

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Contents

- A. Introduction
- B. Involving the local community
- C. Drafting the Neighbourhood Plan
- D. Pre-submitting the Neighbourhood Plan
- E. Results of the Pre-Submission consultation

A. Introduction

1. This Consultation Statement relates to the Pre-Submission version of the Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan (the Draft Plan), as required by Regulations 14 and 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. In line with Regulation 15, this statement:
 - Contains details of the people and bodies who were consulted about the Plan;
 - Explains how they were consulted;
 - Summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the people consulted; and
 - Describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan (the Proposed Plan).
2. This Statement also contains details of the earlier consultation initiatives undertaken while developing the first draft of the Neighbourhood Plan.
3. This Statement has been prepared by Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council’s Neighbourhood Plan Working Group (the Working Group).

B. Involving the local community

4. The Working Group has split the work leading to the submission of the Proposed Plan to Wycombe District Council (WDC) into three phases, as summarised in Figure 1.

PHASE 1	PHASE 2	PHASE 3
TIMEFRAME: 05.06.15 TO 20.10.15	TIMEFRAME: 21.10.15 TO 02.06.16	TIMEFRAME: 03.06.16 TO 26.08.16
FINAL MILESTONE: WDC decision on Neighbourhood Area obtained	FINAL MILESTONE: Neighbourhood Plan drafted	FINAL MILESTONE: Proposed Neighbourhood Plan submitted to WDC
1. Raise awareness of initiative 2. Recruit Working Group & Task Groups 3. Consult on Neighbourhood Area 4. Inform of outcome of consultation on Area	1. Maintain awareness of initiative 2. Define content of Pre-Submission Plan and gather relevant evidence	1. Consult on Pre-Submission Plan 2. Gather comments and amend Pre-submission Plan accordingly before submission to WDC 3. Submit Proposed Plan to WDC

Figure 1

5. At each phase of the project the Working Group used means of communication and undertook specific initiatives with the aim of (i) raising / maintaining awareness of the initiative and (ii) involving residents in the work on-going at the time.
6. Bledlow-cum-Saunderton is a large rural parish, made up of three wards, with no “main village” to act as a focal point. The geographic structure of the parish was taken into account when selecting the initiatives and means of communication used during each phase.
7. The Working Group used the following means of communication during each phase of the project:
 - Parish Council website – The Neighbourhood Plan provided the trigger for a full overhaul of this website, which was completed on 16th October 2015. The new website has an extensive Neighbourhood Plan section, which has been kept up to date throughout the duration of the

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

project. Until the launch of the new website the old Parish Council website was used to carry news on the Neighbourhood Plan.

- Parish magazines – The Parish is served by two separate magazines ('Contact' and 'The Messenger') in which monthly updates on the Neighbourhood Plan have been published since October 2015.
- Parish Notice Boards – The Parish Council has six notice boards distributed around the parish. Neighbourhood Plan notices were posted to remind passers-by of forthcoming important events (such as Parish Survey, Public Meetings, etc.).
- Other notice boards – In addition notices have been posted in the three pubs, the Country Store at Bledlow Ridge and other venues within the Parish such as Churches and the Princes Risborough Golf Course.
- E-mails – A new Parish Council e-mail list was created in September 2015 (98 subscribers as of 22nd July 2016) and has been used periodically. The Working Group has also had indirect access to a number of other local e-mail distribution lists, which were used regularly throughout the life of the project.
- Word of mouth - The local residents who worked on the Neighbourhood Plan helped keep the local community up-to-date with and involved in the progress of the plan on an ongoing basis.

C. Drafting the Neighbourhood Plan

8. Key dates of Phase 1 include the initial decision by Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council (the Parish Council) to produce a Neighbourhood Plan (5th June 2015); the first meeting of the Working Group on 8th August 2015; the Neighbourhood Area application consultation process (from 24th August to 2nd October 2015); and the Neighbourhood Area designation (13th October 2015).
9. During Phase 2 of the project the Working Group organised five Task Groups to gather evidence and develop policies for specific sections of the Neighbourhood Plan (the kick-off meeting between the Working Group and the Task Groups took place on 14th December 2015). In carrying out their activities the Task Groups contacted interested parties and other people with local knowledge in the areas covered by the relevant Task Group.
10. In Phase 2 of the project some specific initiatives took place aimed at ensuring that residents' views and priorities could influence the drafting of the Neighbourhood Plan from the outset:
 - Parish Survey – A survey covering a wide range of planning issues was conducted in January 2016. The survey was preceded by a thorough communication campaign using the above means of communication, as well as a letter from the Chairman of the Parish Council delivered to each household in the Parish (December 2015) and a flyer campaign (carried out in December 2015 / January 2016). Part of the flyer campaign specifically targeted some of the local "hotspots" of community life (the local school, pre-school, churches, pubs and golf club). The survey yielded a 39% response rate (a total of 360 responses were returned out of 921 surveys sent to all households in the parish). A Survey Report is available on the Parish website.
 - Public Meetings – Two all-day exhibitions took place on Saturday 27th February 2016 (Bledlow Ridge Village Hall) and Saturday 5th March 2016 (Bledlow Village Hall). At these events the results of the Parish Survey and the initial proposals and draft policies prepared by the Task Groups were presented. These events were organised as walk-in exhibitions (with some 40 A1 posters displayed), with members of the Neighbourhood Plan Team in attendance to respond to any questions visitor had. A total of 145 residents attended these events (69 and 76 visitors respectively). These events generated 137 feedback forms, either

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

filled in during (68 forms) or mailed/e-mailed later to the Working Group after each event (69 forms received by 26th March 2016). The Task Groups analysed and considered all comments made by the public when preparing their reports to the Working Group at the end of their activity. A Feedback Report is available on the Parish website.

- Neighbourhood Plan Clinics – On 16th (Bledlow ridge Village Hall) and 17th (Bledlow Village Hall) March 2016 the Working Group ran two-hour clinics to allow residents the opportunity to ask questions and express their views to members of the Working Group.
- Presentations – The Working Group offered to present the Neighbourhood Plan to local organisations. Three such presentations (to the Bledlow Belles, Bledlow Ridge Friendship Club and Bledlow Ridge Women Institute) took place in the period January - May 2016.

11. The work carried out by the Task Groups and Working Group during Phase 2 of the project led to the preparation of a series of policy proposals, which were shaped by the results of the Parish Survey. The feedback gathered during the Public Meetings and the Neighbourhood Plan Clinics helped refine these proposals, which eventually became the Draft Plan, presented to and approved by the Parish Council on 2nd June 2016.

12. In parallel, a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report was prepared and forwarded to the Statutory Consultees on 29th February 2016 by the Parish Council. A draft Sustainability Appraisal incorporating a Strategic Environmental Assessment was later prepared (see Section D).

13. All documents generated during Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the project have been posted on the Parish Council website.

D. Pre-submitting the Neighbourhood Plan

14. The key initiative carried out in Phase 3 was the formal Regulation 14 pre-submission consultation on the Draft Plan and the related draft Sustainability Appraisal incorporating a Strategic Environmental Assessment.

15. The consultation process started on 8th June and ran until 20th July. The consultation was preceded by another significant communication campaign based around leaflets (Appendix A), the Parish Council website, the parish magazines, as well as:

- a letter from the Parish Clerk (see Appendix B) delivered to:
 - Each household in the parish
 - All known businesses and charitable organisations in the parish
 - A number of developers and landowners
- An email from the Parish Clerk (see Appendix C) sent to statutory and other consultees (as identified in agreement with Wycombe District Council).

16. The names of all organisations that were advised of the consultation are listed in Appendix E, while Appendix F lists the statutory and other consultees contacted by email. The list of the households in the parish has not been published.

17. On 20th June the Working Group sent a reminder email to the Parish Council mailing list and, indirectly, to a number of other local e-mail distribution lists. On 28th June and 6th July further two-hour Neighbourhood Plan Clinics were held in Bledlow Ridge Village Hall and Bledlow Village Hall respectively.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

18. All consultees were invited to register their opinions on the Plan by completing a Comments Form (see Appendix D). Responses could be e-mailed or posted, using the contact details provided.

E. Results of the Pre-Submission consultation

19. The Pre-Submission consultation yielded 49 responses for a total of just over 200 individual comments.
20. The statutory and other consultees who provided feedback are listed in Appendix G. The names of organisations which commented on the Plan are listed in Appendix H. The name and contact details of all individuals who commented on the Plan have been withheld for reasons of confidentiality, but are available in the Consultation Evidence File.
21. Appendix I includes all comments regarding the Plan made by the statutory and other consultees and by the organisations; Appendix L shows the comments made by residents.
22. Whenever practically possible comments have been copied verbatim into Appendices I-L. When the length of the comments did not allow this, a summary has been made. In such cases, the original submission is available in the Consultation Evidence File.
23. Appendix M includes a report which summarises those representations made by the statutory consultees, developers/landowners and other interested organisations at pre-submission stage (Reg 14).
24. Each comment made has been individually considered by the Working Group to determine if any changes to the policies and/or other text of the Draft Plan were to be made, in order to produce the Proposed Plan.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan
CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Appendix A – Leaflet (Pre-Submission Consultation)



BLEDLOW-CUM-SAUNDERTON
PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Jocelyn Cay: Trees Cottage, Church Lane, Bledlow Ridge, HP14 4AX
Tel: 07887 575017
bcsclerk@outlook.com
www.bledlow-cum-saundertonparishcouncil.org.uk

BLEDLOW-cum-SAUNDERTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN
PUBLIC CONSULTATION
8th JUNE – 20th JULY 2016

The Pre-Submission version of the Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan (“Plan”) is now available for public consultation:

- ❖ Online at www.bledlow-cum-saundertonparishcouncil.org.uk.
- ❖ In hard copy at the following locations:
 - The Golden Cross Pub – Saunderton
 - St Mary & St Nicholas – Saunderton
 - The Boot Pub – Bledlow Ridge
 - The Country Store – Bledlow Ridge
 - The Lions – Bledlow
 - Holy Trinity – Bledlow

Comments on the Plan using the designated Comment Form (available via the link above) must be:

- ❖ E-mailed to np@bledlow-cum-saundertonparishcouncil.org.uk (preferred) or
- ❖ Mailed to the Parish Council Clerk (address above).

Closing date for comments is Wednesday 20th July at 5pm.

The Neighbourhood Plan Working Group will be available to discuss the Plan on the following days:

- ❖ Tuesday 28th June 2016, 7.00- 9.00PM at Bledlow Ridge Village Hall
- ❖ Wednesday 6th July 2016, 7.00-9.00PM at Bledlow Village Hall.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan
CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Appendix B – Parish Clerk Letter (Pre-Submission consultation)



BLEDLOW-CUM-SAUNDERTON
PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Jocelyn Cay: Trees Cottage, Church Lane, Bledlow Ridge, HP14 4AX
Tel: 07887 575017
bcsclerk@outlook.com
www.bledlow-cum-saundertonparishcouncil.org.uk

3rd June 2016

PRE-SUBMISSION NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSULTATION

The Pre-Submission version of the Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan (“Plan”) was approved by the Parish Council on 2nd June 2016 and will be available for public consultation for a period of six weeks (**from 8th June to 20th July 2016 inclusive**) as required by the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Comments on the document must be made in writing using the designated Comment Form, which can then be e-mailed to np@bledlow-cum-saundertonparishcouncil.org.uk or mailed to the Parish Council Clerk (address above). E-mail is preferred.

From 8th June 2016 the Plan and the Comment Form will be available online at www.bledlow-cum-saundertonparishcouncil.org.uk. Paper copies of the Plan and Comment Form will be available at the following locations:

- The Golden Cross Pub – Saunderton
- St Mary & St Nicholas – Saunderton
- The Boot Pub – Bledlow Ridge
- The Country Store – Bledlow Ridge
- The Lions – Bledlow
- Holy Trinity – Bledlow

PRE-SUBMISSION NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CLINICS

Representatives of the Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan Working Group will be available to discuss the Plan on the following days:

- Tuesday 28th June 2016, 7.00- 9.00pm at Bledlow Ridge Village Hall
- Wednesday 6th July 2016, 7.00-9.00pm at Bledlow Village Hall

Yours faithfully



Jocelyn Cay
Clerk, Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Appendix C – Parish Clerk Email (Pre-Submission consultation)

SUBJECT: Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Version: consultation with Statutory Bodies



BLEDLOW-CUM-SAUNDERTON PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Jocelyn Cay: Trees Cottage, Church Lane, Bledlow Ridge, HP14 4AX
Tel: 07887 575017
bcsclerk@outlook.com
www.bledlow-cum-saundertonparishcouncil.org.uk

Dear Sir / Madam,

As required by the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council is undertaking pre-submission consultation on its Neighbourhood Plan. As a Statutory Consultee, we are seeking your views.

The Pre-Submission Version of the Plan ("Plan") was approved by the Parish Council on 2nd June 2016 and will undergo consultation for a period of six weeks, from 8th June to 20th July 2016 (5.00pm) inclusive.

From 8th June 2016 the Plan will be available online at www.bledlow-cum-saundertonparishcouncil.org.uk.

We kindly request that your organisation reviews the Plan and lets us have any comments by return e-mail before the end of the consultation period.

Yours sincerely

Jocelyn Cay
Clerk, Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Appendix D – Comments form (Pre-Submission consultation)

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Version – Comments Form

Please note that anonymous, irrelevant to the content of the Plan, abusive and/or defamatory comments will not be accepted.

All comments will be made public but your personal details will remain confidential and only be used for reference purposes.

ABOUT YOU

Name:

Full address:

E-mail:

COMMENT 1

Number of the paragraph of the plan the comment refers to:

Please state your comment:

Please indicate an alternative approach which would address your comment:

COMMENT 2

Number of the paragraph of the plan the comment refers to:

Please state your comment:

Please indicate an alternative approach which would address your comment:

Is there anything of substance missing from the Plan?

IF YOU HAVE MORE COMMENTS TO MAKE PLEASE COMPLETE A NEW FORM
MANY THANKS FOR TAKING TIME TO COMPLETE THIS FORM

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Appendix E – Organisations informed of the Pre-Submission consultation

Businesses & Charities
Thames Restek UK Limited
Wycombe Coin Limited
Clipper Components Limited
Sporting Memorabilia Limited
Sportingold Limited
Oak View Restorations Limited
Flying Test Systems Limited
Vidionics Security Systems Limited
Ministry Wharf Management Limited
Timpson's Smallholding Limited
R & M Chateau Wines Limited
MG Innovations Limited
Leo Distribution Limited
Durashine Auto Body Restoration Limited
The Occupier
NWP Engineering
The Occupier
David Nichols Wholesale Meats Limited
Resource Print & Resource Digital Graphics
Advisa
ategi Shared Lives
AMUSF Limited
Automatic Vending Association
Barnardo's
BFM Limited
Buckinghamshire Disability Centre
Child Bereavement UK
Carers Trust Thames
Deafax
Global Recordings Network UK
Kids in Sport
Libertartem Limited
MapAction
Mencap
National Education Trust
National Trust
Ngage Solutions Limited
Pets As Therapy
POhWER
RAF Central Fund
RHEMA UK & Ireland
Social Link

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan *CONSULTATION STATEMENT*

The Caesura Centre
The Quiet Garden Trust
The Retreat Association
Wycliffe Bible Translators
Luxton Nurseries
Fullers Flowers (Hemley Hill Farm)
Risborough Service Centre Limited
Combined Carriers
Princes Risborough Golf Club
Dean Valley Studios
Reed & Rackstraw

Land & Development interests
ERLP 1 Sarl c/o St Congar Land
Saunderton Estates Ltd
Sear Family c/o Carter Jonas
West Wycombe Estate

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Appendix F – Consultee List (Pre-Submission consultation)

Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012		
Consultee type	BcSNP consultee	Email
(b)a local planning authority, county council or parish council any part of whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority;	WDC BCC OCC SODC AVDC adjoining parishes - Radnage Piddington and Wheeler End Bradenham Princes Risborough Longwick cum Ilmer Lacey Green Chinnor	planning.policy@wycombe.gov.uk ; strat_planning@buckscc.gov.uk ; planning@oxfordshire.gov.uk ; planning.policy@southoxon.gov.uk ; forwardplans@aylesburyvaldc.gov.uk ; radnagepc@virginmedia.com ; clerk@piddingtonandwheelerend.org.uk ; clerk@bradenham.org.uk ; towncouncil@princesrisborough.com ; clerk@longwickcumilmer.org.uk ; clerk@laceygreen-pc.org.uk ; chinnorpc@btconnect.com ;
(d)the Homes and Communities Agency(19);		Steve.Collins@hca.qsx.gov.uk
(e)Natural England(20);		consultations@naturalengland.org.uk
(f)the Environment Agency(21);		planning-wallingford@environment-agency.gov.uk
(g)the Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (known as English Heritage)(22);		e-seast@historicEngland.org.uk
(h)Network Rail Infrastructure Limited (company number 2904587);		TownPlanningLNW@networkrail.co.uk
(i)Highways England;		CooEric.Cooper@highwaysengland.co.uk
(k)any person—		
(i)to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under section 106(3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003; and		dpm@monoconsultants.com Site.Information@everythingeverywhere.com ServiceDesk.Receptionist@airwavesolutions.co.uk info@kelly.co.uk
(ii)who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority;		tendai.madziya@ukpowernetworks.co.uk nigel.warwick@centrica.com info@gtc-uk.co.uk

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012		
(l) where it exercises functions in any part of the neighbourhood area—		
(i) a Primary Care Trust established under section 18 of the National Health Service Act 2006(24) or continued in existence by virtue of that section;	Buckinghamshire Primary Care Trust	Clinton.Green@buckshealthcare.nhs.uk louise.patten@nhs.net john.lisle@nhs.net
(ii) a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 6(1)(b) and (c) of the Electricity Act 1989(25);	ie The Distributing Network Operator	InfrastructureServices@edfenergy.com
(iii) a person to whom a licence has been granted under section 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986(26);	Centrica, Amec Foster Wheeler (consultants) on behalf of National Grid and Southern Gas network	nigel.warwick@centrica.com n.grid@amecfw.com customerservicesouthern@sgn.co.uk
(iv) a sewerage undertaker; and	Thames Water, Savills as Thames Water's appointed supplier for Property Services function	ctbell@savills.com Mark.j.Dickinson@thameswater.co.uk
(v) a water undertaker;	Thames Water	see above
(m) voluntary bodies some or all of whose activities benefit all or any part of the neighbourhood area;	Bledlow Charities Hearing dogs for the Deaf The Rural Community Defibrillator Group	henryandjanet@phpshaw.co.uk info@hearingdogs.org.uk http://rcdg.org/contact-us/
(n) bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the neighbourhood area;		NA
(o) bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the neighbourhood area;	Parish of Bledlow with Saunderton and Horsenden Bledlow Ridge St Paul	vicar@bledlowparish.org.uk https://www.achurchnearyou.com/bledlow-ridge-st-paul/#
(p) bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the neighbourhood area; and	Buckinghamshire Business First Country Landowners Association	rupert@bff.uk.com robin.edwards@cla.org.uk
(q) bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the neighbourhood area.		alison@waafa.plus.com
Non Statutory		
Chiltern Society		mrchadw@btinternet.com
Chilterns Conservation Board		planning@chilternsaonb.org
Ward member		carl.etholen@wycombe.gov.uk
Chiltern Railways		Thomas.Painter@chilternrailways.co.uk
West Wycombe Estate		ed@westwycombeestate.co.uk

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan
CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Appendix G – List of Consultees who provided feedback (pre-Submission consultation)

Consultee #	Consultee name
500	Mr PJ Murray, Chief Finance Officer, Chiltern CCG
501	Janet Shaw, Chairman of the Trustees, Bledlow Charities
502	Stephen Cotton, PCC secretary for St Paul's Bledlow Ridge
503	David Hetafield, Chiltern Railways
504	Lucy Murfett, The Chilterns Conservation Board
505	Carmelle Bell, Savills as Thames Water's appointed supplier
506	Aude Pantel, Wycombe District Council
507	Rebecca Micklem, Natural England
508	Michelle Kidd, Environment Agency
509	Diane Clarke, Network Rail
510	Emily Brown, Buckinghamshire County Council
511	Deirdre Brown, Bradenham Parish Council

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan
CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Appendix H – List of Organisations which provided feedback (pre-Submission consultation)

Org #	Organisation name
100	PPML Consulting on behalf of ERLP 1 Sarl c/o St Congar Land

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Appendix I – Consultees’ and Organisations’ comments (Pre-Submission consultation)

Consultee #	Paragraph #	Comment	Alternative	Changes to Plan
500	Whole plan	<p>It should be noted that residents in Bledlow-cum-Saunderton are generally either registered with a GP in Princes Risborough or Chinnor and that there are no plans to site a GP facility in the area. The CCG therefore endorses comments made in the plan that only limited infill development should be approved, rather than development on a larger scale.</p> <p>The CCG is working with WDC to ensure that consideration of healthcare requirements is included in local development plans for Wycombe and Princes Risborough.</p>		No need to amend the plan.
501	Whole plan	<p>The Trustees do not have any comments to make on the Pre-Submission version of the Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan as it appears that it is unlikely to have any direct effect on the Charity or the way in which it operates within the boundaries of the civil parish. The Trustees are however grateful for being the opportunity to comment.</p>		No need to amend the plan.
502	Policy 11 (para 5.76)	<p>I am writing on behalf of the PCC of St. Paul’s Church, Bledlow Ridge. The PCC takes a keen interest in the welfare of the village and felt it should include the Neighbourhood Plan consultation on the agenda for our meeting on 4 July.</p> <p>We agreed that we would like to congratulate those responsible on their extremely thorough and well-presented plan.</p> <p>We also agreed that we would like to raise the matter of whether St. Paul’s Church should be included in Policy 11, Community Facilities. We would certainly regard the church as a community facility, open to everyone seven days a week and often visited by village residents and others from further afield. It can also offer a versatile space for meetings, concerts, etc.</p> <p>The inclusion of St. Paul’s would of course lead to consideration of the inclusion of the other two Anglican churches in the parish; on the other hand we appreciate that places of worship may not be regarded as being in the same category as the other listed community facilities for planning purposes. It may be that precedents have been set in other plans which you are following in this case.</p> <p>In conclusion we invite you to consider whether it is appropriate to include St. Paul’s as a community facility in Policy 11.</p>		Amend the plan to add St Paul's (Bledlow Ridge), Holy Trinity (Bledlow) and St Mary and St Nicholas (Saunderton).

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

503		Having read the document we have only one comment to make in relation to the proposals. We are pleased to see the insistence on the development of the Molins site including provision of safe and convenient cycle and pedestrian connections to Saunderton station. We support this proposal and welcome all steps which allow our customers to access the station site in a safe and sustainable way.		No need to amend the plan.
504	1.2	The neighbourhood plan will form part of the statutory development plan so you could be more robust in how you refer to its use	The purpose of the Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan (BcS NP) will be to make planning policies that can will be used to determine planning applications in the area.	Amend to say "will be used in determining"
504	1.3 and 1.7	The plan does not become part of the development plan automatically once it passes referendum, the local planning authority has to take a formal council decision to 'make' the plan. There is a step missing here.	Para 1.3 Once approved at a referendum, and 'made' by the district council , the Neighbourhood Plan becomes a statutory part of the development plan for the area and will carry significant weight in how planning applications are decided Para 1.7 If a simple majority of the turnout votes for the Plan, and the District Council takes a decision to 'make' (adopt) the plan then it becomes adopted ('made') as part of the formal planning policy for the area.	Amend as suggested for para 1.3. For 1.7, amend to say "it will become adopted..." as WDC has no discretion on whether to adopt once it has been passed at the referendum.
504	1.5	Slightly inaccurate description of one of the basic conditions. For more information see http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/neighbourhood-planning/the-basicconditions-that-a-draft-neighbourhood-plan-or-order-must-meet-if-it-is-to-proceed-toreferendum/eu-obligations/	Is the plan compatible with European Union obligations on environmental impacts? Has the process of making of the plan met the requirements of the European environmental standards?	Amend as suggested
504	1.11	The Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is outside but near to the boundary of the neighbourhood area (it covers Bradenham Beeches, Park Wood and The Coppice, and Naphill Common). The effects of the plan proposals on the SAC should be assessed and reported on for completeness. Natural England advised you that impact on the AONB and SAC were the main issues, but the SAC is not addressed	Add a new paragraph after 1.11 regarding the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation. Explain whether an Appropriate Assessment (AA) is required for the neighbourhood plan (for example, do you consider that AA requirement has been already covered in a higher level WDC assessment?).	Whether an 'Appropriate Assessment' is necessary is a decision for WDC. This need should be identified within the SEA Screening Report produced by WDC and as requested in the BcS NP SEA Screening Letter.
504	2.3	Chinnor is incorrectly referred to as a town, it is a village	Both towns settlements (and in particular Princes Risborough where the current plan suggests 2,500 new houses, representing an increase of 70% in the town's population) are currently the subject of development plans which would see their respective geographical footprints and populations grow significantly.	Amend as suggested
504	2.4 and 2.5	It would help to have further references for the statements like "There is a great deal of evidence of prehistoric activity in the parish, which has the largest concentration of Bronze Age barrows outside of Wessex"	Provide some references or footnotes to the historical information	No need to amend the plan as there is sufficient detail for what is a general description of the area.
504	2.7	This para is rather awkwardly expressed, open space has a different meaning from undeveloped land	Historic maps show that over the last 150 years the parish has maintained a majority of the open spaces remained largely as undeveloped countryside which are now forms part of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and has have only slightly changed little over the years.	Amend as suggested

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

504	2.8	This is a bit confusing, domestic extensions are not normally described as housing development.	During the period 2006-2015 domestic extensions were by far the most common form of housing development which took place in the parish.	Amend as suggested
504	2.8	Could usefully refer to Molins site here	At the same time the parish has few non-agricultural employment sites and has experienced a pattern of continuing loss of light industrial and small businesses units over the last 30 – 40 years, and the closure and sale of the tobacco machinery business at Molins, the biggest employment site in the parish.	Amend as suggested
504	2.10	The list of which landscape character areas fall within the parish is a bit meaningless without further information.	<p>i) Add a map of the landscape character areas</p> <p>ii) Change text to: Large parts of the parish are included in the The Parish contains several different following Landscape Character Areas, which individually and collectively define many of the help describe key characteristics of the land and parish identify its relative sensitivity to future change: (List as before) plus add some key words summarising their features. The Chilterns Historic Landscape Characterisation Project is also of relevance since the predominant landscape character areas here 17.1 (Bledlow Ridge dipslope with dry valleys) and 13.4 (Wye - Chalk River Valley) contain a series of historic landscape features in addition to archaeology (co-axial elongated field patterns and assart fields following woodland clearance).</p> <p>iii) Add footnotes and hyperlinks to http://www.buckscc.gov.uk/environment/heritage-ecology/landscape/buckinghamshire-landscapecharacter-assessment/wycombe-district-landscape-character-assessment/ And to The Making of the Chilterns Landscape - Chilterns Historic Landscape Characterisation Project http://www.chilternsaonb.org/uploads/files/AboutTheChilterns/HistoricEnvironment/The_Making_of_the_Chilterns_Landscape.pdf</p>	<p>(i) The maps are referenced in Appendix A and may be accessed via a link. It is not felt necessary to include the maps themselves in the Plan.</p> <p>(ii) Amend the introduction as suggested. At the end of 2.10 add the words "The Chilterns Historic Landscape Characterisation Project is also of relevance since the predominant landscape character areas include the Bledlow Ridge dipslope with dry valleys and the Wye - Chalk River Valley.</p> <p>(iii) Add hyperlinks to Appendix A.</p>

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

504	3.12	The paragraph on the Chilterns AONB is brief and should explain its purpose and status, and statutory duties towards it	Over half of the neighbourhood area (south of the Midshires Way and south of the Icknield Way) falls within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and the area that is not designated AONB forms part of the setting of the Chilterns AONB. The Chilterns AONB covers a significant proportion of the south of the parish and the As a protected landscape, with equal planning status to National Parks, government policy in NPPF paragraphs 115 and 116 is that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and that planning applications for major development should be refused except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. The Chilterns AONB Management Plan 2014 – 2019 is a material consideration for all applications within, or within the setting of the AONB. Public bodies, including the Parish Council and District Council, have a statutory duty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000* to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty. *add footnote and hyperlink to http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2000/37/section/85	Amend as suggested other than "(south of the Midshire Way....)" which does not add substance. Add footnote to Appendix A
504	4.4	Sentence doesn't make sense, possible typo?	The evidence collected (a Survey Report and a Feedback Report are available on the BcS PC website) shows that residents are used to, cherish and want to protect the Chilterns AONB, the natural beauty of the parish, the open countryside, the Green Belt areas, the woods and the extensive views.	Amend as suggested
504	4.5	Add 'land' to improve readability	Support is greater for new housing development to take place on brownfield land or within settlements...	Amend as suggested
504	4.6	Improve readability	A large number of residents recognise and is are concerned	Amend as suggested
504	Policy 1	Is publicly accessible open space the only exception to supporting development proposals within settlement boundaries? Could consider add other elements which you might want to conserve. Refer here to policies for the AONB and Green Belt as well as open countryside.	Proposals for development within these boundaries will be supported, provided they do not result in the loss of publicly-accessible open space an important local open space of public, environmental or ecological value and they accord with other provisions of the Plan and the Wycombe Development Plan. Development proposals outside the Settlement Boundaries will be required to conform to the provisions of the Plan and the Wycombe Development Plan in respect of the control of development in the open countryside, and where applicable, the Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Amend as suggested
504	5.29	The final sentence refers to the 'character of the Green Belt' which conveys a misunderstanding the purpose of the Green Belt (see NPPF paras 79 and 80) which is not land of any intrinsic merit in terms of character	The built up nature of the settlement may allow for limited infill and for sensitive redevelopment without undermining the essential character of the Green Belt openness of the Green Belt or the special qualities of the AONB.	Amend as suggested

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

504	Policy 2	Policy is confusing without 'or' between ii and iii	ii. is a single dwelling with no more than 4 bedrooms; or iii. is two or more dwellings at least half of which have either 2 or 3 bedrooms;	Amend to put (ii) and (iii) together under a single bullet separated by "or"
504	Policy 3	The Chilterns Conservation Board welcomes the general policy approach; we would not favour the whole former Molins site being developed for housing and would support mixed use. An extra care community or retirement village plus employment uses would present many advantages (provided that the built form is not too bulky). It is necessary to restrict the number of dwellings proposed to prevent an urban form of development wholly out of context with the area. Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment is essential to test the impacts of the redevelopment of this significant site in the AONB. Add instructions in a footnote specifying the required measuring practice. Be clear and consistent in the terminology. Impact is not just about footprint and area. Heights, colour, materials, lighting, traffic generation, planting and design all matter. 'Scope' is also referred to in 5.41. Plan F then uses the work 'greater'. Check for consistency.	Suggested new text: Design - landscape / LVIA and density considerations influence the delivery of an indicative threshold figure of 15,000 sq m which could be lower but would only be increased exceptionally. Add a footnote: For measuring floorspace, use gross external area consistent with RICS Code of measuring practice.	We do not support developments in excess of 15,000sqm. Developments smaller than that are expressly permitted by the policy.
504	Policy 4	The Board welcomes the references to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and its daughter documents. Why is there no equivalent design management approach for other areas of the Parish, why just Bledlow Village, Pitch Green and Bledlow Ridge? The important views on the policies map seem weakly defined (it is worth learning the lessons of the Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Plan – see examiners' report http://static1.squarespace.com/static/51cd9f71e4b07cb3e8543c97/t/56bc992d60b5e945bd7c73e8/1455200558454/Henley+and+Harpsden+Examiner%27s+Report+%28002%29+-+Nov+2015.pdf pages 37 and 38)	Consider design management approach for the other settlements in the parish. Bolster the important views work	See policy 6 for design management in the parish. No need to amend the plan
504	Policy 5	Add references to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and its daughter documents as in Policy 4.	Add references to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and its daughter documents as in Policy 4.	No amendment because it is felt that policy 6 adequately restricts development that is inappropriate in the AONB.
504	5.47	Could refer to development conserving and enhancing the AONB	development will have a minimal impact on the environment of conserve and enhance the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.	Amend as suggested
504	5.48	Correct reference to the documents	a refinement of the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and policies contained in the Chilterns AONB Management Plan	Amended as suggested. Do global check for "Buildings" instead of "Building"
504	Policy 7	Unclear why the policy is excluding some elements of buildings from calculations for Green Belt extensions and encouraging link buildings. Policy fails to consider AONB impacts of these provisions.	Amend to address AONB impacts as well as Green Belt	This is a Green Belt policy only and therefore the reference to AONB in para 5.50 should be removed.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

504	Policy 8	It is unclear why this policy on rural diversification contains a provision for new dwellings in the countryside. It is more permissive than paragraph 55 of the NPPF and ignores most of the parish being in either nationally protected landscape or the Green Belt. It is also inconsistent with the NP policy 1.	Delete: Proposals for housing development in the countryside will only be granted in exceptional circumstances and where the design and siting are in harmony with the landscape. Any new dwelling required to serve the essential uses of agriculture, forestry or some other special need shall be sited within or immediately adjacent to an existing group of dwellings or on a previously developed site suitably located to serve the purpose, unless it can be shown that there are overriding reasons why it must be built elsewhere	The provision for new dwellings to serve the essential uses is in line with (not more permissive than) para 55 of the NPPF and reflects policies D5, D6, D7 of the CAONB Management Plan 2014 – 2019. Amend paragraph to read "The re-use of an existing building in the countryside will be supported provided that it will enable enterprise, farm diversification or recreation that benefits the rural economy without harming the open character of the landscape. Proposals for housing development in the countryside will only be granted in exceptional circumstances where such dwelling is (i) required to serve the essential uses of agriculture, forestry or some other special need, (ii) in terms of its design and siting in harmony with the landscape and (iii) sited within or immediately adjacent to an existing group of dwellings or on a previously developed site suitably located to serve the purpose, unless it can be shown that there are overriding reasons why it must be built elsewhere. The re-use and development of any such housing must also be in accordance with all other planning policies applicable to that location, including but not limited to policies applying within the Green Belt".
504	Policy 9	Policy encourages employment with no caveats about design, loss of important spaces or AONB impact.	Add caveats about design, loss of important spaces or AONB impact	Add new bullet (v) Provided they comply with all other applicable local and Plan policies.
504	Policy 10	Policy does not match the national policy for the AONB or deliver the degree of protection and significance accorded to the AONB in local community consultation. The policy fails to establish the appropriate hierarchy of nature conservation designations, asking that developers merely 'seek to avoid any material adverse effects' on AONBs and SSSIs, while 'ensuring the protection of' undesignated local assets like mature trees, hedgerows etc	Development proposals must conserve and enhance seek to avoid having any material adverse effects on designated environmental and landscape assets, especially the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Lodge Hill and Butler's Hangings SSSIs. Where such effects are unavoidable then the proposals must show how these effects will be mitigated. Or better still, insert a dedicated policy on the Chilterns AONB and its setting, following the draft model policy developed by the Chilterns Conservation Board	Amend as suggested in first paragraph. The only major development likely to come forward in the Parish is Molins which is adequately covered. Were other major development come forward then NPPF Policy 116 would apply. Accordingly there is no need to adopt the new policy wording.
504	5.97	Add reference to the CCB Position Statement on Renewable Energy	Add reference to ensuring renewable energy installations are appropriate to the AONB and its setting, for further guidance see Chilterns Conservation Boards Position statement: renewable energy.	The reference to appropriateness is already included in the policy. The reference to the position statement is included in Appendix A so no change is needed.
504	6.11	Rather than (or as well as) the Dorset AONB Partnership 2011, Traffic in Villages – Safety and Civility for Rural Roads; A toolkit for communities the plan should reference the Chilterns AONB document Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Highways in the Chilterns (pdf 3Mb) Guidelines for the design and management of roads in the Chilterns	Add reference to Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Highways in the Chilterns	Amend as suggested.
504	Appendix A Schedule of Evidence	The Chilterns Conservation Board welcomes the inclusion of the AONB documents, thank you	N/A	No change needed.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

504	Inset maps 2,3,4 and 5	<p>The inset maps appear to be creating new designations for which there is no statutory basis. Lack of well justified policies to support them.</p> <p>For instance, what are: <input type="checkbox"/> Important groups <input type="checkbox"/> Important/ listed buildings (just include listed buildings or those locally listed?) <input type="checkbox"/> Important open space (is this a Local Green Space designation?) <input type="checkbox"/> Important hedges <input type="checkbox"/> Important groups of trees (are these subject to a TPO?)</p> <p>The inset maps will become part of the adopted policies map, searchable in the land charges system, and identified features need to be of that status. Where these features are not of that status, instead make some of these background evidence or part of a local character assessment?</p>	Reconsider the approach to local features shown on the inset maps	Amend Inset maps to include proposed settlement boundaries only. Move the settlement character appraisal maps and insert into the Design Statements in Appendix B and C of the Plan
504	Is there anything missing?	Add the model policy for the AONB (see comment re policy 10)		We feel that the areas covered by the model policy are adequately covered elsewhere.
505	General Comments	<p>New development should be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012, states: “Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver:.....the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater....”</p> <p>Paragraph 162 of the NPPF relates to infrastructure and states: “Local planning authorities should work with other authorities to: assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater and its treatment.....take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.”</p> <p>The web based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) published in March 2014 includes a section on ‘water supply, wastewater and water quality’ and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this section also sets out that: “Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development” (Paragraph: 001, Reference ID: 34-001-20140306).</p>		Noted

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

505	Specific Comments	<p>Omission of a 'Infrastructure and Utilities' Policy</p> <p>With the above points in mind it is important that developers demonstrate that at their development location adequate capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users.</p> <p>Given the possible scale of development in Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Thames Water consider that there should be a section on 'Infrastructure and Utilities' in the Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan. Alternatively the adopted Wycombe Core Strategy (2008) contains a strong policy on infrastructure in Policy CS20(8). Thames Water would request that this policy is listed in paragraph 3.8 as a policy that is specific to the BcS NP area.</p> <p>Should a specific section on 'Infrastructure and Utilities' be the preferred route, then the section should make reference to the following: ...</p>	<p>Example Policy</p> <p>By way of an example of a strong section/policy, the Marsh Gibbon Neighbourhood Plan (located within the Local Authority of Aylesbury Vale) Section H on Infrastructure and Policy MG20 is the type of policy Thames Water would like to see adopted</p>	<p>With the exception of the Molins development, there are no plans for major development in the parish. Looking at the nature of the parish as a whole it is not felt that a policy is needed at a parish level and this should be dealt with at a district level. However, we agree to add a reference in paragraph 3.8 to Policy CS20.</p>
506		<p><u>Habitats Regulations Assessment under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (As amended)</u></p> <p>In light of Natural England's letter dated 23 March 2016 which refers to the need to consider the Chilterns Beechwood SAC in proximity of the plan area, and provided you haven't addressed this already, you may want to go back to Natural England to clarify the need for a Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening of the plan. Wycombe District Council will publish a draft HRA screening report of the Local Plan very shortly, which you may want to look at to inform any screening report that might need to be undertaken.</p>		<p>Whether an 'Appropriate Assessment' is necessary is a decision by WDC. This need should be identified within the SEA Screening Report produced by WDC and as requested in the BcS NP SEA Screening Letter.</p>
506	Policy 1a and Policy 2	<p>Our initial view is that the extent and definition of settlement boundaries can be a matter for the neighbourhood plan, provided that it satisfies national policies and that the Neighbourhood Forum is satisfied that the policies in relation to settlement boundary changes achieve the aims of sustainable development, and that the scale of development that is likely to result is sustainable, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>The NPPF allows infilling in villages in the Green Belt but not necessarily more extensive development (see NPPF para 89) – I suggest you split the policies to set out approach for villages outside the Green Belt and those within.</p> <p>Ultimately, you need to be satisfied that the extent of development allowed by policy 1 and 2 is within the scope of the NPPF, and you need to ensure that you are satisfied that the scale of development implied by the policy is sustainable, having regard to the scale and sustainability of each settlement.</p>		<p>We have reviewed this proposal extensively and have reviewed those paragraphs that would apply to the green belt and those which would not. We have determined that the majority of the clauses apply equally within and outside the green belt, and that the objective of promoting the character and openness of the parish are best served with a single policy. We have determined the settlements that are sustainable within our rural parish and the methodology to be applied in determining existing settlements. This methodology applies equally within and outside the GB. We note that the concept of "limited infill" in the NPPF is specifically mentioned in the context of the green belt and we will therefore add an additional sub-paragraph in Policy 2 referring to this requirement for green belt development.</p>

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

506	Policy 3	<p>It is the Council position that only Option 1 should be supported. We have received clear Counsel advice that the starting point for considering the impact on openness for redevelopment must be the current built form on the site, not previous buildings which have since been demolished.</p> <p>We of course want to continue working with the Neighbourhood Plan steering group, particularly as there are other elements of the Neighbourhood Plan which are not specific to the Molins site, however it is important that all parties are working together to reach a successful outcome for the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Ultimately it is for the Neighbourhood Plan steering group to decide on the appropriate way forward.</p>		Noted. For reasons previously discussed the Plan has to cover both options depending on the outcome of the appeal.. No amendment needed.
506	Policy 7	Wycombe District Council is satisfied with the way the policy has been reworded prior to the consultation as a result of the meeting held on 19/05/16.		No amendment to plan
506	Policy 8	Wycombe District Council is satisfied with the thrust of this policy. However, different policy considerations would apply depending on whether development is in the Green Belt or in the countryside beyond the Green Belt, and this should be reflected in an amended policy and supporting text. You may want to see if this is adding to or contradicting the emerging policies DM 43 and DM45 in the draft New Local Plan.		The provision for new dwellings to serve the essential uses is in line with (not more permissive than) para 55 of the NPPF and reflects policies D5, D6, D7 of the CAONB Management Plan 2014 – 2019. Amend paragraph to read "The re-use of an existing building in the countryside will be supported provided that It will enable enterprise, farm diversification or recreation that benefits the rural economy without harming the open character of the landscape. Proposals for housing development in the countryside will only be granted in exceptional circumstances where such dwelling is (i) required to serve the essential uses of agriculture, forestry or some other special need, (ii) in terms of its design and siting in harmony with the landscape and (iii) sited within or immediately adjacent to an existing group of dwellings or on a previously developed site suitably located to serve the purpose, unless it can be shown that there are overriding reasons why it must be built elsewhere. The re-use and development of any such housing must also be in accordance with all other planning policies applicable to that location, including but not limited to policies applying within the Green Belt".
506	Policy 10	We would recommend removal of this policy and supporting text, as the matters dealt with this policy are covered in existing Development Plan policies (in particular policy L1 of the adopted Local Plan, policies DM12, DM13, DM14 and DM16 in the adopted Delivery and Site Allocations Plan – DSA) and Policy DM31 of the emerging Local Plan.)		Because of the nature of the parish we feel it is necessary to include a policy addressing environmental issues.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

506	Policy 11	You will need to consider whether this is consistent with current and emerging Local Plan policies on extensions in the Green Belt. You might want to explain this in the supporting text.		Add the following text to policy: "...in design terms, will not harm the amenities of the adjoining residential properties – and insert...and in all other respects accords with the development plan."
506	Policy 12	<p>Page 6 of WDC's adopted Planning Obligations SPD (2013) (https://www.wycombe.gov.uk/uploads/public/documents/Planning-Obligations-SPD-2.pdf) sets out the interaction between CIL and Planning Obligations. The introduction of CIL has scaled back the use of S106 planning obligations – no more than 5 separate planning obligations can be used to fund a specific project. This is set down in the CIL regulations.</p> <p>The requirement in Policy 12 that "Developer contributions will be sought in order to contribute towards the school's expansion from developments in the parish and subject to assessment of viability" is not appropriate for a number of reasons:</p> <p>In order to secure a planning obligation it must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms - Directly related to the development; and - Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development <p>As there is no firm proposal to expand the school at the time and with some acknowledged spare capacity before an expansion is required, a S106 contribution to a school expansion that may or may not take place would not be necessary to make a development acceptable.</p>		<p>Amend second paragraph to read ""Any proposals to extend the school should include a plan to promote sustainable travel measures to support an increase in the size of the school population and to minimise the volume of vehicle traffic to and from the school."</p> <p>Delete final paragraph talking about developer contributions</p>
506	Policy 13	Most of the policy is fine apart the final paragraph requiring developer contributions. Reference to developer contributions to broadband infrastructure is not practical for similar reasons as set out above for policy 12. Such infrastructure is more appropriately secured through CIL and reference to developer contributions should be removed from the Policy.		Delete final paragraph talking about developer contributions
506	Foreword	The NDP will become part of the Development Plan, not the Local Plan	Correct wording	Amend as suggested

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

506	Glossary (and elsewhere)	Reference to the HEDNA is out of date – see Buckinghamshire HEDNA January 2016 on WDC website: https://www.wycombe.gov.uk/pages/Planning-and-building-control/New-local-plan/New-local-plan-supporting-evidence.aspx	Correct reference and findings	Amend as suggested
506	Glossary	Reference to Special Area of Conservations could be added	Addition	SAC is not referred to anywhere else in the Plan and therefore no amendment needed.
506	1.5	para 1.5 could be clarified by referring to the full basic conditions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as per the legislation: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/pdfs/ukpga_20110020_en.pdf • and as per the PPG: http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/neighbourhood-planning/the-basic-conditions-that-a-draft-neighbourhood-plan-or-order-must-meet-if-it-is-to-proceed-to-referendum/ 	Amendment	Amend as suggested
506	1.11	Depending on Natural England’s advice with regards to the need for an HRA screening of the Plan due to the proximity of the Chilterns Beechwoods SAC, this paragraph would need to be amended to refer to the Habitats Regulations Assessment under The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (As amended)	Potential amendment	New text inserted at para 1.11 to confirm Natural England's assessment
506	2.3	It could be helpful from a reader perspective to add "High" before "Wycombe"	Addition	Amend as suggested
506	2.8	It could be helpful from a reader perspective to add "housing" before "extensions"	Addition	Amend as suggested
506	2.10	It could be helpful from a reader perspective to add link to Landscape Character Assessments on WDC website https://www.wycombe.gov.uk/import/council-services/planning-and-buildings/Planning-guidance.aspx	Addition	Already included in Appendix A
506	3.1	It could be helpful from a reader perspective to spell out WDC in full	Change	Already included in the Glossary
506	3.2	This section could also refer to the National Planning Practice Guidance	Addition	Amend as suggested
506	3.3	It could be helpful from a reader perspective to add “,as the planning authority,” after “Wycombe District Council”	Addition	Amend as suggested

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

506	3.4	<p>o correct title of the Local Plan is : Wycombe District Local Plan (as saved and extended (2007) and replaced by the adopted Core Strategy July 2008 and delivery and site allocations plan July 2013)</p> <p>o Full title of the DSA: Delivery and Site Allocations Plan for Town Centres and Managing Development (2013)</p> <p>o Also part of the development Plan: Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (2004-2016 - part retained)</p>	Rectification / omission	Amend as suggested
506	3.5	The end of the plan period is 2033, not 2031	Correction	Amend as suggested
506	3.5	It could be helpful from a reader perspective to add a footnote after delivery and site allocations plan saying the following “with the exception of policies with regards to flood risk, and with regards to requirements in terms of water efficiency and energy”	Clarification	Amend as suggested
506	3.5	where it says “will set out” you might want to add “strategic policies for the District” before “individual site proposals” , as the emerging Wycombe Local Plan will provide the strategic framework for the District’s development, as well as detailed sites and management policies.	Addition	Amend as suggested
506	3.7 and 3.8	3.7 and following para – it is our view that this section may benefit from clarification – the consolidated local plan is the 2004 local plan as amended by the core strategy and the DSA – all the policies referred to in para 3.8 are from the 2004 LP. Therefore at 3.7 you may want to include the 2004 LP as a key document part of the development framework, and at 3.8 you may want to add the relevant policies of the Core Strategy (e.g. Green Belt) and DSA (e.g. biodiversity in new developments).	Clarification	Amend paras 3.7 and 3.8 as suggested and cross reference to para 3.4 which sets out the components of the Wycombe District Development Plan
506	3.8	Policy L2 – the criteria on AAL does not apply in the neighbourhood area – we suggest to remove this reference.	Deletion	Amend as suggested
506	3.12	It could be helpful from a reader perspective to spell out AONB in full	Clarification	In the glossary. No amendment needed
506	5.58	You may wish to add reference to the Local Plan 2004 (as saved and extended (2007) and replaced by the adopted core strategy July 2008 and delivery and site allocations plan July 2013). This is the consolidated plan. Together with the CS and the DSA (and Bucks Minerals and Waste Plans) they form the Development Plan		Para 5.8 - Simplify by referencing paragraph 3.4 and deleting specific references.
506	5.13	para 5.13 should be expanded upon to reflect that other rules apply where the land outside of the settlement is Green Belt or AONB or both.	Clarification	Add wording “, and in particular policies within the Green Belt and AONB where applicable.”
506	Policy 2	Policy wording: Criterion i. should be removed – this is achieved by policy 1.	Deletion to policy wording	It is not spelled out in Policy 1 and is needed. Policy 2 is a reasonable place to include this statement.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

506	5.33	It could be helpful from a reader perspective to add reference to where the quote comes from in a footnote.	Clarification	Amend to add "(see BcSNP Housing Development Report)"
506	Molins Policy	<p><i>The following comments are made without prejudice for the purpose of clarifying policy wording, and separately from the main comments made on the Molins policy earlier in this letter, which still stand :</i></p> <p>Policy wording</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There could be an “or” between points 1. and 2. to clarify that these are two potential scenarios – this also could be clarified in the supporting text. • Question: the figure of 15000 square meters gross floor area: where does it come from, what does it look like? • 2. I presume these are all “and” criteria? – add “and” as appropriate. 2 (i) : it could be helpful to give an indication of scale of the retirement village • 2(i) – clarification should be given in relation to the evidence for the need for one or more community facilities, and the types of facilities. This could be explained in the supporting text. • 2. (iii) as policy GB9 will not be replaced in the Wycombe new local plan it is advised to add that the developable area in scenario 2 is as defined by Inset Map 1 and by GB9 – this will ensure that when GB9 is deleted, the area as set out in option 2 is still defined by the map in the emerging, or adopted, NDP. • (iv) – it is not believed that the paragraph is needed, and we would recommend to delete it; but if it is kept, we would suggest to add “in particular” after development plan (as the list isn’t exhaustive) – also, Chilterns with an “s”, not Chiltern. • (v) to clarify the policy position it is suggested for the first sentence to be deleted and replaced with “The development will be required to provide:” • (v) This is valid elsewhere in the plan but here in particular as it is a long list: for ease of reference, you may want to replace bullet points by a) b) c) etc. • (v) –4th bullet point: reference to “previous development” – to ensure correct interpretation of the policy when making decisions on any planning application, the policy should clarify which previous development is referred to here. 	Clarifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There could be an “or” between points 1. and 2. to clarify that these are two potential scenarios - Agreed. • Question: the figure of 15000 square meters gross floor area: where does it come from, what does it look like? - Amend supporting text to explain where this number came from • 2. Add “and” as appropriate. 2 (i) Add “each of” in introductory wording. We are reluctant to indicate the size of the retirement village because it will depend on the mix, area of development, availability of funding and other issues. We will amend supporting text to highlight the importance of employment generating uses. • 2(i) add text providing the evidence, which includes the results of the survey. Note that the PC has been campaigning for a children's playground in the South Saunderton Area for some time. • 2. (iii) agreed • (iv) – agreed. Delete • (v) agreed • (v) agreed • (v) –4th bullet point - agreed.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

506	5.40	To clarify this paragraph it is suggested that a full stop is added after development plan. Then the following text could be amended as this: "A decision was made by Wycombe District Council" instead of "and the decision by WDC"	Addition	Amend as suggested.
506	Policy 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To make it clear that the policy applies to all areas in the Parish with the exceptions of those covered by policies 4 and 5, it is suggested that the policy title is changed to "Design Management in the rest of the Parish" policy wording - third bullet point – you may wish to add "where possible" after boundary treatments – to make the criteria more realistic. Policy 6 fourth bullet point – you may wish to remove the second sentence which is a statement of opinion rather than a policy criterion. You could put it in the supporting text if you wish to keep it 	Amendment to policy	Amend to read "In addition to complying with Policies 4 and 5 (where applicable)..." Amend as suggested Delete "high and solid gates...in the countryside"
506	5.56	There seem to be a missing word – add "is" between "this" and "a complex area"	Addition	Amend as suggested
506	Policy 11	It is suggested to remove the word "unnecessary"	Deletion	Amend as suggested
506	Policy 12	The second paragraph in relation to the school travel plan is not a policy requirement – we advise to move this to the supporting text.	Deletion to policy wording	Amend second paragraph to read ""Any proposals to extend the school should include a plan to promote sustainable travel measures to support an increase in the size of the school population and to minimise the volume of vehicle traffic to and from the school." Delete final paragraph talking about developer contributions
506	Policy 14	Last bullet point – providing a transport assessment is perhaps not enough to make a developer address the traffic implications. I suggest the following rewording to strengthen the policy requirement: "any traffic implications can be addressed through a transport assessment."	Amendment to policy wording	Amend to read "any traffic implications can be addressed through a transport assessment."
506	6.8	This paragraph refers to the impact of the P RTP transport proposals and the need for close dialogue between the PC, WDC, BCC and TFB – however impact of potential relief road on Shootacre lane is not mentioned and should be referred to as well.		Amend as suggested
506	6.15	National not Nation?	Typo	Amend as suggested
506	Keys for inset maps 2,3,4	What do you mean by "important groups"? is this explained elsewhere?	Clarification	Provide explanation in the the Design Statements. Insert character maps into each Design Statement

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

506	Appendices	There are several references to plans described as "Plan X" – we presume these references need updating.	Correction	Amend as suggested
506	Appendices	The plan should recognise the new BCC parking standards	Addition	Include reference in Evidence Base table
506	Sustainability Appraisal 3.6	The policies referred to in this para are in fact in the 2004 local plan – this section is also missing reference to the strategic policies in the Core Strategy and DSA	Correction	Paragraph 3.6 amended to cross reference with the Submission Plan
506	Sustainability Appraisal 3.6	Option 3 is now also put forward in the pre-submission version in policy 3 – Molins – this should be clearly referenced. You may also wish to clarify how the 2500 m2 reference has been derived.		SA Report amended as suggested and area clarified
506	Sustainability Appraisal 7.12	Option 2 and 3 here are option 3 and 2 at para 3.16 (I suggest change the text at para 3.16)	Correction	SA Report amended as suggested
506	Sustainability Appraisal 7.32	As we suggested to remove policy 10 and its supporting text, this should be reflected in the SA update	Deletion	No amendment to plan as policy 10 remains
506	Sustainability Appraisal 7.35	It appears that words are missing in last sentence?	Addition	Noted, but no correction necessary
507	General Comments	The plan identifies settlement boundaries for 4 areas either within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) or in its setting. Additionally the plan supports development of the Molins site, also within the AONB. We note that the policies have been informed by the Chilterns Management Plan and the Chilterns design Guide; we advise the Chilterns Conservation Board is also consulted for further advice with regards to this aspect. We welcome the inclusion of Policy 10, and that Policy 3 identifies the need for submission of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, and recognises the need to deliver green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancements		No amendment needed. CCB already consulted.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

508	Annex A	Flood Risk - this annex has confirmed that the Bledlow Neighbourhood Plan is not allocating sites within Flood Zones 2 or 3 and we support this. We are pleased to see that the proposed allocations have been directed to the areas at the lowest probability of flooding and that they are all located within Flood Zone 1. The Local Authority will be able to advise if there are areas at risk from surface water flood risk (including groundwater and sewerage flood risk) in your neighbourhood plan area. The Surface Water Management Plan will contain recommendations and actions about how such sites can help reduce the risk of flooding. This may be useful when developing policies or guidance for particular sites.		No amendment needed.
508	Annex A	Watercourses - this annex also confirms that the Bledlow Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing site allocations near the following watercourses, Kingsey Cuttle Brook, Ilmer Upper Ditch or The Lyde.		No amendment needed.
508	Policy 3	We are pleased to see and support the following text within Policy 3 Molins, South Saunderton: <i>"...nor infiltration into areas of contaminated land;"</i> and <i>"a contamination statement setting out how any contaminated and other ground condition issues will be addressed."</i>		Noted. No amendment needed.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

509	General Comments	<p>The proposal area reaches down to (our ref) NAJ2 21.0235 in the south and PRC 0.1139 in the eastern section.</p> <p>From the documents submitted it appears that the neighbourhood area includes within its boundary Network Rail land and the existing operational railway.</p> <p>In light of the above we would request that the Bledlow-Cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan group should contact Network Rail for any proposals within the area to ensure that:</p> <p>(a) Access points / rights of way belonging to Network Rail are not impacted by developments within the area.</p> <p>(b) That any proposal does not impact upon the railway infrastructure / Network Rail land e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage works / water features • Encroachment of land or air-space • Excavation works • Siting of structures/buildings less than 2m from the Network Rail boundary / Party Wall Act issues • Lighting impacting upon train drivers ability to perceive signals • Landscaping that could impact upon overhead lines or Network Rail boundary treatments • Any piling works • Any scaffolding works • Any public open spaces and proposals where minors and young children may be likely to use a site which could result in trespass upon the railway (which we would remind the council is a criminal offence under s55 British Transport Commission Act 1949) • Any use of crane or plant • Any fencing works • Any demolition works • Any hard standing areas • Any tunnels in the plan area <p>We would request that the Bledlow-Cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan authority / group when submitting proposals for a development contact Network Rail's Town Planning Team and include a location plan and a description of the works taking place for review and comment.</p>	<p>No specific proposals are being made within the plan which impact Network Rail. This appears to be a standard response</p>
-----	---------------------	---	---

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

509	General Comments	<p>Network Rail would draw the council's attention to the following (which applies to England only): The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 Publicity for applications for planning permission within 10 metres of relevant railway land 16.—(1) This article applies where the development to which the application relates is situated within 10 metres of relevant railway land. (2) The local planning authority must, except where paragraph (3) applies, publicise an application for planning permission by serving requisite notice on any infrastructure manager of relevant railway land. (3) Where an infrastructure manager has instructed the local planning authority in writing that they do not require notification in relation to a particular description of development, type of building operation or in relation to specified sites or geographical areas ("the instruction"), the local planning authority is not required to notify that infrastructure manager. (4) The infrastructure manager may withdraw the instruction at any time by notifying the local planning authority in writing. (5) In paragraph (2) "requisite notice" means a notice in the appropriate form as set out in Schedule 3 or in a form substantially to the same effect.</p> <p><u>Network Rail is now a statutory consultee for proposals within 10m of the</u></p>		Noted. No amendments required.
510	Policy 3	BCC is pleased to see the inclusion of a retirement village in Policy 3.		Noted. No amendment needed.
510	Policy 3, 2(ii)	BCC suggest an additional bullet point that would require the development to ensure safe and convenient pedestrian access to the existing bus stops on Wycombe Road to the north of the Haw Lane/Wycombe Road junction.		Our concern is that this would be interpreted as requiring a pavement under the railway bridge which would require a contraflow with traffic light. The evidence suggests that the community is already concerned about traffic flow and therefore we would not support this solution.
510	Policy 3, 2(v)	<p>The final bullet point states the following:</p> <p>"A transport strategy to demonstrate how the scheme will manage its traffic effects on the road network, with specific reference to not exceeding the capacity of Haw Lane, and how it will encourage and enable walking and cycling to Saunderton station and Bledlow Ridge."</p>	<p>It would be advisable to amend this to read the following:</p> <p>"A transport strategy to demonstrate how the scheme will manage its traffic effects on the road network, with specific reference to not exceeding the capacity of the Haw Lane/Wycombe Road junction (or ways to mitigate such an impact), and how it will encourage and enable walking and cycling to Saunderton station and Bledlow Ridge."</p>	Amend as suggested.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

510	Policy 6	<p>A bullet point pertaining to landscaping, boundary treatments and lighting of new or existing developments states the following:</p> <p>“Areas of residential parking and driveways should avoid the extensive use of modern surface treatments which represent a single visual and impermeable mass such as tarmac or concrete.”</p>	<p>It would be advisable to amend this to read the following (in order to avoid loose surface materials from being tracked onto the public highway):</p> <p>“Areas of residential parking and driveways should avoid the extensive use of modern and/or unbound surface treatments which represent a single visual and impermeable mass such as tarmac or concrete.”</p>	<p>Loose materials such as gravel are commonly used and not considered urban in form. No amendment needed.</p>
510	6.10 & 6.11	<p>Whilst it is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan proposes to gather empirical data pertaining to speeds on various roads within the Bledlow-cum-Saunderton area, it is unlikely that any future development within the parish will contribute to providing funds to conduct the surveys or any desired speed reduction measures other than those required to either review or mitigate the impact of the development itself.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Area 5 Speed Limit Review amended (primarily lowering) many speed limits in this area. To introduce lower speed limits or reduce existing ones further without substantial supporting evidence would not be supported by the Highway Authority.</p>		<p>Noted. Amend paragraph 6.10/6.11 to make it clear that this is subject to available funding and where evidence supports the action.</p>
510	Policy 12	<p>The local school Bledlow Ridge CE School has an admission number of 20 and is generally full in all seven year groups. The school does admit a few children from outside catchment although a similar number of local pupils choose to go to neighbouring schools. To recognise the complexities of parental preference, BCC plans provision at wider planning area level i.e. BCC considers growth proposals across the wider area when planning school provision although acknowledges the aspiration of parents for schools to serve their local population. Bledlow Ridge CE School is a popular and successful school so the moderate growth proposals would be expected to effectively displace any out area children over time (unless the school agreed to expand to meet growth across the wider area); BCC would then need to consider the impact of this change in pupil trend on other schools in the planning area. Projections show that over the next few years all schools in the planning area will be close to capacity, with most new development likely to be concentrated in Princes Risborough. To meet some of the impact of new development in the area, there is scope to expand neighbouring schools (e.g. Princes Risborough School) as well as Bledlow Ridge (from an admission number of 20 to 30). Based on BCC adopted pupil yield rates an increase in intake of 10 children, as this would be the next step up for Bledlow Ridge, would equate to around 200 homes. The plan does not allocate a specific number of homes but seeks to support relatively small scale development which it would seem is unlikely to generate sufficient local demand to warrant the school expanding i.e. if the school were to expand it would be to accommodate not just local demand but demand from the wider area.</p>		<p>Noted.</p>

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

510	Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report	<p>The main areas for potential development as featured within the Neighbourhood Plan area (subject to each proposal containing acceptable details or a mitigation strategy) are deemed as being served by acceptable sustainable transport options, either generally or within a local context:</p> <p>1) Pitch Green (No.320 peak hours commuter service) 2) South Saunderton (No.300 service and Saunderton railway station)</p> <p>Whilst Bledlow Ridge is located along the No.275 bus route, the times at which the service is available to residents are outside those where one would be able to effectively use it to commute to High Wycombe or Oxford. Also, it would take a significant level of development (more than that which could be reasonably accommodated in this area) to provide funding in order to evaluate and consider adding suitable respective peak time services.</p> <p>As for Bledlow itself, it is noted that it is served by the Risborough Area Community Bus. Nevertheless, and as was the case for the Barn Road development in Longwick and the Mill Road site in Monks Risborough, we would not be able to secure funding to augment this service as it is a community-run facility that does not fall under the administration of the County Council. As a result any further residential or employment facilities in this area beyond those that replace existing dwellings or facilities, or those viewed as small scale infill developments, may not be considered sustainable in a transport terms and therefore not in accordance with local and national policy/guidance.</p>		<p>The B4009 is accessible from Bledlow and there is an existing RAC bus. It is not clear why development at Pitch Green would be sustainable whilst development in (nearby) Bledlow would not. See para 6.12 which addresses transport issues. Para 28 of the NPPF establishes the terms by which neighbourhood plans can take a positive approach to supporting sustainable rural communities which is reflected in other policies in the neighbourhood plan. National Planning Guidance describes a sustainable rural community as “A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities” and the draft SA/SEA Report assesses this policy as generally positive.</p>
511	Whole plan	<p>Bradenham parish council has not been able to comment on your plan. We unfortunately only meet every 2 months and the holiday period has meant that the council was not able to give your plans due consideration. We wish you well and will do our best to engage with future developments.</p>		<p>Noted</p>

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

100	General Comments	The policies contained in the BcSNP will need to be modified in order to allow for a significant degree of flexibility. Such flexibility is paramount to allow for the delivery of future, sustainable growth opportunities to enable Wycombe District Council to achieve a deliverable, responsive and continuously rolling 5 year housing land supply.	We consider that the policy (as amended) includes a lot of flexibility within the parameters set by the consultation process, the priorities identified by the Parish and the guidelines set out in paragraph 58 of the NPPF.
100	Policy 3	<p>The owner considers that the BcSNP draft Policy 3(1) in its current form will effectively act as a constraint to the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities. The owner contends that draft Policy 3 as a whole is based on an ineffective and inflexible strategy which contains a number of mandatory land use requirements which is considered to be outside the remit of neighbourhood planning. The Policy is framed in such a way that it is rigid, inflexible and wholly capable of being unviable and not deliverable all of which conflicts with national policy.</p> <p>The lack of clarity contained in the policy also results in a failure to provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal to ensure that policies can be applied consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. Planning policies should therefore be concise, precise and supported by appropriate evidence base. As submitted, Policy 3 does not accord with the requirements of national planning policy and will not assist the Council in maintaining a flexible and continuously rolling 5 year housing land supply position.</p>	<p>The community has expressed a strong preference for a mixed development. The policy (as amended) will allow for such a development to proceed. The final mix will be determined at the application stage.</p> <p>5 year land supply is not a matter for the NP to address.</p> <p>We see no evidence to support the suggestion that a mixed development is not viable. We would refer to the supporting text for the Policy for evidence supporting the viability of the proposals.</p> <p>Regarding clarity, we consider that the policy, taken together with the indicative land use diagram provides plenty of clarity on the form that development could take.</p> <p>We have made some amendments increasing flexibility whilst balancing the comments made by St Congar with the feedback provided by other consultees.</p>
100	Policy 3 (1)	As held within the Woodcock decision (and as discussed in paragraph 3.11 above), a housing policy in a neighbourhood plan will not satisfy the basic condition to have regard to the NPPF, and in particular the need for flexibility and to plan positively for growth, if it sets a numerical cap on new housing. That point has particular force in the absence of a demonstrable 5 year housing land supply which is the case here. Whilst draft Policy 3(1) does not expressly impose a numerical cap on dwellings, its imposition of a restriction on the developable area within which the plan considers housing acceptable, would have an identical effect. It is recommended that this aspect of Policy 3 is deleted.	Policy 3(1) and 3(2) are in the alternative depending on the result of the planning appeal. It is not for the NP to judge the outcome of that appeal or to make decisions about how the NPPF should be interpreted.
100	Policy 3 (2)	the first part of this policy seeks to restrict development to 15000 sq.m However, there is no evidence or justification to limit development to this arbitrary level. The quantum of development acceptable on the Molins site should not be predetermined or pre judged for the reasons identified in Woodcock and set out in relation to Policy 3(1). In developing neighbourhood plans the NPPF at Paragraph 58 – 3rd bullet point, states that plans should "optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development". The draft policy conflicts with this criterion as it seeks to restrict and contain rather than optimise. This part of the policy should therefore be deleted.	We will add a paragraph in the supporting text explaining what the 15,000 sqm figure was based on.
100	Policy 3 (2) (i)	This part of the Policy sets out four mandatory land use components that any development 'must include'. Neighbourhood Plans need to be aspirational but also need to be realistic and deliverable. It is in no one's interest if a plan is prepared and is not deliverable. No account is taken of viability of such development and/or the evidential base to support the need case	Amend "must" to "shall". The final mix of uses will be a matter for the developer in any planning application. As stated above we see no evidence to suggest that development would not be viable.
100	Retirement Village	<p>The policy is constructed in such a way as to make the village/extra care a mandatory requirement which will effectively preclude the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities and therefore does not accord with the positive approach required by the Framework to deliver sustainable development to boost significantly the supply of housing.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.44 BcSNP refers to the Buckinghamshire Housing and Development Needs Assessment 2016 and that the demand for 'extra care' facilities is confirmed in the evidence base. Critically, paragraph 8.28 of the HEDNA states that it is important that the need for specialist older person housing is considered in partnership with other agencies in particular those responsible for older person support needs. This includes assessing the development viability of a scheme and the availability of revenue funding for care and support services for which the BcSNP is silent and lacks any credible evidence that the need on the Molins site and in this particular location has been subject to the level of assessment as prescribed in the evidence based.</p> <p>Policy 3 (2) (i) fails to have regard to national policy requirement for flexibility. We therefore recommend that (i) any development must comprise is deleted and replaced with 'the following land uses will be supported either as a combination of one or more of the listed land uses or as a stand-alone individual land use'.</p>	We consider that the policy allows for sustainable growth opportunities including a housing element. St Congar's suggestion merely opens the door for them to propose a 100% housing development proposal which is not supported by the community.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan
CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

100	Policy 3 (2) (ii)	Again this part of the policy makes the requirements of development a mandatory requirement. The principles of what is sought is supported by the Framework with regards heritage and sustainability both in terms of drainage infrastructure and promoting sustainable patterns of movement. The requirements in the Policy particularly for the pedestrian and cycle links are not in the control of ERLP 1 Sarl and deliverability of this component cannot be certain or relied upon. As an aspiration it is to be supported we therefore recommend that (i) 'development must include' is deleted and replaced with 'the following elements will be supported'. Inset map 1 should also be amended to make clear that the proposed ped/cycle connection to Saunderton Station as annotated on the Plan is an 'aspirational route'	Amend to make it clear that this obligation is conditional on relevant consents being available provided the developer has used best efforts to obtain such consents.
100	Policy 3 (2) (iii)	Reference to out of date saved Policy GB9 of Wycombe Local Plan 2004 to determine the extent of the developable area should be replaced with the guidance in the Framework with regards the definition of previously developed land.	Amend inset Map 1
100	Policy 3 (2) (iv)	adds nothing and it is not necessary to make such reference in the plan.	Agreed. Delete
100	Policy 3 (2) (v)	<p>Lists 10 bullet points of assessments required to support an outline planning application. This part of the policy seeks to impose a (mandatory) requirement of supporting information not proportional to the nature and scale of proposals that may come forward. This part of the policy also then seeks to add further constraints which either conflicts with other parts of the policy or with national policy</p> <p>With regards to the 3rd bullet point which requires the submission of a draft planning obligation "to include the means by which the delivery of all land use and infrastructure requirements of the policy, for which provision has been made in the masterplan, will be secured"; this requirement entirely ignores the (a) whether any such planning obligation is CIL Regulation 122 compliant; (b) may exceed the pooling restrictions in CIL Regulation 123; (c) whether infrastructure requirements are already included on a Regulation 23 List; and (d) viability issues</p> <p>With regards the 4th bullet point of Policy 3 (2) (v) i.e. demonstrate how a scheme will have no greater impact on the openness than the previous development contradicts with Policy 3 (2) which seeks to restrict development to 15,000 sqm, that being more than exists on the site at present. It is not clear to an applicant or to any future decision maker how this part of the Policy applies</p> <p>With regards the last bullet point whereby it states traffic 'not exceeding the capacity of Haw Lane'; this requirement appears to discount any mitigation measures capable of making the development acceptable in planning terms. As such it does not comply with the NPPF (Paragraph 32) which expressly states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.</p> <p>We recommend that Policy (3) 2(v) is deleted and that the information required is determined by national and local validation requirements and proportional to the nature and scale of proposals.</p>	<p>3rd bullet point - wording of the policy will be amended</p> <p>4th bullet point - agreed; policy to be amended.</p> <p>Last bullet point - wording of the policy will be amended.</p> <p>We do not agree with the recommendation to delete Policy (9) 2(v), which will remain in place with the above amendments</p>

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan
CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

100	<p>Additional Comments</p>	<p>Vision, Objectives & Land Use Policies</p> <p>Paragraph 5.7 of the BcSNP states that the purpose of the NP policies "is to either encourage planning applications to be made for things the local community wants to see happen or to discourage applications for developments that they do not want to happen". The Community's desire for type and scale of development cannot restrict development that would otherwise be acceptable with regard to relevant local and national planning policy (NPPF Paragraph 16): The application of the presumption will have implications for how communities engage in neighbourhood planning. Critically, it will mean that neighbourhoods should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● develop plans that support the strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing and economic development (my emphasis added). Both the out of date local plan and the evidence base for the emerging local plan, (objectively assessed housing need), recognise WDC's strategic need for additional housing land. 	<p>Whether the NP complies with the basic conditions will be determined at the examination stage. In principle NPs are community led documents.</p>
100	<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>ERLP 1 Sarl recognises the role of Neighbourhood Plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that the BcSNP must be consistent with national planning policy and the up-to-date strategic requirements of the wider local authority area.</p> <p>The Plan in its current form contains a series of flaws not only in its application of local and national policy with regards site specific Policy 3 - Molins but also the approach is inconsistent with the ethos of the Framework which seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing and the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>The recommended changes suggested in these representations would overcome the identified flaws and we encourage the Parish Council to accept those changes and engage in a collaborative manner with the owner.</p>	<p>See above for those changes which will be made to the existing plan.</p>

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Appendix L – Residents’ comments (Pre-Submission consultation)

Res #	Paragraph #	Comment	Alternative	Changes to Plan
1	6.10	<p>Could consideration please be given to adding Lee Road, Saunderton Lee to those roads where speed is of concern. The 40mph limit doesn't start until Cherry Trees Nursing Home when travelling east from the Wycombe direction down Lee Road so there is a long stretch of road which is designated 60mph/national speed limit which does have housing along it, and farmland entrances. It is just wide enough for 2 cars to pass at sensible speeds but also contains some "blind" corners, and where I am situated there is a small crossroads. Cars are legally allowed to travel at 60mph across this junction towards a 90 degree right hand bend.</p> <p>The housing and crossroads actually mirror Shootacre Lane which IS 40mph so it is difficult to understand why the 40mph limit couldn't be extended right along Lee Road to the A4010 too for safety of householders pulling out of drives, from the Golf Club, from farmland and also for the many cyclists and horseriders who use the lane.</p> <p>I know that the residents at Hightyme support this request.</p>	I don't think there is an alternative other than to consider reducing the speed limit.	Add an additional bullet to para 6.10 "At the junction between Upper Icknield Way and Lee Road, assess the need for a speed restriction on the approach to the zig-zag bend heading north."
2	5.22	<p>Although a resident of Chinnor Road (south west) I support the extension of the GB4 boundary to include the south west side of Chinnor Road for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I recognise that we will need more housing in the village over the coming years as population increases. This is generally conceded in the village survey. 2. The existing GB4 area is essentially full with further expansion limited. 3. Building in open countryside is not permitted. So there is nowhere else. 4. This is not HS2 - No existing residents of Chinnor Road South West will be forced to sell their land for development so the likelihood of rapid change is minimal. The village will continue to evolve. <p>It is therefore my reluctant conclusion that it is impossible to oppose the expansion of GB4 to the southwest side of Chinnor Road and still achieve the stated objective of permitting additional housing in the village's existing settlement area.</p> <p>Although a resident of Chinnor Road (south west) I support the extension of the GB4 boundary to include the south west side of Chinnor Road for the following reasons:</p>	It has been mentioned that the village hall could be relocated to Meadow Styles which would allow development on a central brownfield site within the existing GB4 boundary. It is also likely that within a number of years with the acknowledged expansion of Saunderton, Bledlow Ridge School may outgrow its current location and that land will become available for re-development. Whilst I do not think either of these are bad options, neither present a realistic prospect for new housing within the next few years and these problems need to be tackled now and not deferred to future generations, tempting though it may be to put off tough decisions.	The relocation of the village hall from its current location to a site at Meadow Styles would be done using the facility of a "Community right to build". We do not therefore need to amend the Plan to cover this.
2	5-30-5.36	I support the statements made in these paragraphs.		No need to amend the Plan
2	5.44	I broadly support the policy of extra care facilities in a retirement complex but as part of a mixed use scheme. I would oppose a retirement home in an area where there are no facilities, buses, shops etc and where the residents might become isolated.		There is no need to amend the Plan because Policy 3 would only allow the development of a retirement village as part of a mixed use scheme.
2	5.76	Protection of community facilities is essential vis a vis The Boot Pub in Bledlow Ridge.		Policy 11 already includes the Boot as a community facility and therefore no change is required.
2	Policy 12	I support these proposals.		No need to amend the Plan.
2	Whole NP	I commend the whole of the Neighbourhood Plan and broadly support the contents of the whole document which has been very well put together. The aim is for our Parish to have a say in how development on our doorstep might perhaps go ahead over the next generation and I think this is about the best way to accomplish the desired outcome.		No need to amend the Plan.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

3	Whole NP	I have no comments on changes or improvements to the plan – just wanted to say that the plan makes a lot of good sense, hangs together very well and clearly reflects a great deal of careful thought and hard work by a lot of people. Well done so far!		No need to amend the Plan.
4	Policy 3, 2(v)i	"At least two entrances to the site from Haw Lane" creates a remote development accessed from a narrow country road/bridleway/railway bridge which are unsuitable and dangerous for vehicles, pedestrians and animals.	Create one community for Saunderton with a safer direct link road plan so this development becomes integrated with village and share all facilities.	Creating a direct road link between Molins and South Saunderton is not feasible for a number of reasons including (i) the need to cross pieces of land not owned by the developer, (ii) existing housing would prevent an access being built and (iii) the cost would be prohibitive. Realistically the only access would be via Haw Lane as was previously the case when the site was being used by Molins. No amendment needed.
5	5.21/5.22	The proposed line seems to be inconsistent in favouring certain properties within the GB4 extension. i.e. from the rear of Studmore Farm farmyard it then cuts back on paddock land behind Yewden and Ridge Cottage, then out around paddock land of Capel Farm which used to be the caravan field. I am unaware of permission being granted for change of use from Agricultural to domestic. The line then continues along the boundaries of properties excluding the farmyard of Crofters Farm of which both Capel Farm and Crofters Farm were part of Pounds Scots and Miss McMorrans estate. The line then continues along the domestic cartilage apart from the back fields developments i.e. The Clock House, Windrush and one other neighbour. Then to the rear of the buildings of Tudor Farm Stud.	Attached is the plan as I would like to see it, to correct these anomalies. It is easier to view my proposal, in conjunction with your viewing it on Google earth/satellite where the boundary lines and buildings are much clearer. I also believe this also falls in line with policy C6, countryside and rural economy. Also GB5, GB6 and GB7.	Noted. The working group will review the boundaries and where appropriate make adjustments to address some of the concerns raised.
6	2.3	I suspect that for residents of the 'Saunderton Village' end of the Parish, High Wycombe is nearer than Chinnor, and definitely easier to get to by car or public transport.	Add High Wycombe to the list of 'nearest towns'	Amend para 2.3 to say "The nearest towns are Chinnor, Princes Risborough and High Wycombe....." with consequential changes to the remainder of the paragraph.
6	4.6	Small grammatical edit - 'A large number of residents recognise and is concerned...'	Should say 'A large number of residents recognise and are concerned...?'	Amend as suggested.
6	Policy 3, section 2.1	Section 2.1 is far too prescriptive and appears, as written to provide a choice between Retirement Village and Housing. I'm not sure whether this is just a matter of presentation or is a mechanism to force through the idea of a Retirement Village. The Retirement Village does have some support but I don't believe is universally supported. Personally I would rather see a growing community of economically active younger families/professionals rather than an older population.	Rather than 'must' use 'should' and insert 'and/or' at the end of each bullet point	The Parish survey and other feedback makes it clear that housing and other facilities for the elderly is a priority. Policy 3 is designed ensure that any development delivers a mixture of uses covering all the priorities that have been identified (including houses for younger families). Any policy will need to give a developer some flexibility in determining the exact mix of types of development, but a retirement village would only be part of that.
6	Policy 4	Re the bullet point below: "Traditional natural materials should be used for new or replacement windows and doors in the Bledlow Conservation Area in order to safeguard the special character of the Conservation Area. In the Settlement Areas painted timber windows and doors are more appropriate - the use of modern materials such as UPVC and aluminium must be considered with care to ensure that they are sympathetic to the character of the area" I am concerned that the use of 'modern' materials may be used as an opportunity for future planning applications to be declined based on personal taste. We should be supporting energy efficiency in ways that are affordable for all residents, even if that means some compromising of the street scene.	I'd remove this paragraph altogether - it's too prescriptive. The final bullet point should provide enough scope to manage inappropriate schemes	This statement is taken from the existing Bledlow Conservation Area design statement and is limited to the Conservation Area. So in effect, there is no change from the current position and therefore the paragraphs needs to remain.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

6	Policy 5	Re this bullet point: "The use of hipped roofs on all but the largest developments should be avoided. Half hipped roofs should be avoided. Why? How is this justified through evidence? This does sound like a question of taste/aesthetics rather than planning policy.	Remove the bullet point	The wording is a (slightly more relaxed) version of the Chiltern Building Design Guidelines and is the established standard for buildings in the Chilterns AONB. No change is required.
6	Highway Safety & Traffic Calming	We don't seem to have anything in the plan re 'Quiet Lanes' or similar to address the concerns of residents around the dangers presented by traffic speeds and HGVs on the many narrow lanes with 'National Speed Limits' - I believe that we had this in the Survey feedback.	Can we have a policy for this please?	The creation of new "Quiet Lanes" is currently not supported by Transport for Bucks and therefore not deliverable under the Plan. Separate representations would have to be made to Bucks CC if this policy was to be changed.
6	Anything of substance missing from the Plan?	The plan doesn't really do anything for or seem to have much relevance for residents living outside the designated 'Settlements'		The survey results suggest that residents do not wish to see a lot of new development outside settlement boundaries. As these areas are already well protected by existing planning rules (both national and local) there is no need for the Plan to add any more restrictive policies.
7	Whole NP	I support the Pre-Submission Version.		No need to amend the plan
8	5.22	We are opposed to the policy proposed in 5.22 for two main reasons: 1. It would be inappropriate to squeeze 2-3 bedroom houses into an area which is already populated with mature and attractive houses. There is the potential for overcrowding. 2. Any new development is highly likely to change the pastoral nature of the area which should be preserved.	There is ample opportunity to develop 2-3 bedroom properties on the Molins site which is currently the subject of planning discussions.	Policies 2, 5 and 6 specifically address the issue of what type of housing and what design will be considered appropriate. Any application will need to demonstrate, inter alia, that the size, location and design of a particular development is in keeping with the plot size and neighbouring properties. However, we will review the boundary lines to address concerns about inappropriate development.
9	5.22	Concerned that the development in extended GB4 area will result in the south side of Chinnor Road having a cramped appearance detrimental to the character of area if plots subdivided by width reduction.	Leave boundary as it is.	Policies 2, 5 and 6 specifically address the issue of what type of housing and what design will be considered appropriate. Any application will need to demonstrate, inter alia, that the size, location and design of a particular development is in keeping with the plot size and neighbouring properties. However, we will review the boundary lines to address concerns about inappropriate development.
9	Policy 3	Increase in no of dwellings on Molins site with no clear upgrading of infrastructure is not acceptable and upgrading should form part of proposed development plan.	Ensure adequate transport plan, including footpath along Haw Lane.	Policy 3 already includes a requirement for a transport strategy. No amendment needed
9	Appendix C	Reference to Old Rectory and associated Rectory cottages is in error.	Correct designation is The Old Vicarage, Old Vicarage Cottage and Vicarage Cottage.	Amend plan with correct designations

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

10	5.22	I reside in Kiln Cottage, one of the houses in the protected GB2 area and listed as being a building of note in the plan (as the property dates back to the eighteenth century). I would therefore strongly object to any new construction (likely to take place in the case of any extension of the boundary area) which would by its nature not be in keeping with existing properties in the GB2 area. Generally speaking the properties on the South West side of the road are significantly older and are an integral part of the history and character of the village.	N/A	Policies 2, 5 and 6 specifically address the issue of what type of housing and what design will be considered appropriate. Any application will need to demonstrate, inter alia, that the size, location and design of a particular development is in keeping with the plot size and neighbouring properties. However, we will review the boundary lines to address concerns about inappropriate development.
10	5.22	The South West area is unique in its aspect, positioning and provision of stunning views across to Stokenchurch and Radnage. I therefore feel that this vista should be protected as far as possible, in order to retain the essence of the Ridge landscape. Any new development would also impact negatively on the views across to Bledlow Ridge from these areas.	N/A	Policies 2 and 5 recognise and seek to protect special views and preserve the essential open character of the Parish.
10	5.22	Whilst I fully support the construction of new dwellings within the village which are in keeping with its character, and recognise the importance of new builds in regenerating the area, I feel that there are more appropriate parts of the village which could be used for this purpose.	The site of the old Molins factory is a brown belt area and consequently far better suited to the purpose of development. I would particularly support Wycombe District Council's proposal of 25 small (c1000 sq ft) houses and/or the Neighbourhood Plan proposal for a mixed use development as an alternative.	We do not know what type of development (if any) will occur at the Molins site. In any event the Plan needs to provide for limited development opportunities across the Parish in all wards and within existing settlement areas.
11		Views on the proposed Chinnor Road Inner Core Settlement area and others. In short, I agree with the majority of the current Chinnor Road Inner Core Settlement area (dark blue on the map) with the exception of the area west of the Meadow Styles playing area and The City. I do not agree with the proposed south western Chinnor Road Outer Core Settlement area (teal) nor any of the Chinnor Road Periphery Settlement area (pale blue) due to the resulting extension of more compressed development or apparent 'urbanisation'.	The north west western Chinnor Road Outer Core Settlement area (teal) would be acceptable so long as consideration is given to preventing the Chinnor Road building being too close to the road. A clear view of The Boot approaching from Chinnor (however ugly the building) enhances the entrance to the village proper.	Noted, although the areas where the resident has objected have already either wholly or partly been removed from the proposed GB4 extension.
12	5.22	I object to the proposed changes in the planning status of the South West side of Chinnor Road, as in my view any new development that would result in this change would alter the entire nature of the buildings on this side of the road and consequently the intrinsic character of the village. Several of the properties on the protected side originate from the early 1800s and form an essential part of Bledlow Ridge's social history.	N/A	Policies 2, 5 and 6 specifically address the issue of what type of housing and what design will be considered appropriate. Any application will need to demonstrate, inter alia, that the size, location and design of a particular development is in keeping with the plot size and neighbouring properties. However, we will review the boundary lines to address concerns about inappropriate development.
12	5.22	Over development of the South West side of Chinnor Road would detrimentally affect the views from the surrounding areas. A dramatic change in the type and age of buildings currently on view to neighbouring villages would be most unwanted. The current view provides very attractive green breaks which are valued by the local community.	N/A	Policies 2 and 5 recognise and seek to protect special views and preserve the essential open character of the Parish.
12	5.22	There are other nearby areas that could be used to accommodate any required building development.	The old Molins site nearby provides more than adequate space for further development	We do not know what type of development (if any) will occur at the Molins site. In any event the Plan needs to provide for limited development opportunities across the Parish in all wards and within existing settlement areas.
12	5.22	As a resident of one of the fewer older properties in the village, I am in a minority and concerned that my objections might be outweighed by the majority of other home owners who would be less affected by new development in this area.		Noted.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

13	Diagram of 'Plan F'	<p>It seems to me that the hamlet surrounding Saunderton station is one of those strange areas with an identity crisis. I cannot find a map that gives a name to this area. Although the station is called Saunderton, the village of Saunderton is some three and a half miles north.</p> <p>The only public service business is The Golden Cross pub, there being no shops etc. Referring to the map of Plan F on page 33 of the Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>I feel there is a fantastic opportunity here to, finally, do something with the Rolins site, integrate it into the adjacent hamlet and thus help turn this little hamlet into a thriving village with its very own identity.</p> <p>It would seem to me that area C (Retirement village etc) might generate an imbalance in the demographics of the area although it would create the possibility of generating work opportunities for local residents.</p> <p>Whilst this is in an AONB, and rightly so, none of the lettered or greyed out areas are (easily?) visible from public thoroughfares and so, I would suggest, would be suitable areas for sympathetic development.</p> <p>The white areas, below the junction of Haw Lane and the A4010 and between marked areas I and H, seem strangely incongruent in that they serve to isolate rather than connect the lettered areas to the rest of the hamlet.</p> <p>If you could imagine an outline shaped like a (sort of) lopsided upside down teardrop ranging, approximately, from top left to bottom right including the two white areas mentioned above, which could include additional residential development, I feel this would create a cohesive community where it would be financially viable for the introduction of a village shop, school etc in addition to helping the UDC attain its house building targets.</p> <p>It is my understanding that all major services run beneath the A4010 including Gas, which should make development more attractive.</p>	<p>Under the NP, this area is named "South Saunderton".</p> <p>Linking Molins with South Saunderton was discussed as part of the "Greater Saunderton" project. This was a WDC initiative which was rejected following two public meetings at the Clare Centre. At this point, development beyond the red areas shown on the Plan (p54) would not be permitted without removing the area from the green belt which is beyond the powers of an NP. In addition, the evidence strongly suggests that such a proposal would not be supported. No amendment needed.</p>
----	---------------------	--	--

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

14	Inset Map 3	<p>We write as long term residents of Bledlow Ridge and members of the Community who have taken an active interest in the local issues around Planning and Proposed Development. Particularly in Bledlow Ridge, but also in the immediate and surrounding areas.</p> <p>We received a copy, via email, recently, of the Proposed Draft Neighbourhood Plan for our Village.</p> <p>We noticed with some alarm that it is being proposed to Protect a view over our property. The view in question is detailed on the Inset Map 3 Pre-Submission Plan. A blue arrow details a view through our field gates and across our rear entrance. This is a wholly private piece of land and entrance way to our property and is subject to no restrictions, other than the normal planning restrictions, which do not include views ! (we have attached photographs)</p> <p>We would take this opportunity to voice our objection to this proposal . We have of course, protected and looked after this view for a quarter of a century and we reserve the right to continue to exercise complete control over this access to our property.</p> <p>We are not sure why the Parish Council and the Neighbourhood plan working group have strayed into an area of control over private property . This was not the brief of the working group.</p> <p>This is neither desirable for our community nor warranted. Indeed, we do object most strongly to any attempt to try to restrict our use or enjoyment of our property.</p> <p>Furthermore, we reserve the right to continue with our future plans for landscaping and further planting in this area. We may wish in the future to improve the overall security of this entrance and indeed we have already started to do this in some areas , following on from a burglary, which occurred here last autumn.</p> <p>So can you please log our dissatisfaction with this proposal and can the working group please restrict itself to the brief it was given. i.e. "To make planning policies that can be used to determine planning applications in the area. Its policies will aim to protect the special character of the parish and to encourage development proposals for the benefit of the local community".</p>		<p>The NP is able to designate views within the parish that are worthy of protection. However, the NP only addresses planning issues and the growing of hedges and trees generally falls outside the requirement for planning permission. Residents are therefore free to grow hedges etc for security and other reasons.</p>
15	Inset Map 3 page 56	<p>Whilst accepting that "key views" are somewhat subjective, we do think there should be some acknowledgement of the importance of the view from Haw Lane N to Lodge Hill and NE to Loosley Row. If views from public footpaths might be included, the view N&E from public footpath B64 as it drops from Chinnor Road should be included.</p>		<p>The view north-east to Loosely Row should be included, but the view to the north (Lodge Hill) should not because only views from publicly accessible places can be included in the Plan.</p>
15	All	<p>Our congratulations to all contributors for a very thorough and well-researched piece of work.</p>		<p>Noted.</p>

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

16	5.22	I reside in the protected GB2 area and object to the proposed changes in its status, as it would in my view impact negatively on the entire village, and not just the South West side of Chinnor Road. The GB2 area is of historic significance and possess a character that would be lost should new developments be incorporated into this side of the road.	N/A	Policies 2, 5 and 6 specifically address the issue of what type of housing and what design will be considered appropriate. Any application will need to demonstrate, inter alia, that the size, location and design of a particular development is in keeping with the plot size and neighbouring properties. However, we will review the boundary lines to address concerns about inappropriate development.
16	5.22	The landscape of Bledlow Ridge currently provides a much valued unspoilt, less developed and green view for many of the surrounding areas. This unique outlook would be permanently lost to many of the outlying villages should a change in status of the South side be agreed. A more highly developed and densely populated outlook would inflict a permanent change to an area of outstanding beauty.	N/A	Policies 2 and 5 recognise and seek to protect special views and preserve the essential open character of the Parish.
16	5.22	I object to new housing being built on a protected area and would prefer other suitable areas such as brownfield sites to be explored instead.	The old Molin's factory is a brownfield site and would be better suited as an alternative site for development.	We do not know what type of development (if any) will occur at the Molins site. In any event the Plan needs to provide for limited development opportunities across the Parish in all wards and within existing settlement areas.
17	5.22	I am strongly opposed to the proposed policy to extend the GB4 built up area of Bledlow Ridge to the South West side of Chinnor Road. The South West side of the road presently benefits from the protection of Green Belt planning provisions as it has done for over half a century. The South West side of Chinnor Road is the most attractively rural part of Bledlow Ridge comprising mainly appropriately spaced detached houses set back from the road behind tall hedges. As such it is totally unsuitable for in-fill housing. Such in-fill development would disfigure the character and appearance of the South West side of the road and despoil its environment: features which have remained unchanged for several decades and which should be retained as such for generations to come. Smaller 2/3 bedroom housing is already well provided elsewhere in the village and further supply will be more than adequately provided by the forthcoming Molins' development, whatever form that may eventually take.	There is one very small section of the South West side of Chinnor Road, near the Northern-most end of the area described in paragraph 5.22, which would obviously benefit from modest and tasteful re-development in keeping with its immediate neighbours. As such it would benefit from my support, provided that the entirety of the South West side of the road would otherwise remain outside the GB4 built up area	Policies 2, 5 and 6 specifically address the issue of what type of housing and what design will be considered appropriate. Any application will need to demonstrate, inter alia, that the size, location and design of a particular development is in keeping with the plot size and neighbouring properties. However, we will review the boundary lines to address concerns about inappropriate development.
18	General	Where in the document is a clear description given as to where the Molins site sits as part of a settlement area or is it completely separate to South Saunderton & Bledlow Ridge areas that have been designated in the NP? This needs to be clarified as to how the Molins site will be recognised within the parish.		The Molins site is not included in the NP as a settlement area (policy1) and therefore is not a settlement for the purposes of the NP.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

18	<p>Policy 2</p> <p>(vi) Avoids harming the amenities of adjoining residential properties by way of forming a new access route or of overlooking neighbouring properties</p> <p>The indication of the possible formation of a cycle / pedestrian pathway through the lower field and at the side of Saunderton Vale & the railway line would be unacceptable for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would represent development of a previously undeveloped piece of land in an area of green belt/AONB, contrary to both National and Local Planning Policy. • It would urbanise the area as it would require a hard surface of at least 1.8m width and permanent lighting in a designated dark skies area. It would have to suit all ages that might use it and be permanently managed in order to keep it clear & safe at all times. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the previous regard, there are major changes in ground level between the Molins field, and land owned by Saunderton Vale Management Company Ltd, adjacent to the railway line. It would therefore require major engineering works in order to form a suitable slope between the upper and lower levels, in order to provide access at a suitable grade. Aside from the engineering difficulties posed by this, such an engineering proposal, in the Green Belt and AONB, is contrary to both National and Local Planning Policies. • Within Saunderton Vale itself, as the suggested route of the path reaches the station, there is insufficient width between the boundary with the railway line, and the road through Saunderton Vale, in order to construct the path. It would also remove extremely valuable established landscaping. • It would open up serious security issues for Chiltern Rail /Network Rail & the MOD in the area as well as residents in Saunderton Vale. In addition the Police would also see this as a security/safety issue. • The Directors of SVMC, on behalf of the residents, have already indicated that any link to the station, on land owned by them would not be available. It would remove the landscaping amenity which provides security, safety & a noise reduction buffer to the very busy Chiltern Railway line. It would urbanise the quiet residential setting that is enjoyed by those living in Saunderton Vale reducing the security of the properties which would be overlooked, increase concerns of safety issues for residents & their families. The residents would be 'footing the bill' for any damage done, by other members of the public, to the surrounding land for which they are owners. 	<p>The footpath would not be subject to Policy 2 because it is not a development within a designated settlement. However, these comments can be considered as comments relating to policy 3. There are a number of practical concerns that would have to be addressed before such a path could be built. However, the majority of the feedback suggests that such a path is supported by the community. Furthermore, having non-motorised access to the station would make the development more sustainable. Considering the access issues and the need to involve third party land interests, a modification to the policy could be considered.</p>
----	--	--

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

18	Policy 3	<p>(ii) The provision of safe and convenient cycle and pedestrian connections to Saunderton Station either (a) by the creation of a direct connection or (b) by the upgrading of and improvements to the existing right of way between Haw Lane and Slough Lane</p> <p>(iii) Any development shall be confined to the developable area, which is defined by Wycombe Local Plan Policy GB9 as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt, as shown on the Policies Map, and be designed to ensure that the character and layout of the proposed redevelopment respects the setting of the site within the Wye Chalk River Valley.</p> <p>(iv) Any development must have full regard to all the relevant policies of the development plan in respect of the Green Belt, the Chiltern Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, access/transport, green infrastructure, biodiversity, heritage assets, sustainable drainage and land contamination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The public right of way already provides a link between Haw Lane & Slough Lane which is also recognised as part of a Chilterns Country Walk route and both are already utilised by local residents and visitors to the area. Any new pathway would affect the diversity of wildlife, fauna & flora that exists within this area of green belt /AONB. • Bledlow Ridge residents refer to the need for connectivity to link with South Saunderton down towards the main A4010. There is already a pedestrian/cycle designated route along the A4010. Through a 106 Agreement and the construction of a pathway on Haw Lane extending from Bledlow Ridge to the Molins site and thereafter to the main road to include a traffic light system to control vehicle movements through the bridge as the pathway would narrow this section of road. This would improve the link between the settlements and any future residents on the old Molins site for both cyclists & pedestrians along the full length of Haw Lane. It would improve the connection to both bus & rail travel links in the area along the A4010 for existing businesses & residents. This would allow for the more natural countryside rural public pathway between Haw Lane & Slough Lane to be retained in its more natural setting. 	<p>A traffic light system would reduce traffic flow and increase congestion which has already been identified as a concern in the survey and at the two public meetings.</p>
----	----------	---	--

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

18	Sustainability Report	<p>7.23 Option 3 however has a number of strong positive effects in relation to the economy and employment given that, the C2 uses generate local employment, have less transport effects than C3 residential uses and includes proposals for business premises to support start-up and micro-business uses. Perhaps most significantly, all the proposed uses included in the policy are likely to have positive effects on self-containment by reducing negative transport effects and supported by a pedestrian and cycle link to Saunderton Station.</p> <p>There is no clear evidence that the option of a new direct route would be used by the majority that could be living/working in the Molins grounds to justify the creation of yet another path in previously undeveloped land which would overlook existing properties on either side of it. With the likelihood of no increase in the train service at Saunderton the small increase in the numbers of passengers does not justify creating a pathway on previously undeveloped land. The station also has limited space for storage of bicycles or car parking and it is still more likely that residents will use their cars for essential journeys to surrounding towns in the absence of a more comprehensive daily rail /public road transport system along the route of the A4010.</p>		<p>Policy 3 (v) final bullet point requires the applicant to demonstrate how walking and cycling to saunderton station will be encouraged, and the sustainability appraisal is a reflection of the this policy intent. Sustainable travel planning is about providing the opportunities for people to make alternative travel choices and evidence confirms choice is more likley to be exercised where routes are direct and convenient The policy is inline with NPPF paras 29 - 41. Note comment 503 from Chiltern Railways support the access to the station as proposed in Policy 3. Policy 3 (ii) 2nd bullet indicates two options for accessing the station.</p>
19	5.19	<p>I object to the inclusion of the field between the Old Childrens Home and Bledlow Cottages into the proposed revised settlement area for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Although the children's home has been re-developed, the footprint of the development is not substantially different than before. The objective of the development was to remove an eyesore, not to over-develop this part of Bledlow. 2. The field in question is visible from the houses and beside Bledlow Cottages and provides as sense of space and country living, which would be completely lost if the field were to be developed. The only view would that would then be available would be of housing. 3. The dangerous corner at near the 'village only' only sign and the old Children's home is already a concern; further development near this point will only exacerbate the problem it causes for people turning in and out of housing in Perry Lane. 	<p>The commentary for the plan states that as the field is not visible from Perry Lane as if that is enough of a reason to develop it, but in fact none of the fields on this side of the road from the bottom of Perry Lane/Chinnor Road are visible from the road so that is hardly a compelling reason.</p> <p>There has been new development at the bottom of the Perry Lane already, so there is no reason why more development could not occur between this junction and the railway bridge without having to be crammed in. Also this makes sense as there would also be easier access to public transport from here to nearby towns and the train station.</p>	<p>Access issues would be addressed by BCC as part of any planning application and therefore no development could go ahead without safe access being ensured. Any development would have to meet the other criteria in the plan including the need to follow the existing building line as well as appropriate densities. This area remains open to the countryside at the back and the view from the road would be largely unaffected. The WG considers that this field forms part of the settlement area using the methodology but agrees to look at amending the boundary line at the back to prevent the plot being subject to overdevelopment.</p>
20	Whole NP	<p>Now that I have had time to read the Neighbourhood Plan and its various attachments I wish to say how impressed I am with how comprehensive it is. It shows not only a masterful summation of the views of the residents of the parish obtained through the consultation exercises this year and last, but also demonstrates that the concerns raised re some of the earliest proposals have been listened to and acted upon.</p> <p>I believe it captures the essence of what existing residents want from their village both now and in the future and therefore I am pleased to wholeheartedly support the draft Plan.</p>		<p>Noted.</p>

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

21	Whole NP	I have looked at the draft Neighbourhood Plan and am very pleased to see that it has captured the main important views that the residents have expressed in all the consultation process and meetings etc regarding the former Molins site. I am very happy to see that the recommendation is for new housing to be built only on existing building plots and should be of appropriate design to fit in with the village. I feel very strongly that it is critical that we maintain the AONB status of this area and I believe that the plan has taken this into consideration. Therefore I am happy to endorse the plan, and thank all those people who have worked hard to produce this.		Noted.
22	Policy 3	I approve of the sentiments incorporated in the paragraph but in order to avoid an applicant trying to circumvent the requirements of paragraph 2(ii) by including a token or nominal retirement village of insignificant size, it would be useful to include indicative ratios of floor areas of the various categories of development including maxima and minima for each. This is particularly important for the retirement village, employment, and residential components. Community facilities might best be incorporated into at least the more attractive existing building (ballroom) if practicable.		We have considered the possibility of indicative percentages by use-type but concluded it was not practical because the percentages will vary depending on how much of the land is developed. We will, however, amend the supporting text to highlight the importance of employment generating uses.
22	Policy 3	Supplementary to the retirement village with sheltered and care facilities could be what might be termed 'transient' or 'intermediate' accommodation akin to care facilities but of a transient nature for hospital in-patients who have no further need for the depth of care (with commensurate expense) of the hospital ward but who cannot return to their homes directly. This may be, and often is, because whatever treatment the patient has received has rendered them partially and temporarily unable to be self-sufficient at home without full-time live-in care. With a period of residence in this 'convalescent home' these patients can regain their independence without unnecessarily 'blocking' hospital wards while they recover, thereby delaying the admission of acute patients et al. The geographic positioning of the Molins site lends itself ideally to this use, being, as it is, located between Wycombe Hospital and Stoke Mandeville Hospital and on an already established ambulance route. It is possible that the authors of the HEDNA report had some degree of this use in mind when they refer to 'Extra Care' facilities. Either way, there is a pressing need for this type of facility.		The wording of Policy 3 should be flexible enough to include the type of facilities described in the comment, No change required.
22	Plan F	The diagram clarifies the suggested relative sizes of the different categories of uses quite well but would be enhanced by the ratio statements suggested in my Comment 1. In general, I wholeheartedly concur with the intentions of the diagram and the Plan.		Noted

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

23	5.22	<p>This South west side of Chinnor Road with its long vista of hedges, tall trees and limited number of houses which are well set back from the road, is a key asset in setting the character and attractiveness of the centre of Bledlow Ridge. If it lost its GB2 status and there were new buildings, two or three to a plot, this key character would be eroded, everyone in the village would lose something of value and the village could become much more of a polyglot ribbon development and far less attractive.</p>		<p>Policies 2 and 5 recognise and seek to protect special views and preserve the essential open character of the Parish.</p> <p>The results of the survey and other consultations show a clear majority of residents in favour of limited development within existing settlement areas. The methodology by which the settlements have been identified has been subject to wide consultation and has been consistently applied. However, we will review the boundary lines to address concerns about inappropriate development.</p>
24	5.22	<p>I am opposed to the proposed policy set out in Paragraph 5.22, because I believe it is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate, because the South West side of the road is the most beautiful and “green” part of the whole village. The 33 houses in the affected area are a delightful character-full mix of designs and ages, with many dating back centuries and none less than several decades old. Plot sizes generally are generously proportioned and well spaced reflecting the majority of the houses being medium-sized to large detached. There is a great variety of build line, but with the large majority set well back from the road and screened from view by hedging. This pastoral scene would be irreparably damaged by squeezing in additional new-build houses between the existing housing, as would the views up to the Ridge from Bottom Road and across from the Radnage valley and escarpment. In contrast the North East side of the road is clearly “built-up” with a large number of smaller properties close to and visible from the road and with a mainly consistent build line. • Unacceptable, because the area in question benefits from the protection of GB2 Green Belt planning regulations which are much more restrictive than those applicable to GB4. It makes no sense to sacrifice the GB2 status from which the South West side of the road has benefited for more than half a century • Unnecessary, because there is already an ample supply of 2/3 bedroom houses on the North East side of Chinnor Road/Fords Close and whatever solution is adopted for the Molins’ site re-development it will provide a significant number of additional 2/3 bedroom houses for the parish. • Unfair and Undemocratic, because the 33 households in the affected area represent just 3.3% of the households in the parish. The other 96.7% are not directly affected by the proposed policy set out in Paragraph 5.22 which is thus unlikely to affect how their occupants vote in the referendum, and yet their votes will obviously count just as much as those of the residents of the affected area <p>From the all the responses to a survey of households in the affected area a massive (>90%) majority is against the policy. It is therefore essential that the policy proposal set out in paragraph 5.22 is deleted or very substantially modified</p>	<p>The proposed policy to extend the GB4 built up area of Bledlow Ridge to the South West side of Chinnor Road should be deleted in its entirety or be very substantially modified to restrict the extension to the extremely small minority of householders who are known to favour the policy and where the building of a small number of 2/3 bedroom houses would have the minimum impact on and improve the built environment</p>	<p>Policies 2, 5 and 6 specifically address the issue of what type of housing and what design will be considered appropriate. Any application will need to demonstrate, inter alia, that the size, location and design of a particular development is in keeping with the plot size and neighbouring properties. However, we will review the boundary lines to address concerns about inappropriate development.</p>

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

25	Policy 5.3	<p>The Molins employment land is an irreplaceable major employment site in this part of the Chilterns AONB. This was recognised throughout during past resident discussions / meetings on the use of the Molins site (and indeed as regards the now aborted Greater Saunderton proposals), the retention of some employment use on the Molins site has been at the forefront of resident thinking. Although traditional manufacturing industry would be unlikely to return to the site, it was expected that more modern industries and indeed service businesses uses would still be attracted to at least in part of the site.</p> <p>We seem to have lost sight of this important issue during the NP process. Although WDC's policy is to to concentrate employment land in other towns in the District and maximise rural residential development, the NPPF and the whole concept of sustainability make it plain that land should not be allocated by financial viability which is what has been happening throughout the parish.</p> <p>We are very surprised therefore that in this section 5.3 Objectives for land use, no mention whatsoever is made of trying to keep some appropriate employment use for land within the parish. Although 87% residents in the January Survey voted to use brownfield sites for new housing; it would be entirely wrong to conclude that brownfield sites should in priority all be redeveloped into housing. I suspect many residents qualified their response to this survey question in the written space provided; I know I and others did so to reflect the general wisdom of developing residential on brown field sites. The seemingly overwhelming 87% vote in therefore somewhat misleading in reality.</p> <p>We do however acknowledge that the draft report's findings for the Molins site</p>	<p>Agreed to amend paragraph 5.3 to add an objective of supporting rural employment oppoertunities. We will also add additional wording in the text relating to policy 3 describing our commitment to including business uses at this site. The policy and supporting plans do make it clear already that any development will have to include some business use. However, the evidence that we have seen so far does not support extensive business use (see the Task Group Report on Rural Economy and Environment). We have therefore attempted to balance the wishes and needs of the community with mixed use split between residential, business and facilities for the elderly.</p>
----	------------	--	--

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

25	Policy 3	<p>The extant data centre planning permission was considered very carefully by WDC and resident groups before its consent was granted in 2008. Although the visual impact of the data centre was considered more significant than would normally be accepted in this location in the green belt and AONB, the development overall was judged to be suitable given the continued employment use of the site which it provided and its generally benign influence on the area in all other aspects including, the very light traffic flows associated with its use as a data centre.</p> <p>In June 2016 the current owner of the Molins Site submitted to the Planning Inspectorate what it described as “Minor Variations” to the design and layout of its application under appeal, and up-dated supporting documentation. Section 3 of the “Planning Statement Addendum For The Redevelopment of The Former Molins Factory Site, Haw Lane, Saunderton –July 2016” in the supporting documentation, states that the owner of the site has now received “expert advice” that the UK market for data centres has improved significantly, and that a development under the existing planning consent for that use may now be commercially viable. Accordingly, it no longer wishes to rely upon advice undertaken by GVA on behalf of the previous owner, and requests for the data centre consent to remain a fullback use of the site to its current residential application.</p> <p>As the appellant in the PI Appeal to be heard in September, the owner’s intent in reviving the data centre use, may simply be to argue against WDC’s “existing buildings” contention in the Appeal; claiming that the datacentre is now viable and can be built, and that the data centre should represent the “existing building”.</p> <p>Some recent due diligence / enquiries on the data centre market does however suggest that there has indeed been a very significant recovery in that market, and that a very large capacity data centre facility with an existing planning consent may well be commercially viable again. Whether the proposed residential development or the data centre is the more profitable use of site for the owner is unknown.</p> <p>We would expect a revival of the data centre development under the existing planning consent to be strongly supported by residents.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.38 makes reference to the data centre “which is no longer viable and will not be delivered”; this may need revision in the light of the above. In the circumstances Policy 3 of the BcSNP needs to be redrafted to address the possibility that the existing planning consent for a data centre might now be implemented by the current owner.</p>	<p>Noted. The "fall-back" position and the question of "minor variations" will both be discussed at the appeal. St Congar will need to provide evidence to support their assertion that data centres are still viable. We are not aware of any such evidence or any evidence to suggest the Molins site would be developed as such. For the time being we have to plan for the most likely outcomes, being those covered by Policy 3.1 and 3.2. No amendment required.</p>
----	----------	--	--

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

25	Policy 3	<p>In the absence of the data centre a retirement village complex with a care home and suitable extra care facilities seems the ideal use for the Molins site. As well as being much needed to meet the needs of an ageing local population, such a facility provides a “modern day” employment use of the site and its impact on the tranquillity of the AONB would be more benign than most other uses. Traffic flows, probably most residents’ biggest concern, would be lessened and diluted away from peak times and demands on local education services would be minimised.</p> <p>Residents recognised the above in the January Survey result and I would have expected that this sort of retirement village complex would form the core of any “mixed development” proposal set out in 2. (1) of Policy 3 (page 29). The conditionality tests as drafted in this section however imply an equal weighting between the four bullet point conditions with no emphasis on any one as the core use. Although Plan F on page 33 does visually show the proportions allocated over the site in the WP’s example these are indicative only.</p> <p>Somewhat surprisingly the land usage for community use on Plan F is larger than the allocation to incubator / micro business units and employment use.</p>		Agreed. We will switch switching A and B on the plan the other way round.
25	Whole NP	Subject to the matters mentioned above, we believe the Plan is well written and deserves to achieve its purpose as the Parish Neighbourhood Plan.		Noted.
26	5.22	<p>I disagree with the policy set out in para 5.22 because for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It will disproportionately affect one of the most scenic areas of the village. The attractive hedges and trees along the SW side of Chinnor Road, with many of the houses set back from the road, make the centre of the village seem more rural and distinctive, compared to the more densely built-up NE side of the road. The outlook both from within the village, and also the views across the valley from Radnage, would be adversely affected by greater density of housing on the SW side, which would inevitably result in the long term from GB4 designation. This is not appropriate for the village and would severely impact the nature of Bledlow Ridge - We should not remove GB2 status from the SW side of Chinnor Road and the protection that it provides against inappropriate development. - The Molins development will more than meet needs for additional housing in the local area, on an existing brownfield site. It therefore makes no sense to detrimentally affect the SW side of Chinnor Road 	There will be sufficient capacity for additional housing in the Molins development	<p>Policies 2, 5 and 6 specifically address the issue of what type of housing and what design will be considered appropriate. Any application will need to demonstrate, inter alia, that the size, location and design of a particular development is in keeping with the plot size and neighbouring properties. However, we will review the boundary lines to address concerns about inappropriate development.</p> <p>We do not know what type of development (if any) will occur at the Molins site. In any event the Plan needs to provide for limited development opportunities across the Parish in all wards and within existing settlement areas.</p>

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

27	5.5	Comprehensive policy which seems a basis for sensible planning		Noted. No amendment needed.
27	5.22	Proposed amendment to the SW side of Chinnor Road would be able to allow small developments without detriment to landscape and to avail of the local infrastructure, as the facilities are already in place. i.e. water, gas, electric, sewerage, and is within the 30mph built up limit.		Noted.
28	5.22	Object to change of status from GB2 to GB4 as any new infill would substantially change detrimentally the attractive Chiltern village character. Why is infill necessary when there is a large redevelopment proposed on the Molins site? Views up to the ridge from Radnage below would be adversely affected by unsightly infill, also the lovely vista now seen through the gardens and small number of gaps at present. Further access onto Chinnor Road would enhance the already large amount of peak time traffic often travelling well above the speed limits.	As stated re the Molins site	Policies 2, 5 and 6 specifically address the issue of what type of housing and what design will be considered appropriate. Any application will need to demonstrate, inter alia, that the size, location and design of a particular development is in keeping with the plot size and neighbouring properties. However, we will review the boundary lines to address concerns about inappropriate development. Policies 2 and 5 recognise and seek to protect special views and preserve the essential open character of the Parish. The results of the survey and other consultations show a clear majority of residents in favour of limited development within existing settlement areas. The methodology by which the settlements have been identified has been subject to wide consultation and has been consistently applied.
28	5.83	Having been involved in gridlock situations due to school parking on Chinnor Road, any further developments along the SW side of the road would only add to the chaos at peak times.	Possible use of school bus for pupils too far away to walk to school.	Any development will be limited and will need to be reviewed by Bucks CC for transport issues in the usual way.
29	Appendix C & D1	<p>"No 11 Haw Lane are good examples of how modern architectural design has been incorporated amongst the existing mix of architectural styles without negatively impacting the essential characteristics of the street scene"</p> <p>In order to achieve this good example of modern architectural design in future I don't see how under your proposals in Appendix D this will be achieved:</p> <p>App D1 - "Make maximum use of sites contours without major earthworks and the need to excavate basements" - No 11 has a basement and therefore involved major earthworks.</p> <p>"Avoid skylines" - what does this mean? No 9 is one of the oldest in Haw Lane and probably one of the highest on the skyline due to it being on the highest part of the hill. No 11 and 13 were built with this as a marker for height allowed but please note that both of these houses involved major earthworks, No 13 also has a garage under the house. No 7 is built slightly lower down the slope but probably did not include major earthworks but the drawback is the height of the back garden in relation to the level of the house not good for small children or elderly people. The same applies to a lot of properties at the top end of Haw Lane and the Crest. Properties have already had major earthworks to make their gardens more useable and safer and not needed planning permission to do so (nor should they)</p>		Appendix D is a checklist of Design Guidelines. It is not a policy in and of itself. It is a document that designers need to demonstrate that they have given due regard to within Design and Access Statements where planning applications are being submitted. In some instances it is clear that there will be good design reasons to pursue alternative approaches to those identified in the checklist however these should be able to be justified within a Design and Access Statement. No need for change to the plan.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

29	2	"Avoid flat roofs where they will be overlooked (acceptable exceptions green sedum roofs)" - There are several flat roofs in Haw Lane mainly on garages or carports adjacent to the road. They do not have green roofs and are overlooked because of being on a hill. In future are you going to allow garages with sloped roofs or will you say they are too bulky? Remember a cartshed design has a bulky roof.		Appendix D is a checklist of Design Guidelines. It is not a policy in and of itself. It is a document that designers need to demonstrate that they have given due regard to within Design and Access Statements where planning applications are being submitted. In some instances it is clear that there will be good design reasons to pursue alternative approaches to those identified in the checklist however these should be able to be justified within a Design and Access Statement. No need for change to the plan.
29	Appendix D8	I don't think it is a good idea to dictate what plants and trees to grow in front gardens. I have seen instances where the council have made this a condition of planning with trees planted near to the highway and when they grow too tall the electricity company come and chop bits off them because of the cables which makes the trees look ugly. The council are not responsible for the maintenance of peoples front gardens or a householders gardening skills, perhaps they should be more concerned with existing hedges and trees that overhang roads and pavements. Have some trust in the people of the parish who look after any native trees and hedges in their own gardens because that is why they live here, you don't need to manufacture a landscape with locally sourced common native species, nature usually takes care of that.		Appendix D is a checklist of Design Guidelines. It is not a policy in and of itself. It is a document that designers need to demonstrate that they have given due regard to within Design and Access Statements where planning applications are being submitted. E66
29	Policy 6	Gardening of the road verge - how does this fit in with the daffodils planted on the grass verge and what are you going to do about the parts of the verge where this has already happened? How can you impose this policy?		Policy is that gardening of the road verge should be "avoided". Policy is drawn from CBDG and is therefore already established guidance. This is policy for forthcoming applications, not to be applied retrospectively. No change to plan required.
29	Appendix D9	Access parking and garages - I find this section the most annoying. How many new houses will be asking for a garage on a planning application and have no intention of parking a car in it, even existing garages have never had a car parked in it. Is the reason for them on a new planning application to convert them at a later date which reading policy 7 seems to be what you are now proposing, although I am still confused can you convert a garage to include a bedroom or not??? What do you mean by an ancillary building and it is a building that never needed planning permission in the first place ie a garden shed?		Not clear if this comment is directed at Appendix D part 9 or Policy 7. Appendix D is a checklist of design <i>guidelines</i> . It is not a policy in and of itself. It is a document that designers need to demonstrate that they have given due regard to within Design and Access Statements where planning applications are being submitted. The checklist has been drawn from the guidance contained within the CBDG. The guidance is not mandatory and can not be retrospectively applied. Policy 7 relates to <i>existing</i> outbuildings only for the purposes of reducing the impact of otherwise new extensions on the openness of the greenbelt. with regards the meaning of ancillary, the policy does not refer to ancillary buildings but ancillary uses. Uses which are not considered ancillary are clearly defined within the policy. No change to plan required

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

29	Appendix D9	Front gardens should not be turned into parking areas - why stipulate this when it is already the case that people already park cars in their front garden even if they have got a garage, there is no rule to say that you can't for an existing dwelling so it is too late to impose this on a new planning application it would be changing the established street scene. It would also depend on the size of the front garden. What about parking on the road or grass verges instead, do you want to encourage this?		The NP is unable to influence what has gone before. It is not intended that the policies or guidance should be applied retrospectively. However because things have been considered acceptable in the past does not mean that there is not scope for policies that discourage poor practice in the future. The guidance is drawn from existing guidance contained in the CBDG. No need for changes to the plan.
29	Appendix D9	Parking areas/driveways at side of house - how many houses can do this? Is it the older ones with no architectural merit, as you would say, but have a garden big enough to enable this, or is it the ones that are more modern looking but have a garage in the front garden with no car in but a driveway full of cars visible from the street????		Unclear what comment is attempting to achieve. The checklist has been drawn from the guidance contained within the CBDG. The guidance is not mandatory, only consideration of it. No change to plan required.
29	Policy 6	The use of modern surface treatment (Tarmac/concrete) - What if you have a steep driveway and an alternative surface such as shingle washes down your driveway and blocks the drains in the road? Note - this already happens.		Existing Policy wording does not mandate the avoidance of impermeable surfaces. Consideration could be given to revising policy to read: " <i>Areas of residential parking and driveways should, where practical, avoid the extensive use of modern surface treatments which represent a single visual and impermeable mass such as tarmac or concrete.</i> " The policy is drawn from existing guidance from the CBDG and the need to reduce run off from urban style developments is one highlighted in the Chilterns AONB Management Plan.
29	Policy 6	Dark skies policy - I agree with the dark skies policy even though it is a but dangerous when walking at night when you don't have a torch, it would be a good idea if houses had a security light that comes on when someone is walking past in the street, it would also help with security for all those cars parked in their front gardens or should they be screened from the road (as above). Light trespass is a problem especially if your bedroom faces a property with large amounts of glass and outside lights that have been left on all night.		Noted. No amendment needed.
29	Policy 7	Sustainable design in the green belt - Proposals for extensions or alterations should not be disproportionate over and above the size of the original building - what if your house has never been extended and the adjacent houses are twice as large?? The rule used to be that a small house could be extended by more than 50% if the neighbouring properties were a lot larger.		The wording of Policy 7 has been carefully consulted on with WDC in order to be read in conjunction with relevant policies in the WDC Local Plan pertaining to the acceptable scale of extensions within the Green Belt. Currently this is controlled by WDC Policy GB6 with WDC currently consulting on a replacement policy, DM41, in the draft New Local Plan. No need for changes to the plan.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

29	Haw Lane	I think you should reconsider some of your policies with regard to Haw Lane. Most of the properties are built on a slope and if you were to continue with any policy regarding major earthworks and instead encourage use of an existing slope, this would be hard to achieve and unfair. It would also add considerably to the cost of any new buildings as it already probably does to extensions. Added to that is the cost of maintaining long driveways built at the side of houses which are als impractical when it snows and you have got to clear the drive before you go to work. It is more practical to park you car in the front garden nearer the road and on as flat a surface as possible and then perhaps you can use a more permeable surface, but then again this may involve major earthworks.		References within the plan to the need to minimise major earthworks and to use a sites contours when considering the desing of new buildings only occur as <i>guidance</i> and not mandatory policy. In those instances where it may be necessary to disregard this guidance it is expected that this would be justifiable in a Design and Access Statement. No need for changes to the plan.
29	Whole NP	Will all of your proposed policies apply in full to any large scale housebuilding that may arise in the parish? I am thinking about the planning experts that they have at their disposal against a householder that wants a simple extension or make an improvement to their property. A large scale housebuilder has a blank canvas but an existing property owner in the parish has to work around existing structures and therefore will face more obstacles. If you apply this theory to say the Molins site which is fairly flat but has to use major earthworks before they can build you can see why this would be unfair. Why don't you have less rules for exisiting properties so that homeowners can understand them more easily, it is impossible to generalise in villages and even streets that have properties that are so diverse.		Apart from Molins (which has its own policy) there is relatively little scope in the parish for larger scale development. There are rules which apply to larger developments already (mix of affordable housing, requirements for SEAs etc) but, in line with national and local policy, it is not possible to have policies which apply to developers but not individual householders.
29	Whole NP	I have only commented on Haw Lane because I live there but that is not to say that I do not care about the rest of the Parish. I am most concerned about large scale housebuilding and I am worried about the sale of a large tract of farming land at Saunderton. Please forward my concerns to Wycombe District Planning dept.		Noted. No amendment needed.
30	3.8	We do not think that "major development" should be considered in AONB	No alternative approach, it should not be allowed	This is a reference to WDC policies in the local plan and is not part of the NP. No amendment needed.
30	5.9	"Proposals for development within the boundaries will be supported", "the principle of development inside the defined settlement boundaries is accepted" - by whom?	We went to 2 crowded meetings and nobody appeared to want a housing development on the Molins site - if a lot of houses were planning to be built then some sort of factory development was far more acceptable to, we think it fair to say, everybody present. The next thing we hear is that a village plan is being put forward which involves not only factory space but also retirement homes, a care home, community facilities and residential development. How did this come about? We filled in the form earlier in the year which we thought was to provide ideas if the only alternative was the St Congar plan. However, now that WDC are making their case for the only part of the land which can be built on is the existing development, then surely the 28 (or 25?) homes maximum which they are supporting is infinitely preferable to the small village which seems to be what the local plan consists of? It seems that you have taken everyone's ideas, for a care home, or factory space etc, and stuck them all together on a piece of land. This certainly isn't what we intended when we filled in the form earlier in the year.	The parish survey and other feedback shows support for development within existing settlements. Policy 1 defines 4 existing settlements in which limited development will be encouraged. This does not include Molins which is subject to policy 3 and which supports mixed development. Policy 3 does include language supporting WDC's argument for 25 houses. It also supports a more limited development should WDC's argument fail. In any event at much lower densities than that proposed by St Congar.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

30	5.36	See comment re 5.9. Also, surely once one starts talking about a large development such as the one outlined in the local plan, then all the concerns about traffic, which are amongst the objections to St Congar plan, are again brought into play? This surely makes no sense?	As we previously stated, WDCs proposal for 28 homes on the existing development seems to us infinitely preferable to the large development of the local plan.	See above. If WDC is successful in arguing that 25 homes is the maximum development, then our policy 3.1 will ensure that any development fits within this limit. It is only if WDC is unsuccessful in its argument that our policy 3.2 comes into play. In those circumstances the NP proposes that the development is "optimised" along the lines proposed in the survey and other feedback rather than "maximised" along the lines that St Congar is proposing.
30	5.36	As regards the 2 entrances, at least, that would be needed to the site from Haw Lane with St Congar's plan, people were rightly very concerned about the traffic flow into Haw Lane, and onto the A4010 - where the local plan is concerned, this all seems to be being disregarded. And what about the concerns about the lorries needed for all this building, and dealing with going under the railway bridge, up and down Haw Lane etc - all these objections to St Congar's proposal seem to be totally disregarded where this local plan is concerned. It makes no sense at all.	Just build the 28 homes WDC have suggested, and nothing more. We do not see how you can use all these reasons to fight a large housing development, and then totally disregard them where the local plan is concerned.	The NP does not support the St Congar proposal nor does WDC or the Parish Council who will be making representations to this effect at the appeal.
30	5.41	"which allows for the reuse of the site in line with the preferences expressed by the community in the parish survey" - as previously mentioned, when we filled in the parish survey, if we stated that, in preference to the St Congar proposal, we would prefer to have a care home, for instance, we meant a care home, and not a care home, the various ideas muted in the parish survey seem to have all been taken and thrown together on this piece of land. Speaking for ourselves that is certainly not what we meant when we filled in the parish survey.	As previously stated, WDCs proposal for 28 houses seems infinitely preferable to this new village which seems to be proposed by the local plan.	The proposals for mixed use including residential, business use, recreational facilities and a care home were informed by the results of the survey and are generally supported by the community feedback we received so far.
30	5.96	We would argue that we do not want any solar farms - they ruin the beauty of the countryside, and we also do not want any wind turbines - they also ruin the beauty of the countryside, plus are a danger to birds and also cause noise pollution for residents.	No alternative approach	National Policy supports alternative energy so we are not able to prevent it altogether. But we can seek to restrict it which we are doing.
30	6.12	We do think that it is very important to retain a bus service - even if they do not use it now, may residents may need it in the future, and we are always being encouraged to use cars less, which is only possible if there is some sort of bus service in the area.	There is no alternative approach - local areas need a bus service for the above reasons, and also we believe it vital that everyone can reach doctors surgeries, shops etc if they cannot/are no longer able to drive.	See paragraph 6.12. Buses services are outside the planning environment and therefore not directly covered by the NP. However, the PC has supported bus services in the past through grants and other means and will continue to do so.
30	Whole NP	We should just like to close by stressing that we would have thought that most people who live here appreciate the beautiful countryside, and we think that this countryside should be retained and cherished, not built over, because once its gone, it's gone. We should do all that we can to ensure that the countryside continues to exist, for the sake of both future generations, and the natural habitat. We would hate for this area to become a small town, with all the traffic, street lighting and general ruination of the countryside that this entails, and once you start building large developments then this becomes more and more of a possibility. It seems terribly sad that the beauty of the countryside seems very quickly to be being eroded.		Noted and agreed. The proposed NP limits development to existing settlements/brownfield sites and would not make it any easier to develop housing etc in the open countryside or green belt which are already well protected under existing policies.

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

31	5.22	<p>I wish to put a case for amending the lines on the extension of the GB4 on the south west side of Chinnor Road, Bledlow Ridge. I object to your proposals as they favour dwellings and buildings that are not in line with the boundaries. I enclose 3 maps with alternatives to your proposal of the GB4. These must be viewed in conjunction with viewing it on Google view satellite. I believe you will have to consider Policies C6 countryside and rural economy, GB5, GB6 and GB7.</p> <p>Map 1 - why are you protecting modern barns at Studmore farm? This is allowing for back fill development in the future. If they were old barns that could be redeveloped for dwellings then that would be a different matter. Derek tells me you wish to keep straight lines. Why then are you making a line around open paddock behind Capel Farm which is enclosing an open paddock? If you wish to take this approach then you should realign, see map 2.</p> <p>Map 3 - consider extending the GB4 from Studmore farm to the end of the dwellings to the pond opposite Chapel Lane. There are already a number of dwellings that have been extended over and above the 50% rule. There is only one potential building site and that is the telephone exchange, as and when it becomes redundant. How you fit a dwelling into this space is magical, but someone will.</p>		<p>Noted. The working group will review the boundaries and where appropriate make adjustments to address some of the concerns raised.</p>
32	4.6, 5.5, 5.31, 5.34	<p>All of the above paragraphs make statements referring to ‘smaller and more affordable dwellings’ (4.6), ‘including affordable homes for letting/shared ownership’ (5.31), ‘a preference for creating modest new housing within existing settlements • a desire to rebalance the housing stock by building a higher proportion of smaller homes’ (5.31), ‘Giving priority to smaller dwellings to address the imbalance identified and also to support residents wishing to downsize’ 5.34.</p> <p>The site suggested in Chapel Lane, between two listed buildings is a plot size upon which a developer would have the space to develop either:</p> <p>a. One or more large home of 4 bedrooms which would be ‘(a) appropriate for the size of the plot, and (b) in keeping with the existing pattern of housing development in proximity to the proposed development’ (Policy 2) with the size of the home being ‘in keeping’ with the homes either side of the land (Pitch Green Cottage and Pitch Green Farm). However, if this was the case, the size of any new build/s, with the accompanying land, would result in the production of yet more homes beyond the reach of many and therefore failing the aforementioned aims of the development plan in terms of providing more affordable houses to ‘support a wide demographic both in terms of age and income’ (5.31).</p> <p>b. A number of smaller homes were built, to ‘rebalance the housing stock by building a higher proportion of smaller homes’ (5.5) which would be more ‘in keeping’ with the cottages opposite the land. Our fears with this would be that higher volume of traffic (assumed at two cars per household) would be impractical and unsustainable on a small, narrow, rural lane which currently is poorly maintained by the council.</p>	<p>Do not use this site for development</p>	<p>The policy does not require the site to be developed. What is does is mandate the criteria that must be considered before a specific development would be considered appropriate. However, we note concerns about overdevelopment of the site and will review the boundary line, potentially limiting the amount of development allowable at the back of the plot.</p>

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

32	5.3 D	<p>This piece of land has, to our knowledge been denied planning permission at least twice in the past. The most recent, which was appealed in 2009 was denied as 'both Grade II Listed Buildings have historically been part of an open rural context and that the development and domestication of the appeal site which, as it stands, forms part of that context, would fail to reserve the character of that setting.' Any development of the land was considered to be contrary to protecting built heritage. (appeal no. APP/K0425/A/09/2102169).</p> <p>The refusal of planning permission also cited concerns about flooding to the main vehicular access to the land. Chapel Lane is a known flood risk with flooding occurring twice this year (2016).</p>	Do not use this site for development	Existing policies protecting listed building and addressing access and flooding issues would remain in place and need to be met on any planning application. The WG considers that this field forms part of the settlement area using the methodology but agrees to look at amending the boundary line at the back to prevent the plot being subject to overdevelopment.
33	5.22	<p>I strongly disagree with this proposed development as it can have no benefits for our village. The development would spoil the open feel of this side of the road and new homes would obliterate the attractive existing spacing, styles and maturity of this side of the road. The GB2 green belt zone must be preserved in order to maintain Bledlow Ridge as an attractive area within the Chilterns for now and posterity - it would be a travesty to allow it to become another housing estate near High Wycombe. The views from Bottom Road, Radnage and within the village would be mangled. Extra housing can be provided on the more densely housed North East side of the village and of course the nearby brown field site at Molins will provide many homes.</p>		<p>Policies 2, 5 and 6 specifically address the issue of what type of housing and what design will be considered appropriate. Any application will need to demonstrate, inter alia, that the size, location and design of a particular development is in keeping with the plot size and neighbouring properties. However, we will review the boundary lines to address concerns about inappropriate development.</p> <p>Policies 2 and 5 recognise and seek to protect special views and preserve the essential open character of the Parish.</p> <p>The results of the survey and other consultations show a clear majority of residents in favour of limited development within existing settlement areas. The methodology by which the settlements have been identified has been subject to wide consultation and has been consistently applied.</p>
34	5.22	<p>I am strongly opposed to the proposed policy for the following reasons:</p> <p>Firstly I disagree that the extension of the GB4 boundary to the other side of the road would be consistent with a sense of enclosure. I do not think it is necessary to have even housing densities on each side of the road. I feel that there are sufficient properties on the NE side of Chinnor Road.</p> <p>Secondly, the SW side of Chinnor Road is characterful, containing many traditional Chilterns properties as well as other interesting houses and appropriate buildings. These are consistent with the rural, green nature of the village, which I strongly feel would be forever changed and spoilt by allowing this policy. This side of the road has GB2 Green Belt status and so should remain as such. If this policy was allowed, the views from the Radnage Valley up onto the Ridge would be forever changed for the worst and I feel there is no need or benefit to the area to do this.</p> <p>Finally, as one of the residents directly affected by this proposal I feel it is my duty as the owner of the sole remaining working farm in this section of the village to keep the rural, agricultural nature of the village secure for further generations to come.</p>		<p>Policies 2, 5 and 6 specifically address the issue of what type of housing and what design will be considered appropriate. Any application will need to demonstrate, inter alia, that the size, location and design of a particular development is in keeping with the plot size and neighbouring properties. However, we will review the boundary lines to address concerns about inappropriate development.</p> <p>Policies 2 and 5 recognise and seek to protect special views and preserve the essential open character of the Parish.</p> <p>The results of the survey and other consultations show a clear majority of residents in favour of limited development within existing settlement areas. The methodology by which the settlements have been identified has been subject to wide consultation and has been consistently applied.</p>

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

35	General	<p>The plan has been rushed through driven by the need to influence the development of the Molins site and introduces restrictions on the Parish and Bledlow in particular which will have long lasting limitations and effects.</p> <p>There is no identification of brown/previously developed sites on the plan other than Molins. This was despite an overwhelming comment by the public on the survey.</p> <p>Inadequate provision for the needs of young families outside of the settlement boundaries and even within the <u>totally arbitrary</u> settlement lines which will add overcrowding to these areas.</p> <p>Little account taken of the needs of agriculture for agricultural succession.</p> <p>The settlement boundaries are unduly restrictive of development in the parish outside of the conservation area. Within the settlement boundaries there is little to encourage inventiveness in terms of architecture.</p> <p>The plan seeks to restrict development outside of the Green Belt, AONB, Conservation areas, and to treat the 'open countryside' as if it should be preserved in 'aspic' for the delight of the residents rather than for agricultural activities. In fact the majority of land in the parish is agricultural and there is little evidence of agricultural land owners influencing this document.</p> <p>Wycombe District Council already make planning strict enough and this plan where it relates to Bledlow allows for very little development and encouragement of affordable housing for local young families to move into this village to help this village live and sustain its various activities. These include the Church, Village Hall, Cricket Club, Preschool, Pub and the variety of other associations within the area.</p> <p>Despite the best efforts of the planning committee the Plan is unnecessary and adds more limitations to the progress in Bledlow.</p>		<p>The timetable of the NP is largely determined by law and in our case is similar to the time taken for similar NPs in rural areas. In any event, we have extended the original timetable to allow for additional time for consultation.</p> <p>Feedback from the survey, the open meetings and subsequent consultation meetings does not favour the extensive development of housing in the parish. We have defined settlements by reference to established criteria (including sustainability) which have been used here and elsewhere. There is no realistic prospect that the NP would get through examination if we extend the housing envelope to the smaller hamlets even if this was supported by the community at large.</p> <p>Brownfield sites are defined by law. NP is not required (or able to) set out where all the brownfield sites in the Parish are located.</p> <p>Molins is an exceptional case because it is a designated brownfield site in the Local Plan.</p>
36	5.22	<p>There is not a case for extending the GB4 boundary to the western side of the Chinnor Road as this could spoil the "open" character of the village. Why submit to the lowest common denominator by easing the planning restrictions when we can still maintain the openness and wide views that we are all lucky to have in this village? Why is this side of the Chinnor Road being targeted. What is wrong with maintaining the "status quo" which has existed for decades?</p>	<p>With any lessening of planning regulations to allow infilling, this would only produce a relatively few extra houses which surely would be better achieved on the development of the former Molins site.</p>	<p>Policies 2, 5 and 6 specifically address the issue of what type of housing and what design will be considered appropriate. Any application will need to demonstrate, inter alia, that the size, location and design of a particular development is in keeping with the plot size and neighbouring properties. However, we will review the boundary lines to address concerns about inappropriate development.</p> <p>Policies 2 and 5 recognise and seek to protect special views and preserve the essential open character of the Parish.</p> <p>The results of the survey and other consultations show a clear majority of residents in favour of limited development within existing settlement areas. The methodology by which the settlements have been identified has been subject to wide consultation and has been consistently applied.</p>

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan CONSULTATION STATEMENT

36	5.34	<p>By “.....recognizing that some larger homes on sites that provide more than one dwelling may be necessary.....”this surely would compound the issues above and possibly give incentive to unscrupulous actions by residents who wish to exploit this option for profit at the expense of keeping the character of the village.</p>	<p>As above.....the Molins site provides the answer</p>	<p>Policies 2, 5 and 6 specifically address the issue of what type of housing and what design will be considered appropriate. Any application will need to demonstrate, inter alia, that the size, location and design of a particular development is in keeping with the plot size and neighbouring properties. However, we will review the boundary lines to address concerns about inappropriate development.</p> <p>Policies 2 and 5 recognise and seek to protect special views and preserve the essential open character of the Parish.</p> <p>The results of the survey and other consultations show a clear majority of residents in favour of limited development within existing settlement areas. The methodology by which the settlements have been identified has been subject to wide consultation and has been consistently applied.</p> <p>We do not know what type of development (if any) will occur at the Molins site. In any event the Plan needs to provide for limited development opportunities across the Parish in all wards and within existing settlement areas.</p>
36	<p>Anything of substance missing from the Plan?</p>	<p>Why under “Green Belt” on Page 15 is no mention made of the other GB Policies, viz. GB2 which I believe currently covers the west side (the proposed extended GB4 boundary) of the Chinnor Road. It would be interesting to compare the regulations that apply regarding these two categories that are basically separated by a road.GB4 obviously allows for infilling.....what does GB2 impose, which has been successful in maintaining the countryside feel of the village?</p>		<p>Amend Page 15 to include reference to GB2</p>

Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan
CONSULTATION STATEMENT

Appendix M – Regulation 14 Report of Statutory Consultees / Developers / Landowners and other Interested Organisations

Please see separate document