creating space for full bus access and supporting appropriate uses in the station area</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relief Road option creates a huge barrier to pedestrian/cycle access to station and any improved retail here, and health and safety. • Relief Road puts car commuters and rail commuters in direct conflict – rail commuters needing to cross the Relief Road during its peak hours. Pedestrian crossing will be needed, which will result in worse tailbacks than those currently seen through town, where traffic flow is separate from the station 	<p>order to keep commuters from parking in the nearby streets and current town car parks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To encourage new, large employers to invest in PR, access to the station is needed from the Princes Estate. • A user friendly in and out access road (u shaped) with safe set down and pick up points, access for buses and cyclists would provide a better solution. • Improvements to existing public realm should include retail options (cafe, small general store, improved taxi office) at the station area and a new pedestrian railway crossing accessing the countryside, Windsor playing fields (Horsenden) and the Princes estate. <p>Resort to original c2012 planning proposals for the railway station – CC</p>
<p>2. Meet the specific housing needs for the town to complement what is already there, as well as contributing to the wider housing needs for Wycombe District.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is certainly contributing to the wider housing needs for Wycombe district, but it is over delivering by about 20 times on the specific housing needs of the town. • The town's housing needs are for affordable homes for young <u>local</u> people close to the town centre. • As above – this 'over supplies' housing of the town's needs and with circa 40% affordable/social housing, will inevitably be used to provide social housing for those who would prefer to be in High Wycombe and/or other major towns. Without access to facilities, support and services, could lead to isolation and/or unsocial behaviour • The level of housing proposed will force most residents to commute to work, exacerbating traffic (and rail capacity) problems across the wider district (Chapel Lane, New Rd in HW is already poor) and beyond. • Over supply could reduce existing house values, as there is limited demand in this rural, poorly connected area. This in turn would lead to a 'dormitory' town. • Key words from NPPF – 'overwhelm the existing settlement'. • The low housing proposals for more suitable locations within the district (Marlow, Stokenchurch and even High Wycombe) will not meet the needs for these areas and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The housing designs need to maintain the variety of housing and not become just big anonymous estates. They need a mix of apartments and two bedroom bungalows and not just four bedroom family homes. • The number has to be restricted to 1000 so that they do not overwhelm the existing town. • The amount of social housing needs to be in line with rest of district and appropriate to the existing needs of the town. Affordable housing should be prioritised for young local people who wish to stay in their home town. • In order to promote the use of public transport and discourage car use, all facilities and public transport should be within walking distance. • Housing needs to be mixed, ideally from a wide cross section of developers, which encourages quality and provides varied style and design more in keeping with existing town profile. High, medium and low density should blend and areas should be set aside for a) self build sites b) for low density aspirational housing and c) Community Land Trust for local allocation • Affordable/social housing needs to be locally

	<p>must therefore be viewed as unsustainably low.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constraints of green belt are being respected in Marlow and Stokenchurch, but constraints of AONB and setting of AONB in Princes Risborough are disregarded. 	<p>allocated and the definition of 'keyworker' housing expanded to include options for teachers and public sector workers who are currently very restricted in their purchasing options.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our proposal for 1000 homes still represents a 30% increase to the town which is well above the average for the district, however it still goes a long way towards 'contributing to the wider district needs' and negates the need for divisive and controversial proposals (road).
<p>3. Tackle existing and future traffic congestion and severance by delivering new highway infrastructure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to our Road infrastructure letter and the need for a strategic transport solution utilising smart technology. • A ring road would be the best option, this would allow traffic calming and some additional pedestrianisation in the town centre. Other towns such as Thame and Amersham have achieved this. If we are to become the second biggest town after Wycombe then a much better solution must be found to reduce traffic congestion on the A4010. • The best road option should be chosen, not the one that can be funded by developers and which destroys green belt and AONB land. • The proposed road can only be described as a poor compromise that will take passing traffic away from the town centre and be merely a 'service' road for the new development. • Transport for Bucks are not fully aligned with this option and although an A4010 traffic solution is needed, a more suitable and long term option for an East-West road needs to be sought. This could include a wider town by-pass, or alternative routing through Chinnor for example. S106 monies would be much better spent on public realm improvements than on a road that will not alleviate existing and projected traffic problems (not completed until 2033) and that seeks to drive through the AONB and greenbelt and compromises Little Kimble. • Existing bottlenecks at Stoke Mandeville and West Wickham will be further exacerbated with little or no option for improvement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to the Road Infrastructure letter and use of SMART solutions to discourage through traffic from using the A4010 at rush hours – educating and informing commuters of alternative options re timing of their journeys, alternative routes and alternative modes of travel using smarter traffic technology • The Jacob's report showed a large amount of the traffic was from the school run Better integration of schools and safer roads plus cycleway/footpaths around them could encourage more walking to schools. • Transport for Bucks need to develop a proper long term solution to East West road route and access to Aylesbury/Milton Keynes and to the southbound M40 and the Thames Valley. • If any expansion is allowed to be built on the other side of the railway then local connecting roads would be all that is needed (Summerleys to Longwick Rd, Longwick Rd to Mill Lane). These would be cheaper and easier to implement and negate the need for the controversial sections at either end. (ref local traffic from Jacobs report) <p>Extract from Tibbalds report – 'In general, the best way to address these issues is to design for slower traffic speeds, with narrower road alignments that sit well within the landscape. This is at odds with the need to move large volumes of traffic quickly. However, given that 60% of the traffic is local to the town, is a 'relief road' to move large volumes of traffic quickly the right objective? It suggests a</p>

		<p>different approach might be more appropriate - building through routes, as an integral part of the development, designed to take both through and local traffic, giving motorists a choice of routes, and adding to the resilience of the network. There are many examples from other towns and cities of streets that have been designed to be people-friendly, but still carry significant levels of traffic at slower speeds. These new approaches have shown that it is possible to 'civilise' traffic, while at the same time achieve acceptable flows and journey times.'</p>
<p>4. Achieve an improved environment for walking and cycling, in both the existing town and the expanded town. Make direct connections to existing railway services, and significantly improve other public transport options.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Plan does make allowances for improved cycle and pedestrian routes within the town and these are welcome. • The opportunity has been missed to develop Risborough as the 'Gateway to the Chilterns ' and to develop Risborough as a recreational centre building on its special location within AONB bringing interest and revenue from tourists and visitors who want to walk and cycle in the Chilterns • Current railway crossings provide options for existing town residents to access the open countryside. The plan seeks to reduce these and therefore restrict access. • No consideration has been given to walkers who use existing trails through proposed development areas, country lanes and important routes such as the Ridgeway. Cyclists using NCR 57 and horse riders using the local lanes completely ignored. • The demographics and geography of the area mean that walking and cycling are not an option for many in the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect and enhance existing routes to provide safer cycling pathways and walking routes. • Special places of outstanding beauty such as Whiteleaf Cross and access to Phoenix Trail and Ridgeway Path and Icknield Way should be promoted and maximised for visitors and economic reasons. Tourism focusing on cycling and walking should be developed. • Remove the contraflow cycle lane in The High St and relocate to Park St providing better (and safer) cycle access to Wades Park (and expansion area), Church St, Market Square. • The public transport options are currently very limited and need to be improved. The local charity bus is the only service for local destinations, Chiltern Rail offers a service to Chinnor, but apart from that it is just the Aylesbury Wycombe network. There are limited buses to Thame and none to Oxford.
<p>5. Deliver new and enhanced green infrastructure as part of an ecosystem services approach to enhance the landscape, mitigate flood risk, achieve a net gain in biodiversity, and link to the wider green infrastructure network and the Chilterns AONB.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building on prime agricultural land and open countryside cannot possibly deliver this objective. • Currently there are areas of biodiversity that have grown naturally, the land at the back of Poppy road has become a habitat for bats and deer. Likewise Regent Park is home for Grass snakes, plus crested newts on Summerleys road. • A green corridor is planned through development area, but Risborough is not gaining green space, it is losing hectares of prime hedged farmland. How can developing the farmland and removing centuries old hedgerows increase biodiversity? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserve the existing green space, and ensure that the current residents can still see the surrounding hills from the town. Restrict the height of new builds and prevent light pollution. Trees do not mask damages that housing can cause, as stated by Lord Steven's in the Farthingloe case (ref xxx) • Follow the Chilterns Conservation Board guidelines for planning and those specific to infrastructure. Protect local chalk streams with restricted draw down from existing water courses. • Water courses and springs should be opened up

		<p>and enhanced to improve the public realm – e.g. the mill pond and streams that run through the former Hypnos site at the station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horns Lane Car Park has remained undeveloped as it provides an important unrestricted view of the Chiltern Hills from the Town Centre. Building on here or even decking the car park compromises this.
<p>6. Successfully mitigate flood risks and issues through the location of new development and through strategic and local interventions which will manage run-off rates and maximise opportunities for absorption.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed expansion zone is on the flat land below the main settlement and is prone to flooding. Bridges on Mill Lane and Summerleys Rd are frequently flooded. • The B4009 (Lower Icknield Way) is historically a summer route as it is prone to flooding hence the Romans built an Upper Icknield way for winter use! • Wades Park is a reclaimed marsh • Some clues to the nature of the land are found in the local names: Mill Lane, Willow Way, Crowbrook Rd, Ford, Marsh, Millstream Close, Park Mill, North Mill. • From Thames Water report in 2014 Climate change will increase the flooding risk for the existing houses, which will be made worse by Urban Creep that any new developments will create. • Much of flooding mitigation already lies within national planning policy, building control and planning requirements for driveways and patios etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any new developments should allow natural run off areas and not just be all concrete. There needs to be more regular cleaning of road drains. • Development in the flood plain should be as limited as possible with areas within the existing town boundary exploited first. • Smart solutions to road surface materials and driveways should be considered. • Existing ponds and natural watercourse routes in the existing town and beyond need to be protected and enhanced.
<p>7. Maximise the potential for new employment uses, and make suitable provision for new businesses to start up and existing businesses to grow or relocate in the Princes Risborough area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not support business creation and growth. The additional land allocated to business use is inadequate for the planned expansion. • Access to the Princes Estate/Regent Park is restricted by the railway bridges. • Current large industrial employers are being encouraged to relocate. • WDC already acknowledged, plus other reports, that the plan falls down due to lack of potential employment. The Wycombe Draft Employment Sites Commercial Assessment (2015) concludes that Princes Risborough does not score strongly on any key commercial drivers and is not ideally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of an enterprise/start-up business park to provide small low cost industrial units. • In addition to the designated Princes Estate expansion area, the land between Summerleys Rd and the main railway line next to Putnams and the Sewage works should be considered as this has better road access. Or improve access to the Princes Estate from the B4009, Chinnor Rd) • Focus on supporting those small businesses that can identify a niche product or service. • Encourage existing businesses like Hypnos to remain and grow.

	<p>placed to benefit from national and regional growth trends. The assessment notes that employment land at Princes Risborough would need to reach a critical mass for a successful new employment allocation. <i>Lepus report Dec 15</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2016 Boyer Report –Wycombe Commercial Assessment – Princes Risborough also scores PR very low in assessment of the commercial drivers and concluded that expansion of the Princes Estate was the best option to improve ‘employment clustering’. • Without an appropriate and full solution to the east-west road issues and without unhindered access to the strategic highway network especially the M40 and Thames Valley, employers will not be attracted to locate to PR. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify small business opportunities within new brownfield developments, particularly within newly designed centre and near station or the town centre and integrated amongst residential development. • Rural/recreational economy businesses encouraged by deeming Risborough a centre/gateway for Chiltern/rural activities.
<p>8. Ensure existing surrounding settlements retain distinct identities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no evidence in the plan that this can be achieved. • Needs to be an Area plan for all three parishes, not three individual unintegrated plans • Current expansion scale of TP will invite sprawl and buffer zones will be marginal in their influence to separate Longwick and Kimble from PR. • The proposed green ‘buffer’ zone now makes provision for sports facilities (no longer a buffer zone) thus allowing Longwick and PR to merge. <p>Refer to RARA AONB letter to WDC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend the green Belt as outlined in the Arup’s report (Bucks Green Belt Assessment P71 para 5.2.4 and Appendix 1G) NPPF also discourages merging of settlements. • If the expansion area has to breach the railway line then it is vital that a distinct and enforceable new town boundary is established. The proposed Crowbrook corridor seems a suitable boundary and would then restrict expansion beyond thus allowing Longwick, Alscot, Askett to retain their distinct identities. • It is imperative that surrounding parishes are included in this decision process.
<p>9. Preserve and enhance historic assets and features of the historic landscape (such as hedgerows), including Alscot Conservation Area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not possible with the proposed plan. <p>Refer to RARA AONB letter to WDC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not build beyond the Alscot Conservation area. • Make a greater effort to make the town more visitor friendly and also enhance the historical sites, Carry out review of the potential iron age settlement sites on Park Mill. Potential for creating PR as a ‘Gateway to the Chilterns.’ • This must include views to and from the town (see comment re Horns lane car park, comments on 8 above and the realising of existing assets such as the manor of the Black Prince (the Mount car park)). • All existing hedgerows should be preserved as should existing topology of any expansion area.

<p>10. Create a clear green edge to development to prevent longer-term sprawl into the countryside.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be an Area plan for all three parishes, not three individual unintegrated plans • Current expansion scale of TP will invite sprawl and buffer zones will be marginal in their influence to separate Longwick and Kimble from PR. • The proposed green 'buffer' zone now makes provision for sports facilities (no longer a buffer zone) thus allowing Longwick and PR to merge. • Relief road proposal to the south of the town is all about extending the existing clear green edge. • Arup report re farm land proposed for development as being appropriate for green belt ignored. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt Arup proposals – extend green belt, especially in strong areas, parcels 102 and 103. • Any new boundary needs to be set in legislation so that future plans do not require this whole process to re-emerge in 15 years time.
<p>11. Create an overall townscape which fits well into the special landscape setting and respects important long-distance views.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed plan does not achieve this. • The long distance views from the Chilterns will be blighted by this massive expansion • No consideration to the fact that PR is partly in the AONB and partly within the setting of the AONB – refer our AONB letter. • WDC has chosen to ignore Chilterns Conservation Board guidelines for Districts re planning within the setting of the AONB development. Virtually every policy and guideline has been broken. Unlike AVDC for example who has fully endorsed it. (see www.chilternsaonb.org) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan should develop the natural assets that the AONB provides. It is important to remember that it is the view into the AONB and not just out of it that is important. Trees do not hide a problem, and the proposed expansion area needs a variety of housing designs • A varied selection of small developments from numerous developers will help contribute to this rather than large developments of 'estates' by single large developers. This also adds to the quality of any development.
<p>12. Meet the infrastructure needs of the expanded town: a) Deliver a comprehensively planned expansion, demonstrating overall viability, with development delivering supporting infrastructure at the right time and in the right places. b) Deliver new community infrastructure including school(s), some shops, and community meeting facilities, health and sporting facilities and other open and green spaces. Upgrade and expand existing facilities where needed, e.g. secondary school provision.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding of essentials such as schools and GP places should not be aspirational but mandatory infrastructure requirements. • Location of schools near playing fields should be a major consideration to promote sport and health and well being. Shared resources and parking. Current plan positions playing fields within buffer zone on outskirts of town. • Sports facilities need to be much wider (hockey, tennis, squash, gym facilities, and additional swimming) • A purpose built community centre/town hall needs to be included. • Also a cinema or theatre for performances/exhibitions/arts etc. The whole emphasis seems to be on sporting matters. There needs to be a better balance of provision for sport 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish the social infrastructure needs under more appropriate housing numbers and utilise private sector if necessary to deliver. • A better town plan would include a new retail centre with restaurant and pub opportunities as well as a new improved community centre. See issues with the proposed plan that relate to this objective. • Health, education and sports needs are a given for any expansion and should not be classed as infrastructure improvements.

	<p>and recreation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is little or no improvement to recreational/night time options such as restaurant and pub provision which are also essential infrastructure needs. <p>In order to fund the infrastructure needs more funds need to be raised from the development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for new schools – The last Steering Group report required part funding from the Dept. of Education. DoE has insufficient funds to maintain existing schools and turning to private Finance for new schools. Where are the guarantees that these schools will be provided. • The developers are being asked to provide 40% social housing, against a district target of 25%. This will cost developers considerably more, because of this the council has only asked for S106 contributions of £25 million. Therefore reduce the amount of Social Housing and ask for a greater contribution from developers. • The social housing allocation greatly exceeds local demand and could be used to provide temporary accommodation for the homeless and those that would not choose this town. Princes Risborough is not the right place for this as there is no local employment and few facilities. 	
<p>13. Achieve high design standards through site layout, landscape and building design principles that are merited by the town’s location in relation to the Chilterns AONB and existing verdant character, including the use of local materials and trees, allowing for structural as well as local planting.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No evidence that WDC are able to deliver this. In fact when questioned on the design and build quality of the former Black Prince site WDC state they had no control of this. • Sustainable construction also includes the distance travelled for materials and equipment required. PR cannot be deemed a sustainable location for major development. • Many opportunities missed due to WDC housing target driven agenda. • Voice of localism untapped and Steering Group has been ‘led’ by WDC to merely provide large scale housing opportunities to satisfy govt requirements. • Sustainability and high standards of design overlooked in developing WDC’s Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WDC needs to adopt the Chilterns Conservation Board policies and advice regarding the building and design principles. (ref xxx) • Use varied and numerous developers to ensure different designs and increase the diversity of the townscape. • A better Town Plan would have the objective of taking into account Localism which should allow the community to have greater input into design and layout.

Princes Risborough Town Council's statement on WDC's Local Plan

Published on their website in early 2015 and unchanged to date (Sept 2017)

Princes Risborough Town Council (PRTC) is opposed to large scale development on the northern side of the Risborough – Aylesbury railway line, as proposed in the draft Local Plan. Development on this land would set a precedent and potentially lead to uncontrolled urban sprawl across open countryside which is overlooked by the Chiltern Hills, a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is PRTC's considered opinion that all the land from the base of the Chiltern Hills, which extends from the northern border of the Town and lies within Wycombe District, should be re-designated as AONB and/or Greenbelt in order to protect this beautiful countryside for the present and future benefit of all.

Whilst PRTC is mindful of the need for new housing within the Town, particularly for young families, it is against the use of Greenbelt/AONB for such developments. PRTC is also mindful that low employment opportunities in this northern part of Wycombe District and poor road connections on the A4010 in either direction could impact any large-scale development being considered sustainable.

However, the Town Council takes its responsibilities seriously and should, in the worst case scenario, development be considered on land north of the railway line it would be imperative that the necessary infrastructure improvements, (including, but not exclusively, a western relief road, new primary school, new doctors' surgery and current town centre redevelopment/expansion within the existing commercial centre of The High Street, Duke Street, New Road, Horns Lane and Bell Street), are implemented alongside any housing development. Furthermore, PRTC insist that it should play a key role in all matters relating to any development, including allocation of housing.

PRTC is currently in the process of establishing a Neighbourhood Development Plan to further establish its position.