

SAMPLE LETTER CONSULTATION RESPONSE – DEADLINE 19th JULY 2019

USE YOUR OWN THOUGHTS AND WORDS

YOUR ADDRESS HERE

Planning Policy Team
Chiltern District Council
King George V Road
Amersham
Bucks
HP6 5AW

DATE

E-mail: planning.policy@chilternandsouthbucks.gov.uk

Dear Sirs

Local Plan Consultation Response

The Local Plan is unsound and not legally compliant because:

Not all brownfield sites have been identified.

A more strategic county-wide view should be taken by the new Unitary Authority before release of any green belt sites.

The housing need figures have been over-inflated.

Planning consents have been granted for development at higher densities than accounted for in the councils' housing availability figures which means their figures for housing need are unreliable.

Insufficient attention has been paid to previously developed land, both residential and commercial.

The councils have merely carried out a request via a "Call for Sites", inviting landowners and developers to nominate land for development, rather than carrying out their own assessment of land availability. This means, for example, that a large proportion of Beaconsfield green belt has, wrongfully, been nominated rather than previously developed land.

This flawed green belt assessment goes against government policy. Previous consultation responses have been ignored. Evidence does not support this green belt release which breaches national policy. Consultation with the communities has been extremely poor.

Policy SP BP9

This policy is unsound for many reasons. Beaconsfield green belt is not a sustainable location because it is too far from the new town supermarkets, shops and services and too far from the railway station. This site should be retained as green belt as it performs the 5 green belt purposes strongly. To release it is not consistent with national policy.

Traffic is already heavily congested in the town with many junctions already operating over capacity. The impact on traffic if Beaconsfield green belt is released for development would be severe.

The ideas for traffic mitigation lack sufficient detail and have not been modelled to take into account all planned development within the surrounding area.

The Jacobs' report confirms traffic congestion in the town would become far worse.

Beaconsfield cannot accommodate any more traffic.

Construction of the Beaconsfield relief road has been started by BCC but a dispute with Inland Homes (who have planning permission for Wilton Park) has meant that completion of the relief road has been delayed. This relief road would just become an access road to a huge housing estate and business park if our green belt is released. The relief road would not offer any relief.

HS2 lorry movements and Heathrow expansion have not been factored into traffic assessments.

Pedestrian and cycle access to the Option 9 areas is dangerous due to the busy roads.

Cycling is not a safe option in this area.

It is unrealistic to think people will walk or cycle to the New Town from Option 9 because it is too far and the roads too dangerous.

Bus services are very limited and infrequent.

The many roundabouts, zebra crossings, traffic lights and railway bridge across the town mean that traffic is not free-flowing before factoring any more development.

Beaconsfield is not a "principal settlement", it is a small market town, smaller than many of its neighbours. It sits on the boundary with Wycombe district which means that the population and traffic from thousands more homes will affect our roads and infrastructure.

The amount of development proposed for Beaconsfield is unsustainable. It is disproportionate.

Air pollution will only get worse. The level of car ownership in this area is one of the highest in the country.

The Air Quality Management Area around the M40 area makes this an unsuitable and unsustainable area for development, being close to the M40 and adjacent to the M40 spur, A40 and A355 which are all heavily congested traffic routes.

Increasing retail development in the new town would only increase traffic trying to reach it. Although there are several empty retail units in the town, so there is no need for more.

Building retail development on Altons carpark would remove a nursery school and a car park which is usually at capacity during week days and on a road with queueing traffic already at peak times.

Building retail development on the Mercedes site would be unsustainable next to Davenies Pre-prep and Prep School leading to dangerous traffic and pollution levels.

This policy is not effective because this land is among the most expensive land in the country meaning it cannot produce truly affordable housing in any meaningful numbers. All that would result is more expensive housing which would not solve the housing crisis. Profits would line the pockets of a few at a huge cost to the town in terms of worsening traffic congestion, strain on infrastructure and services.

The policy is ineffective due to its location being unsustainable, leading to more traffic congestion and pollution.

To remove this site from green belt would be to remove the green lungs of the town.

These fields have been used by dog walkers and for recreation for decades and their loss would result in Beaconsfield itself losing over 60% of its green belt. This is extreme, disproportionate, inconsistent with national policy and unjustified.

Beaconsfield has little park land and these fields are one of its most important natural resources and provide important green infrastructure which cannot be replaced.

The green belt site selection has been erroneous. This is the worst possible and least sustainable site on what is supposed to be our relief road which we have been waiting for since the 1970s.

The selection of this site is contrary to national policy, in particular Para. 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework. No exceptional circumstances have been shown for its release. Housing need itself is not "exceptional circumstances."

Development of this site would result in urban sprawl and a huge urban expansion of what is a small market town. Part of the site is in a Conservation area and there are listed buildings on the site.

The town's population would grow by around one third which is unsustainable.

1600 more homes plus 20,000 sq metres of employment space would lead to thousands more car journeys in the town every day.

The development planned just across the district boundary with Wycombe district (including a further 1,000 homes on the Gomm Valley site near Tylers Green) means around a further 3,000 homes and thousands more cars using our roads and town from these sites too.

There has been no joined up thinking. Beaconsfield is right on the border with Wycombe district. Geographically therefore, it is unsustainable to add c. 1600 more homes into an area right next to an area in Wycombe district thousands more homes are planned.

This land will not deliver meaningful affordable housing. Developers locally have been avoiding affordable housing provision on site for years due to high costs and high land value. It is undeliverable on site in the required numbers.

Removal of this site from green belt would result in loss of a huge proportion of the town's accessible countryside, crossed by public rights of way.

Evidence is being retro-fitted for removal of this green belt site.

This site plays an important role in preserving the "openness" of the green belt which is the first thing one notices when one approaches the town.

This site is important in framing the Old Town Conservation Area.

It is near junction 2 of the motorway and our green belt mitigates against the poor air quality along the Air Quality Management Area of the M40 corridor. Making air quality worse goes against government policy.

This site provides green infrastructure, agricultural land and includes ancient woodland which would be threatened by urbanisation, pollution and traffic.

Release of this site from green belt for development would create severe stress on Burnham Beeches SAC by virtue of it lying within the 5K buffer zone.

This site plays the important role of preventing coalescence with Seer Green.

This site is home for many threatened species such as bees, deer, bats and newts.

The housing need figures have been over-inflated by the government. All housing need can be accommodated on non-green belt land. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify this green belt release; it is unjustified and contrary to national policy.

Release of this green belt site would mean other nearby sites would not be re-generated. It is wasteful use of land.

There is no local A & E dept. at Wycombe Hospital. GPs' surgeries and hospitals are under severe stress. Schools are at capacity.

There are no boys' schools in the town meaning that boys who pass the 11 plus must travel out of town to Wycombe to attend school, adding more traffic to the roads. The distance admission policy means that boys are disadvantaged as more and more development takes place between Beaconsfield and Wycombe. This is unsustainable.

This site performs strongly the green belt purposes. Exceptional circumstances for its release have not been demonstrated. This Plan is unsound.

Policy SP EP3

This policy is unsound and not legally compliant. The reference to use of the Mercedes Showroom and Altons Car park as sites in Beaconsfield for additional retail space or a supermarket should be deleted as this is not only not needed but unsustainable in terms of traffic congestion and impact on air quality. The town has several empty retail units and already has 3 supermarkets. It would involve the loss of a nursery school and make traffic even more hazardous in the vicinity of Davenies School.

Policy SP EP4

This policy is unsound and not legally compliant. Reference to 20,000 sq. metres of economic floor space on Beaconsfield green belt should be deleted. This would generate an unsustainable amount of traffic in an already severely congested area. Air quality would suffer. The evidence does not show a need for this type of use and it would prevent the letting of empty employment space in the vicinity.

Policy SP PP1

This policy is unsound and not legally compliant. It is unjustified. Jordans village should be retained in the green belt. No prior public consultation has been carried out on this point and the public has only just found out about this policy. Jordans Village is a characterful village which nestles in an unobtrusive way within the green belt and it should retain its green belt status. There is no justification for its removal. This is against national policy.

Policy DM PP1

This policy is unsound and not legally compliant. It is unjustified. Penn Village should not be designated an infilling village due to its special character and location within the green belt. No prior consultation has been carried out on this policy. It is against national policy and there is no evidence to support this designation.

Yours faithfully