

Contact: Lucy Bellinger DDI No. 01494 421525

App No : 18/07097/OUTEA App Type : OUTEA

Application for : Outline application with all matters reserved for the construction of up to 500 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and sustainable urban drainage features

At Land Rear Of Park Mill Farm, Park Mill, Princes Risborough, Buckinghamshire

Date Received : 15/08/18 Applicant : Halsbury Homes Limited

Target date for decision: 05/12/18

1. **Summary**

- 1.1. The applicant has lodged an appeal against the non-determination of the application. The Local Planning Authority cannot therefore issue a decision on the application but needs to provide an indication of what the recommendation would have been had the Authority been in a position to determine this application.
- 1.2. The proposal relates to the construction of up to 500 dwellings on land at Park Mill Farm. The application is submitted alongside another planning application for up to 150 homes which would cover part of the land at Park Mill Farm to the east. The applicant states that both the applications are free-standing proposals, but that the smaller proposal for 150 homes can also be regarded as an initial phase of the larger scheme.
- 1.3. The whole of Park Mill Farm is allocated for housing in the 2004 Local Plan. The site is also located in the Princes Risborough Expansion Area which is allocated in the new Local Plan for comprehensive residential development.
- 1.4. Park Mill Farm has extensive planning history, with planning appeals being dismissed on 3 occasions, the last one being in 2017. There are three notable contextual changes that post-date this appeal. First is the submission and examination of the new local plan, second is the replacement of the 2012 NPPF with the 2018 edition, third is that the Council is now able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing
- 1.5. This report provides an assessment of the planning issues relating to this application. There is no objection to the principle of residential development on the site. However, it is considered that the proposal would be contrary to the development plan and emerging new Local Plan in a number of respects. The appeal will be contested for the following reasons:-
 - Insufficient transport information and resulting adverse impact on the safety and flow of users of the local highway network
 - Failure to provide suitable access across the Aylesbury railway line and lack of necessary integration of the site with Princes Risborough
 - Failure to provide and equitably contribute to the provision of infrastructure arising from the development and that is required as part of the total requirements of the Princes Risborough Expansion Area
 - In the absence of a legal agreement the scheme fails to secure appropriate provision of affordable housing
 - Failure to provide sustainable transport solutions
- 1.6. The recommendation is that the appeal is defended for the reasons set out in this report.

2. The Application

2.1. The application is in outline with all matters reserved to develop 20.78 hectares of land with up to 500 new homes. The scheme would include:-

- Public open space
- Landscaping
- Creation of a new access for vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists from the A4129 Longwick Road
- Improvements to existing public transport infrastructure

2.2. The Environmental Statement contains a number of parameter plans, the purpose of which is to inform the assessment of significant environmental effects. The plans detail:-

- Land use and heights plan (drawing DE235-107)
- Green infrastructure plan (DE235-109)
- Movement plan (DE235-108)
- Indicative Phasing Plan (DE235-110)

2.3. An illustrative masterplan is also included (drawing DE235-L-001A) with the planning application. The following parameters are set out within the Environmental Statement.

Development element	Parameter for Environmental Statement
Total site area	20.78 ha
Developable area	11.85 ha
Maximum number of dwellings	500
Average site density	42 dwellings per hectare
Maximum building height	3 storeys/12.5 m Above Ordnance Datum to top of ridge line
Area of public open space, landscaping & ecological planting	7.31 ha

2.4. These parameters within the environmental statement should also be considered as in essence 'fixed' at this point because, if permission were to be granted without fixing these parameters through planning conditions (or S106), this could result in development of a form which was inconsistent with the Environmental Impact Assessment. Or in other words, development would be consented without an assessment of its environmental impacts, in breach of the relevant EU directives. Consideration of these proposals should therefore be on the basis that the parameters within the Environmental Statement will be fixed if permission is granted.

2.5. The application site comprises agricultural land with a spur to the Longwick Road in the north eastern corner which is scrub & rough grassland. To the east of the site lies the former Leo Laboratories site where 96 new homes are under construction. A public bridleway cuts through the site from the west and links through to Longwick Road whilst another route crosses the railway line running north-south.

2.6. The application is accompanied by:

- a) Planning Statement
 - b) Design and Access Statement, including landscape strategy and open space assessment
 - c) Sustainability Statement
 - d) Energy Statement
 - e) Arboricultural Impact Assessment
 - f) Infrastructure Utilities Report
 - g) Wildlife Checklist
- 2.7. The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement. This comprises the following:-
- Non-Technical Summary
 - Socio-economics
 - Landscape and visual resources
 - Ecology and nature conservation
 - Traffic and transport
 - Air quality and odour
 - Noise and vibration
 - Water resources and flood risk
 - Cultural heritage
 - Agriculture and soil resources
 - Geology, hydrogeology, ground conditions and contamination
- 2.8. The applicant has not carried out any community involvement. The Council has widely consulted on the planning application and the responses are summarised in Appendix A of this report and are available in full on our web site.

3. Working with the applicant/agent

- 3.1. In accordance with paragraph 38 of the NPPF2 Wycombe District Council (WDC) approach decision-taking in a positive and creative way taking a proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions and work proactively with applicants to secure developments. WDC work with the applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by offering a pre-application advice service, and as appropriate updating applications/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.
- 3.2. In this instance:
- The applicant has not sought pre-application advice,
 - The applicant/agent was provided with the opportunity to submit additional information to address technical issues arising from consultation responses but chose not to do so

4. Relevant Planning History

- 4.1. 06/05685/OUTEA, Outline application for development of land to provide approximately 570 dwellings with access from Longwick Road, and associated open space and landscaping, appeal dismissed 14 June 2007.
- 4.2. 10/07225OUTEA, Outline application with all matters reserved for 380 - 400 dwellings, up to a maximum of 896 sq.m of Class B1(a), up to a maximum of 224 sq.m of Class A1 (Shops) and/or Class A2 (Financial and Professional Services) and/or Class A3 (Restaurants and Cafes) and up to 13.5 hectares of public open space comprising 2 tennis courts, 2 Multi Use Games Areas, 5 Local Areas for Play, 2 Local Equipped Areas of Play, 1 Neighbourhood Equipped Area of Play, 2 playing pitches, sports pavilion, up to a maximum of 169 sq.m, floodlighting, community woodland, orchard and allotments, refused May 2011, appeal dismissed March 2012.
- 4.3. 15/07825/OUTEA, Outline application with all matters reserved for the construction of up to 500 dwellings with public open space and landscaping. Appeal against non-determination, dismissed 21st March 2017.

- 4.4. 16/05846/OUTEA, Outline application with all matters reserved for the construction of residential development with public open space and ancillary development, withdrawn November 2016.
- 4.5. 18/07096/OUTEA, Outline application with all matters reserved for the construction of up to 150 dwellings, public open space, landscaping and sustainable urban drainage features, appeal against non-determination lodged.
- 4.6. Three previous appeals have been dismissed. The most recent, and most relevant, was a proposal for up to 500 dwellings dismissed in March 2017 by Inspector Baird (APP/K0425/W/16/3146838).
- 4.7. Inspector Baird's decision in 2017 finds firstly that policies for the supply of housing were out-of-date and that the tilted balance applied as a consequence of the LPA being unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. He continues that despite this, "LP Policy H2 is designed to deliver housing and the weight attached to its constituent elements has to be nuanced." (IR54-55) In other words there would be a perversity in setting aside a policy that is designed to deliver housing because of a failure to deliver housing.
- 4.8. He then identifies a conflict with LP Policy H2 at IR55. "The railway represents a significant physical and psychological barrier between the site and the town, the provision of an underpass would significantly improve pedestrian and cycle linkages to the town centre and in the absence of an underpass, the proposal lacks the necessary integration with the settlement." The current proposal makes no provision to deliver an underpass.
- 4.9. He attached limited weight to the loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land and significant weight to the some of the benefits arising from the scheme (IR56-57). Other benefits, he concluded, attracted only moderate weight as they relate to the provision of infrastructure directly required by the needs of the development. (IR58).
- 4.10. He says that "in the absence of a demonstration that the proposed highway mitigation measures would be acceptable, I attach considerable weight to my conclusion that the residual cumulative impacts of the development on the highway network would be severe and unacceptable" (IR59).
- 4.11. Lastly he concludes that "the residual cumulative impacts on the highway network would be severe and unacceptable. This factor coupled with the moderate weight I attach to the conflict with LP Policy H2 significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of this application when assessed against the policies of the Framework as a whole" (IR59).
- 4.12. There are three notable contextual changes that post-date this appeal. First is the submission and examination of the new local plan, second is the replacement of the 2012 NPPF with the 2018 edition, third is that the Council is now able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing.

5. Development Plan and Emerging Planning Policy

- 5.1. In considering the application, the determination must be made in accordance with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 5.2. In addition regard must be had to Section 143 of the Localism Act, which relates to the determination of planning applications. It states that in dealing with planning applications, the authority shall have regard to:
 - (a) Provision of the development plan insofar as they are material,
 - (b) Any local finance considerations, so far as they are material to the application,
 - (c) Any other material consideration.

Any local finance consideration means;

- a grant or other financial assistance that has been or will or could be provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown,
- sums a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of community infrastructure levy.

5.3. The relevant financial considerations in this instance will be CIL and New Homes Bonus.

Development Plan

5.4. For the purposes of considering this application the development plan comprises the Wycombe District Local Plan (January 2004) (as saved extended and partially replaced), the Wycombe Development Framework Core Strategy (July 2008) and the Delivery and Site Allocations Plan (July 2013).

5.5. It is considered that the following policies are the most relevant to the main issues:

Local Plan (2004): H2 (Housing Development (Allocations)) and Appendix 2

Core Strategy (2008): CS6 (Princes Risborough), CS16 (Transport), CS20 (Transport and Infrastructure) and CS21 (Contribution of development to Community Infrastructure)

Delivery and Site Allocations Plan (2013): DM2 (Transport Requirements of Development Sites) and DM19 (Infrastructure and delivery)

Emerging Development Plan

5.6. The emerging Wycombe District Local Plan (Submission Version, March 2018) was submitted for examination in March 2018. The following emerging policies are considered to be the most relevant to the main issues:

The Wycombe District Local Plan (Submission version, March 2018): PR3 (Princes Risborough Area of Comprehensive Development including Relief Road), PR4 (The Main Expansion Area Development Framework), PR6 (Main expansion area development principles), PR7 (Development Requirements), PR8 (Provision and safeguarding of transport infrastructure), PR17 (Princes Risborough Delivery of Infrastructure)

Material considerations

5.7. Material considerations which need to be taken into account include the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), the CIL Regulations, the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Guidance and Buckinghamshire County Council Local Transport Plan.

Policy weighting and consistency

5.8. As ever the starting point for any development management decision is the adopted development plan. Paragraph 213 of the NPPF highlights that existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted prior to the NPPF. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

5.9. One of the aims of the NPPF is to boost housing supply and given that Local Plan policy H2 is about delivery of the housing requirement, it is considered that this policy is consistent with the NPPF. The sites allocated for housing within policy H2 hang off the housing requirement set out within policy H1, which was based on the structure plan. The housing requirement and strategic context has moved on and changed since the Local Plan was adopted. The context behind policy H1 and H2 has changed in that the scale of housing need and the housing requirement are different. The scale of housing growth at Princes Risborough and across the District has changed such that the strategic context has moved on since the Local Plan. As such the specific housing requirement and strategy element behind H2 is out of date.

- 5.10. The wording of policy H2 says that proposals are required to take account of the Development Principles set out in Appendix 2. The principle of development providing infrastructure would be consistent with the NPPF. However, a much wider set of infrastructure requirements are now envisaged as part of the Princes Risborough expansion area in comparison to just the development of the Park Mill Farm housing allocation. As such the weight given to Appendix 2 is tempered.
- 5.11. In relation to relevant Core Strategy policies it is considered that they are consistent with the NPPF and can be said to be consistent with the achievement of sustainable development.
- 5.12. Relevant policies contained within the Delivery and Site Allocations Plan were tested through the examination process part of which was to ensure consistence with national policy in the NPPF and can thus be considered to be fully up to date in this regard.
- 5.13. The weight to be given to relevant emerging policies will be assessed in accordance with paragraph 48 of the NPPF. The New Local Plan is at an advanced stage of preparation by virtue of it being at examination, which means it can be afforded a higher degree of weight. The Council is satisfied that relevant policies in the emerging plan are totally consistent with the NPPF.
- 5.14. It is acknowledged that there are a high number of unresolved objections to the scale and location of housing growth at Princes Risborough. No substantive evidence was submitted to the EiP to challenge the Council's position that PR3 and PR4 are the most appropriate options when assessed against the reasonable alternatives. Therefore limited weight is given to policy PR3 and PR4.
- 5.15. In relation to PR6 there were very few direct objections as criticism of the policy was more focused on asserting that the Plan fails to deliver against the principles. As such moderate weight is attached to PR6.
- 5.16. There are a high number of unresolved objections to PR7 but in general these representations expressed doubt that existing infrastructure would cope and concern that new development would not deliver all required infrastructure or not deliver it soon enough. Development interests tended to object on the grounds of the overall burden of obligation placed on the development and cast doubt on the viability of the allocation. As such moderate weight is given to PR7.
- 5.17. In relation to PR8 the relief road is a controversial proposal for most sections of the community and is linked to objections about the scale of development at Princes Risborough. However, no substantive evidence was submitted to the EiP to challenge the Council's position that this is the most appropriate option when assessed against the reasonable alternatives. It was broadly accepted as a requirement by development interests. It is considered that there are substantial unresolved objections, therefore limited weight is attached to PR8.
- 5.18. In relation to policy PR17, unresolved objections tended to focus again on viability and deliverability. Objections that have been raised do not go to the principle aim of the policy which is to ensure that new development fairly and equitably delivers and contributes towards the infrastructure requirements of the whole Princes Risborough expansion area, and not compromise the full realisation of the allocation. As such it is considered that moderate weight should be afforded to emerging relevant policy PR17.

6. Main Issues and consideration

The principle and development requirements

ALP: H2 (Housing Development (Allocations)), H4 (Phasing of New Housing Development), Appendix 2 Development Principles Park Mill Farm
CSDPD: CS1 (Overarching principles - sustainable development), CS2 (Main principles for location of development), CS6 (Princes Risborough), CS12 (Housing provision), CS16

(Transport) and CS20 (Transport and Infrastructure)

DSA: DM1 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development), DM17 (Planning for Flood Risk Management, DM19 (Infrastructure and Delivery)

- 6.1. The application site is covered by the Park Mill Farm housing allocation. Park Mill Farm was allocated for housing in the Local Plan and saved policy H2 retains the allocation as site (k), with a capacity of some 570 dwellings.
- 6.2. Core Strategy policy CS6 looks to identify opportunities to provide a minimum of 480 new dwellings in Princes Risborough.
- 6.3. As such against the development plan there is no objection to the principle of housing in this location.
- 6.4. In terms of detail, Appendix 2 of the Local Plan provides a list of “development principles” to assist developers and landowners to understand the range of planning requirements. The expected development requirements for Park Mill Farm include:
 - Secure a form of development that is well integrated with Princes Risborough
 - Strong landscape structure, provision of informal and recreational open space
 - Provision of effective transport linkages to the town
 - Secondary access to Summerleys Road (for buses and emergency access)
 - A local distributor road, incorporating a loop road, between the two accesses
 - Improvement to the Longwick Road and New Road arms of the Longwick roundabout
 - Improved footway/cycle track along Longwick Road (with link from development at the north-east corner)
 - New high quality pedestrian and cycle route(s) across the Aylesbury railway line to include a route across Wades Park to give access to the town centre
 - Shared pedestrian/cycle subway under Banbury railway line
 - Start-up of bus service link with the town centre and railway station and extended hours of operation for existing services along Longwick Road
- 6.5. The application would conflict with Appendix 2 and policy H2 because it would fail to provide a new high quality pedestrian and cycle route across the railway line. The lack of this would mean that the development would not be well integrated with Princes Risborough. Although the applicant within the draft Heads of Terms has offered the provision of a bus service, in the absence of a planning obligation this is not secured.
- 6.6. The application proposes that it will “facilitate and “support” the provision and construction of a grade separated solution to crossing the railway line. The application lacks clarity on what this actually means. The application seems to allude that this would mean that the layout would not hinder an underpass being constructed by others and that the applicant would provide necessary land and access to it to allow an underpass to be constructed. But no commitment has been given as to how and when this will be achieved.
- 6.7. The three previous appeals have highlighted that the railway line presents a significant physical and psychological barrier between the site and the town. And that the provision of a railway underpass would significantly improve pedestrian and cycle linkages to the town centre. The Inspector in dismissing the last appeal stated that in the absence of an underpass, the development would lack the necessary integration with the settlement and would therefore conflict with policy H2. This application has not addressed previous Inspectors conclusions and would conflict with Local Plan policy H2 and Appendix 2, policy DM2 of the Delivery and Site Allocations Plan and policy CS16 and CS20 of the Core Strategy.

Fit with the emerging development plan

New Local Plan (Submission Version): PR3 (Princes Risborough area of comprehensive development), PR4 (The main expansion area development framework), PR17 (Princes Risborough delivery of infrastructure)

- 6.8. The emerging new Local Plan envisages a much greater scale of growth at Princes Risborough in comparison to the current development plan. In order to help meet housing needs for the District it is clear that the expansion of Princes Risborough into land to the northwest will be required to meet a proportion of the need for Wycombe District. New Local Plan policy PR3 allocates the Princes Risborough Expansion Area as an area of comprehensive development for residential development and other land uses to support the major expansion of the town. This has an indicative dwelling number of 1765 of which 1662 is indicated within the main expansion area to be delivered within the plan period.
- 6.9. The site would be located within the main expansion area set out within policy PR3 of the new Local Plan. Therefore the principle of housing development on the site would fit with the emerging Local Plan.
- 6.10. Policy PR4 sets out what is required of development within the Main Expansion Area in terms of the broad disposition and scale of land uses, green infrastructure and highway infrastructure, which is illustrated on the Concept Plan.
- 6.11. The Concept Plan contained within the new Local Plan illustrates the provision of a 2 FE primary school within the application site. It is acknowledged that the exact location of the primary school is not fixed by policy PR4. However policy PR4 does require that development within the expansion area delivers the broad disposition of elements. The logic behind the location of the primary schools as illustrated on the Concept Plan, is that it:-
 - Takes account of the location of existing primary schools in the town;
 - Minimises the need for children to cross a main road (the Longwick Road) in getting to school;
 - Would locate a primary school in each of two main development areas (north and south of the Crowbrook green corridor)
- 6.12. Evidence highlights that existing primary schools in the Princes Risborough area are close to capacity and have very limited scope to expand. Therefore to ensure sufficient education provision, a new primary school will be required early in the phasing of the expansion area. The application documentation highlights that the scheme is intended to be a first phase of development within the expansion area. But it fails to address the requirement for primary school provision and thereby does not fit with the comprehensive and equitable approach to the delivery of the expansion area and associated infrastructure set out within policy PR4, PR7 and PR17.
- 6.13. Policy PR4 also requires that land north of the railway line is safeguarded for future railway expansion. The application parameter plans and illustrative masterplan do show land safeguarded. But a planning condition would be necessary to ensure that this is carried forward through into reserved matters application(s).
- 6.14. The application parameter drawings and illustrative masterplan indicate a primary access road running through the site but this is not shown to be built up to the site boundaries. The creation of an internal primary route through the expansion area to act as a complete alternative route to the A4010 is a policy requirement of PR4, PR7, PR8 and PR17. A planning condition would be necessary to ensure that the road is built up the site boundaries so as not to prejudice the delivery of the expansion area and the whole relief road. If such a planning condition was not imposed then the proposal would prejudice the comprehensive delivery of the expansion area and be contrary to the emerging Local Plan.
- 6.15. Policies PR4, PR6 and PR7 requires that development within the main expansion area to deliver safe pedestrian and cycle crossings of the railway with particular

reference to a new underpass to Wades Park. As has been highlighted above the application does not deliver any contribution towards this piece of infrastructure which would be contrary to relevant emerging Local Plan policies that require equitable contributions for infrastructure provision.

- 6.16. Policy PR17 requires that the Princes Risborough expansion area is delivered on a comprehensive basis and in a phased manner, with each developer/application making equitable contributions to infrastructure so as to avoid piecemeal or incomplete provision. The costs of on-site infrastructure will be “offset” against financial contributions sought for off-site infrastructure, bearing in mind the need to ensure a proportionate approach to contributions from different developers. Financial contributions will be adjusted to take into account the costs of any on-site infrastructure required. This will be calibrated to be sure the full costs of the off-site requirements are still secure.
- 6.17. The application makes no provision for an equitable contribution towards the total infrastructure requirements of the expansion area which would be contrary to policy PR17.
- 6.18. The Council is developing supplementary planning guidance in the form of a site-wide detailed capacity and delivery plan(s). These will guide and inform:-
 - the detailed layout and form of development within the expansion area
 - the phasing and delivery of homes and necessary infrastructure
- 6.19. In due course the capacity and delivery plan(s) will be subject to public consultation before their adoption as supplementary planning guidance. Policy PR17 requires that until the capacity and delivery plans have been produced & approved, planning applications within the expansion area be accompanied by a detailed phasing and infrastructure delivery plan. This is so that planning applications demonstrate that the full package of on and off-site infrastructure set out within the new Local Plan can be delivered and phasing issues overcome.
- 6.20. The planning application is not accompanied by a detailed phasing and infrastructure delivery plan which would be contrary to policy PR17. Instead the application submission highlights that the scheme is a free-standing proposal. The application therefore fails to demonstrate how it would ensure and not compromise the comprehensive delivery of the expansion area including infrastructure requirements.
- 6.21. The application proposal is silent on the co-ordinated, comprehensive and equitable approach for the delivery of the Princes Risborough expansion area as set out within the new Local Plan.

Other planning issues

Affordable Housing and Housing Mix

ALP: H9 (Creating balanced communities)

CSDPD: CS13 (Affordable housing and housing mix), CS21 (Contribution of development to community infrastructure)

New Local Plan (Submission Version): DM22 (Housing Mix), DM24 (Affordable Housing), Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (POSPD)

- 6.22. The proposal fails to provide policy compliant affordable housing provision. The application states that affordable housing will be provided but on the basis of 40% of the units. However, Core Strategy policy CS13 requires affordable housing provision on the basis of bedspaces. Secondly in the absence of a legal agreement, affordable housing provision within the scheme would not be secured.

- 6.23. An indicative housing mix is suggested within the application.

House size	Indicative number of	% of housing mix
------------	----------------------	------------------

	dwellings	
1 bed flat	25	5%
2 bed flat/house	190	38%
3 bed house	160	32%
4 bed house	125	25%

6.24. This detailed aspect would be dealt with at the reserved matters stage and should be based upon current evidence of housing need. If planning permission were forthcoming it is considered that the matter of housing mix could be dealt with by way of planning condition and would be necessary in order to respond to housing needs.

Contribution to economic growth

6.25. The proposed development would bring some short term benefits during the construction phase in terms of employment and possibly an increase in local spending.

6.26. The development would deliver the benefit to the Council of a New Homes Bonus payment and CIL, but this would not be unique to this development and would still occur with comprehensive development.

Transport matters and parking

ALP: T2 (On – site parking and servicing), T4 (Pedestrian movement and provision), T5 and T6 (Cycling)

CSDPD: CS16 (Transport), CS20 (Transport and Infrastructure), CS21 (Contribution of development to community infrastructure)

DSA: DM2 (Transport requirements of development sites), DM19 (Infrastructure and Delivery)

New Local Plan (Submission Version): CP7 (Delivering the infrastructure to support growth), PR3 (Princes Risborough Area of Comprehensive Development including Relief Road), PR4 (The main expansion area development framework), PR6 (Main expansion area development principles), PR7 (Development requirements), PR17 (Princes Risborough delivery of infrastructure), DM33 (Managing Carbon Emissions, Transport and Energy Generation), DM47 (Princes Risborough to Aylesbury safeguarded land)

6.27. The application proposes the following access/transportation aspects, albeit that the matter of access is reserved for future consideration:-

- New primary access from A4129 Longwick Road
- A link road with the potential to form part of the proposed Princes Risborough relief road providing vehicular, pedestrian and cycle links to the north and south
- Connections for pedestrians and cyclists to existing rights of way network to the north east and south west and a potential connection to the adjacent Leo Laboratories site
- Provision of a walk and cycle route along the western side of Longwick Road between the site and Brooke Road;
- Additional bus stops close to the site, with bus shelters for the stop into Princes Risborough;
- Provision of a toucan crossing over Longwick Road directly to the south of the junction with Brooke Road/Wellington Avenue; and
- Provision of a new local bus service to serve the site linking to the railway station, funded for a 10 year period

6.28. The County Highway Authority have advised that there are a number of deficiencies

with the transport assessment including trip generation assumptions and local junction assessment. As such insufficient information has been submitted with the planning application to enable the highways, traffic and transportation implications of the proposed development to be properly and fully assessed. The Highway Authority is of the opinion that the proposed development is shown to have a significant impact on the operation of the local highway network, in particular the Tesco roundabout (Longwick Road/Aylesbury Road/New Road/ Duke Street/Tesco roundabout).

- 6.29. From the information submitted, it is considered that the additional traffic likely to be generated by the proposal would adversely affect the safety and flow of users of the existing local road network.
- 6.30. The application recognises the capacity issues raised and proposes to mitigate the impact of increased demand by changes to the Tesco roundabout:
- Increasing the entry width of the Longwick arm of the roundabout
 - Widening of the New Road exit arm
 - Relocation of the Zebra crossing on the Aylesbury Road arm of the junction
- 6.31. The Highway Authority has advised that the mitigation proposed to the Tesco roundabout does not address the capacity issues experienced or provide safe and suitable mitigation to deliver the changes needed to overcome the impact that the development would have on the junction.
- 6.32. The application parameter drawings and illustrative masterplan indicate a primary access road running through the site but this is not shown to be built up to the site boundaries. The creation of an internal primary route through the expansion area to act as a complete alternative route to the A4010 is a policy requirement of the expansion area. A planning condition would be necessary to ensure that the road is built up the site boundaries so as not to prejudice the delivery of the expansion area and the whole relief road. If such a planning condition was not imposed then the proposal would prejudice the comprehensive delivery of the expansion area.
- 6.33. The application makes reference to a number of transportation measures and off-site highway works. However, none of these are secured within a planning obligation. Therefore in the absence of a planning obligation, the development would fail to maximise sustainable transport options.

Railway buffer

- 6.34. The illustrative masterplan would safeguard land so as not to frustrate future double tracking of the railway line. A planning condition would be necessary to ensure that this is carried through into reserved matters application(s).

Railway crossing and public rights of way

- 6.35. The lack of underpass provision and the resulting conflict of the proposal against policy H2 and Appendix 2 is addressed above. The Highway Authority have highlighted that severance remains an issue and that without any assurance that the underpass is deliverable the site is not considered to be sustainable in transport terms.
- 6.36. In terms of consultee responses, Network Rail have highlighted that the development would result in an increase in number and change in character of users on the existing at-grade railway crossings. They recommend planning conditions to ensure that existing footpaths over the railway line are diverted and at-grade crossings closed prior to occupation of any of the new houses. It is considered that this matter could be dealt with by way of Grampian planning conditions.

Travel Plan

- 6.37. A Travel Plan framework has been submitted as part of the planning application. The approval of a detailed travel plan would need to be secured within a legal agreement.

Raising the quality of place making and design

ALP: G3 (General design policy), G7 (Development in relation to topography), G8 (Detailed Design Guidance and Local Amenity), G10 (Landscaping), G11 (Trees), G26 (Designing for safer communities), Appendix 1

CSDPD: CS19 (Raising the quality of place shaping and design)

DSA: DM11 (Green networks and infrastructure), DM16 (Open space in new development)
New Local Plan (Submission Version): CP9 (Sense of place), DM34 (Delivering Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity in Development), DM35 (Placemaking and Design Quality), PR3 (Princes Risborough area of comprehensive development including relief road), PR4 (Main expansion area development framework), PR6 (Main expansion area development principles), PR7 (Development requirements), PR17 (Princes Risborough delivery of infrastructure)

- 6.38. At the outline stage, the issue to assess is whether the site can accommodate the level of development proposed taking into account site constraints and other land requirements, such as the provision of public open space. The dispersal of development and the type of land uses, as illustrated on the parameter plans, can also be considered at the outline application stage. The application is in outline form with all matters reserved. However an illustrative masterplan has been submitted and the Environmental Statement (ES) contains development parameters.
- 6.39. The average site density would equate to 42 dwellings per hectare (dph). The Concept Plan contained within the new Local Plan illustrates a range of densities figures of 25 to 38 dwellings per hectare across the expansion area. Areas of higher density development are envisaged on the application site in comparison to other parts of the expansion area, given the sites' closeness to the existing town centre and regard to views from the AONB. A density of 41 dph was accepted by the Inspector at the last appeal. It is considered that the quantum of development can be accommodated in an acceptable manner on the site.
- 6.40. There are a number of layout aspects of the illustrative masterplan that would need to be addressed by planning conditions and at the reserved matters stage to ensure acceptable place-making and design quality.
- 6.41. Although it is considered that the quantum of development could fit on the site, the emerging Local Plan envisages a primary school being located on the site. The absence of a school from the application has implications for the comprehensive delivery of the expansion area and for meeting educational needs, which is detailed elsewhere within this report.

Amenity of existing and future residents

ALP: G8 (Detailed design guidance and local amenity), H19 (Residents amenity space and gardens) Appendix 1

CSDPD: CS19 (Raising the quality of place shaping and design)

New Local Plan (Submission Version): DM35 (Placemaking and Design Quality), DM40 (Internal space standards)

- 6.42. As the application is in outline form, with scale, layout and appearance reserved for future consideration, matters such as safeguarding the amenity of existing and proposed residents would be addressed through reserved matters application(s).

Environmental issues

ALP: G15 (Noise), G16 (Light pollution)

CSDPD: CS18 (Waste, natural resources and pollution)

New Local Plan (Submission Version): CP7 (Delivering the infrastructure to support growth), DM20 (Matters to be determined in accordance with the NPPF)

- 6.43. Environmental issues relevant to planning include potential disturbance due to noise from traffic and from the adjacent railway line, land contamination and pollution, including odour from the adjacent sewage treatment works.
- 6.44. If planning permission were forthcoming a number of planning conditions would be necessary in relation to contamination, odour and noise protection in order to safeguard future residents and minimise any potential environmental risk.

Flooding and drainage

CSDPD: CS1 (Overarching principles - sustainable development), CS18 (Waste, natural resources and pollution)

DSA: DM17 (Planning for flood risk management)

New Local Plan (Submission Version): CP12 (Climate Change), PR7 (Development requirements), DM39 (Managing Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage Systems)

- 6.45. The Lead Local Flood Authority have raised a holding objection and requested that further information be submitted in relation to surface and ground water flood risk and the drainage strategy. It is considered that these matters could be addressed by planning conditions and are not issues that are fundamental to the application in flooding and drainage terms.
- 6.46. An ordinary watercourse runs through the site and the site is at risk of surface water flooding. The area also has naturally high groundwater levels.
- 6.47. Although the masterplan is illustrative, the application has failed to take a sequential approach to the location of development within the site because it appears as though development would be located within areas at risk of flooding. Part of the access road would be located within an area identified to be at risk of surface water flooding. These aspects could be addressed at reserved matters stage and is not fundamental to the scheme.
- 6.48. Although the FRA acknowledges that bridge design will ensure a safe route of access & egress, the application is lacking in detail to demonstrate how flood risk will be overcome by design. The FRA has also failed to take account of climate change in relation to the watercourse & associated surface water flood risk. It is considered that these matters could be addressed by planning conditions and is not fundamental to the scheme.
- 6.49. The County Council has carried out groundwater flood modelling which has identified that the site is at risk of groundwater emergence of 5mm across the whole site for a 10% annual exceedance probability flood event. The risk of groundwater flooding has not been adequately addressed by the application and proposed mitigation is insufficient. This would need to be addressed by planning condition and is not fundamental to the scheme.
- 6.50. The Lead Local Flood Authority has criticised the application's drainage strategy. This needs to be revised to demonstrate that the development would include an appropriate surface water drainage scheme based on sustainable drainage principles in order to manage flood risk. This could be addressed by way of planning conditions.
- 6.51. Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing waste and water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of the development. Thames Water have therefore recommended that should planning permission be forthcoming that it be subject to a planning condition to ensure that drainage infrastructure is in place to cater for the water supply and wastewater flows from the development, thereby avoiding any increased risk of sewerage flooding or pollution from the development. The Environment Agency has also suggested a similar planning condition. It is considered that such a Grampian style planning condition would be necessary and reasonable.

Landscape and visual impact

ALP: L1 (Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty),
CSDPD: CS17 (Environmental assets)
DSA: DM11 (Green networks and infrastructure), DM13 (Conservation and enhancements of sites, habitats and species of biodiversity and geodiversity importance), DM15 (Protection and enhancement of river and stream corridors)
New Local Plan (Submission Version): CP9 (Sense of place), DM30 (Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) DM32 (Landscape character and Settlement Patterns) DM34 (Delivering Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity in Development)

- 6.52. The site is not located within the AONB but is visible from viewpoints within the AONB. It is considered that subject to the inclusion of meaningful and robust green infrastructure within the site layout, appropriate building design & materials the development would not harm the special qualities of the Chilterns AONB. The sites area and quantum of development sought would allow scope for appropriate green infrastructure to be incorporated into the layout, which would be dealt with at the reserved matters stage and/or by planning condition.
- 6.53. It is noted that Natural England have not objected and consider that the proposal will not compromise the special qualities of purposes of designation of the Chilterns AONB.
- 6.54. The Chilterns Conservation Board have submitted a detailed representation which neither objects nor supports but echoes the comments that they have made at the Local Plan examination. Their request is that the planning application should be determined after the Inspector has reported on the new Local Plan. But in the event of this not happening they recommend that siting and layout is determined at the outline stage; that development is confined to the eastern part of the site; and that the LVIA specifically addresses how design, layout & density takes account of views from the escarpment.
- 6.55. Because an appeal against non-determination has been lodged the Council cannot now make a decision on the application. However, the Inspectors report on the new Local Plan shall have a bearing on the appeal. It is considered that detailed design and layout matters can be adequately addressed at the reserved matters stage to avoid harm to the Chilterns AONB.

Archaeology

CSDPD: CS17 (Environmental Assets)
New Local Plan (Submission Version): CP9 (Sense of place), CP11 (Historic Environment), DM31 (Development Affecting the Historic Environment)

- 6.56. The County Archaeologist has noted that archaeological evaluation of the site has taken place which has not highlighted any significant remains. As such no planning conditions are necessary in relation to archaeology.

Agricultural land

- 6.57. The NPPF sets out government policy to protect agricultural land, which is that decisions should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. The best and most versatile agricultural land is in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the agricultural land classification. The development plan does not contain a policy which reflects this aspect of the NPPF.
- 6.58. Supporting application information concludes that the land is classified as 13.7 ha of grade 2, 4.6 ha of grade 3a and 0.7 ha of grade 3b. Therefore 19 ha of the site would be best and most versatile agricultural land.

6.59. The loss of some high quality agricultural land would cause some harm. However, given the need to meet the housing needs of the District, the weight of harm is limited, as per the last appeal decision.

Ecology

CSDPD: CS17 (Environmental assets)

DSA: DM13 (Conservation and enhancement of sites, habitats and species of biodiversity and geodiversity importance), DM14 (Biodiversity in development)

New Local Plan (Submission Version): DM34 (Delivering Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity in Development)

6.60. The application includes as part of the Environmental Statement detailed ecological surveys (bats, badgers, newts, reptiles and breeding birds) and proposes a series of mitigation measures. The site largely comprises arable farmland, however a number of other habitat types are present including trees and developing woodland, scrub, semi-improved grassland, hedgerows and a watercourse.

6.61. Under Regulation 9(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 “a competent authority, in exercising any of its functions, must have regard to the requirements of the Directives so far as they may be affected by the exercise of those functions.” Regard also has to be given to Regulation 43 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and Article 12 of the Habitats Directive as to whether a criminal offence for European Protected Species (EPS) animals (such as bats) is likely to be committed.

Protected species

6.62. Surveys have confirmed:-

- No badger setts currently present on the site
- No bat roosts within the site
- Small numbers of grass snake are present, mitigation will be implemented
- Great crested newts absent from the site
- Mitigation will be needed prior to vegetation removal to protect breeding birds
- Site unlikely to support any notable invertebrate populations

Protected habitats

6.63. The site lies close (approx. 1.5 km) to statutory habitats – a SSSI and the Chilterns Beechwood Special Area of Conservation (SAC). It is considered that either alone or in combination with other projects, the proposal would not be likely to have a significant effect on the above protected sites and that permission may be granted (subject to other planning considerations) under the terms of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations.

6.64. The Local Planning Authority, as the competent authority has had regard to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, which is the principal means by which the Habitats Directive is transposed in England and Wales. It is considered given the assessment of effects on statutory designations set out within the Environmental Statement, that the development would not be likely to have a significant effect on a European site and is not directly connected or necessary to the management of that site.

6.65. Planning conditions will be necessary to secure ecological mitigation and enhancement measures to maintain and enhance the ecological potential of the site.

Building sustainability

CSDPD: CS18 (Waste, natural resources and pollution)

DSA: DM18 (Carbon reduction and water efficiency)

New Local Plan (Submission Version): DM33 (Managing carbon emissions: transport and energy generation)

6.66. Following the Adoption of the Delivery and Site Allocations Plan (July 2013) and in particular policy DM18 (Carbon Reduction and Water Efficiency) it would have previously been necessary to impose a condition to secure the required 15% reduction in carbon emissions as well as reducing future demand for water associated with the new homes. However, this issue has been transferred to Building Regulations. As such it would only be necessary to condition water efficiency.

Public open space

CSDPD: CS21 (Contribution of development to community infrastructure)

DSA: DM16 (Open space in new development), DM19 (Infrastructure and delivery)

New Local Plan (Submission Version): CP7 (Delivering the infrastructure to support growth), PR4 (The main expansion area development framework), Comprehensive approach to the expansion area), PR6 (Expansion area development principles), PR7 (Development requirements), PR17 (Princes Risborough delivery of infrastructure)

6.67. It is considered that the parameter plans & illustrative masterplan would allow for appropriate open space to be provided in accordance with development plan policy and that envisaged within the Princes Risborough expansion area. Planning obligations and conditions would be necessary to ensure the appropriate quantum, delivery timing and management of open space provision.

6.68. The green infrastructure parameter plan would reflect open/green space provision as per the concept plan for the expansion area in that it would illustrate:

- A green corridor along the railway line
- North-south “green” lanes focused on existing rights of way

6.69. However, it is noted that the parkland buffer to the railway line is annotated as being 20m wide, while the new Local Plan states that a minimum width of 25m (comprising 15m safeguarded for future double tracking of the railway line and a further 10m corridor) is needed to create a linear park. It is considered that this aspect can be addressed at the reserved matters stage and will not materially impact on the quantum of development that can be accommodated on the site.

6.70. To accord with development plan policy DM16 the scheme would be required to make provision for 5.35 Ha of open space provision comprising both local and strategic open space. The Design and Access Statement states that 7.31 ha of open space is proposed, thereby exceeding the requirement set out within policy DM16.

6.71. In the absence of a planning obligation, the development fails to secure the provision of open space in accordance with the development plan and emerging planning policies.

Education provision

CSDPD: CS21 (Contribution of development to community infrastructure)

DSA: DM19 (Infrastructure and delivery)

New Local Plan (Submission Version): CP7 (Delivering the infrastructure to support growth), PR4 (The main expansion area development framework), PR6 (Expansion area development principles), PR7 (Development requirements), PR17 (Princes Risborough delivery of infrastructure)

6.72. Para 94 of the NPPF states the importance of the need to provide sufficient choice of school places to meet the needs of existing and new communities. The NPPF highlights that local planning authorities should give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools through preparing plans and in decision making.

6.73. The Education Authority have confirmed that based on current pupil/population migration trends and housing permissions there will be a deficit of school places in the area. The Education Authority intends to create some additional capacity by

expanding two existing schools at Great Kimble and Princes Risborough which would result in a small surplus to accommodate approximately 260 homes.

- 6.74. The Princes Risborough expansion area will need to deliver two new primary schools in order to meet the educational needs arising from housing growth (policy PR7). Policy PR4 and the Concept Plan indicate a new primary school each side of the Longwick Road within the two main development areas. The location of the new schools set out within the new Local Plan reflects Department for Education guidance on the location of new schools.
- 6.75. The planning application does not deliver and make equitable contributions for education provision and is therefore in conflict with the emerging new Local Plan. The Education Authority have highlighted that the proposal puts the County at risk of not being able to meet its statutory duty to provide sufficient school places to meet demand generated from the Princes Risborough expansion area.
- 6.76. The planning application is not accompanied by a detailed phasing and infrastructure delivery plan which would be contrary to emerging policy PR17. Instead the application submission highlights that the scheme is a free standing proposal. The application therefore fails to demonstrate how it would ensure and not compromise the comprehensive delivery of education infrastructure requirements of the total expansion area.
- 6.77. As such the application would not be consistent with the co-ordinated and equitable approach for the delivery of infrastructure that is necessary for the Princes Risborough expansion area. The application would fail to accord with policy PR17 in that it would not provide on-site infrastructure and equitable contributions towards infrastructure requirements across the expansion area.

Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

CSDPD: CS21 (Contribution of development to community infrastructure)

DSA: DM19 (Infrastructure and delivery)

New Local Plan (Submission Version): CP7 (Delivering the infrastructure to support growth), PR3 (Princes Risborough area of comprehensive development including relief road), PR4 (the main expansion area development framework), PR6 (Main expansion area development principles), PR7 (Development requirements), PR8 (Provision and safeguarding of transport infrastructure), PR17 (Princes Risborough delivery of infrastructure)

- 6.78. In the absence of a planning obligation the development would fail to make provision for infrastructure both on and off-site that is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
- 6.79. The development is a type of development where CIL would be chargeable. The amount of CIL that this development would be liable to pay is approximately £7.3m. There would be infrastructure that the development would need to make provision for by way of either direction provision or equitable contributions to ensure that it accords with development plan and emerging planning policy. It is also necessary for the development to make equitable and timely contributions towards infrastructure associated with the Princes Risborough expansion area. In the absence of this being offered the development would prejudice comprehensive delivery of the whole expansion area.
- 6.80. The application submission includes a list of heads of terms proposed by the applicant. This includes:-
- A contribution towards primary education facilities
 - Provision of sustainable urban drainage
 - Provision and management of open space
 - Compliance with a travel plan
 - Provision of a bus service

- Provision of a considerate construction plan
 - Provision of affordable housing
 - Facilitating the provision of a pedestrian/cycle path under the Aylesbury railway line
- 6.81. Policy PR17 of the new Local Plan requires that new development within the Princes Risborough expansion area delivers on-site infrastructure and equitable contributions for off-site infrastructure across the total requirements of the expansion area. The applicant's draft heads of terms and the planning application are silent and makes no provision to accord with the requirements of policy PR17. The application is presented on the basis of free-standing proposal which would be contrary to the comprehensive equitable approach for the Princes Risborough expansion area as set out within the new Local Plan.
- 6.82. Therefore the application would fail to make developer contributions & direct infrastructure provision that is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and reasonable.
- 6.83. As part of the appeal, aspects regarding the direct provision of and equitable contributions towards infrastructure could be addressed if the applicant entered into a suitable Section 106 legal agreement to secure relevant planning obligations.

Housing supply and need

ALP: H2 (Housing Allocations), H4 (Phasing of New Housing Development)

CSDPD: CS1 (Overarching principles - sustainable development), CS2 (Main principles for location of development), CS6 (Princes Risborough), CS8 (Reserve Locations for Future Development), CS12 (Housing provision)

New Local Plan (Submission Version): CP4 (Delivering Homes)

- 6.84. Currently, the Council can demonstrate significantly more than a five year supply of housing against local housing need. 8.5 years of housing supply can be demonstrated.
- 6.85. Paragraph 73 of the new NPPF published in July 2018 sets out that "Local planning authorities should identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirement set out in adopted strategic policies, or against their local housing need where the strategic policies are more than five years old". The most recently adopted strategic housing policies for Wycombe District are in the Core Strategy which was adopted in 2008 and as such they are more than five years old.
- 6.86. The Council submitted the new local plan for examination in March 2018 based on the Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) as set out in the Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) Addendum. The plan has been subject to a number of hearing sessions, however, at this stage it still remains the case that until the Council adopts the Local Plan full weight cannot be given to the housing requirements set out in the Local Plan. However the publication of the Main Modifications to the Plan gives an indication of the Inspector's 'direction of travel' and when the Inspector's report is received very substantial weight can be attached to the housing requirements set out in the Local Plan.
- 6.87. As such until the Local Plan is adopted, local housing need is calculated using the standard methodology as set out in the NPPG. The minimum annual local housing need for Wycombe in 2018 is 453 dwellings per year.
- 6.88. The most up to date published data on housing supply is contained in the Interim Position Statement on Five Year Housing Land Supply (January 2019), which sets out an update to the position in the Annual Monitoring Report published in March 2018. This shows a supply of 4,019 dwellings against a requirement, including a 5% buffer in line with NPPF paragraph 73, of 2,378 for the period 2017-22. This amounts to an 8.5 years supply.

6.89. The Council will update its 5 year housing land supply assessment further in due course, including updating the assessment to a 31st March 2018 base date, taking account of any Government policy changes and progress with the Local Plan.

Conclusion

6.90. This section brings together the assessment that has so far been set out in order to weigh and balance relevant planning considerations in order to reach a conclusion on the application.

6.91. In determining the planning application, section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In addition, Section 143 of the Localism Act amends Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act relating to the determination of planning applications and states that in dealing with planning applications, the authority shall have regard to:

- a) Provision of the development plan insofar as they are material
- b) Any local finance considerations, so far as they are material to the application (in this case, CIL)
- c) Any other material considerations

6.92. As set out above it is considered that the proposed development would conflict with a number of development plan policies and emerging policies in the new Local Plan.

6.93. The NPPF (para 15) highlights that the planning system should be genuinely plan-led and para 49 and 50 set out guidance on premature planning applications being determined when an emerging plan is at an advanced stage.

6.94. The new Local Plan, albeit not yet formally part of the development plan for the area, is at an advanced stage having been submitted for examination in March 2018 with hearings session having taken place in July and September 2018. It is clear that the new Local Plan is at an advanced stage. The new Local Plan proposes significant expansion of Princes Risborough but there are unresolved objections to the scale and location of housing growth. The extent of housing growth at Princes Risborough is clearly a matter that is being examined through the new Local Plan process and should not be a decision as part of the development management process/Section 78 appeal. Therefore an argument that the application is premature could be justified.

6.95. There is a scenario that the Inspector examining the new Local Plan may not support the scale of growth at Princes Risborough. Therefore in this context, a grant of permission would predetermine issues relating to scale, location and phasing that would be determined as part of the new Local Plan. A grant of permission has the potential to harm the emerging plan by allowing housing against the Local Plan Inspector saying that the new Local Plan proposes the wrong scale of development at Princes Risborough.

6.96. As the planning inquiry is not going to be heard until September, the position regarding prematurity is highly likely to have changed when the appeal is being heard. By that stage the new Local Plan is likely to have been adopted, as such prematurity would not be an issue. At this stage it is considered that the harm arising from a premature grant of permission would weigh against the proposal.

6.97. In considering other material considerations, the proposal has also been assessed against policies of the NPPF and found to be in conflict particularly in relation to delivering a sufficient supply of homes, promoting healthy and safe communities, promoting sustainable transport and achieving well-designed places. Overall, it is considered that the proposal does not represent sustainable development. Officers conclude that the adverse impacts of the proposal significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole.

6.98. As set out above, the Council can currently demonstrate a five year supply of housing sites when assessed against local housing need. The proposal is contrary to the

development plan and emerging planning policies for the reasons set out in the report. Therefore it will be contested through the appeal.

Recommendation: Minded to refuse

1. That had the Authority been in a position to determine this application, permission would have been refused for the following reasons:

1. Insufficient information has been submitted with the planning application to enable the highways, traffic and transportation implications of the proposed development to be properly and fully assessed. From the information submitted, it is considered that the additional traffic likely to be generated by the proposal would adversely affect the safety and flow of users of the existing local road network. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to policies CS16 (Transport) and CS20 (Transport and Infrastructure) of the Adopted Core Strategy DPD, policy DM2 (Transport Requirements of Development Sites) of the Delivery and Site Allocation Plan, policies CP7 (Delivering the Infrastructure to Support Growth), PR4 (The Main Expansion Area Development Framework), PR8 (Provision and Safeguarding of Transport Infrastructure), DM33 (Managing Carbon Emissions: Transport and Energy Generation) of the Wycombe District Council Local Plan Submission Version, the aims of the Buckinghamshire Local Transport Plan 4 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development fails to provide safe, convenient and attractive access on foot and by cycle across the Aylesbury railway line, particularly to link the proposed development directly with the town centre. The absence of such route(s) results in an unsatisfactory degree of integration of the development with Princes Risborough, would not maximise opportunities for walking and cycling as an alternative means of transport to the car. It would also prejudice the wider delivery and integration of the Princes Risborough residential expansion area. As such the proposed development would be contrary to policies CS16 (Transport), CS20 (Transport and Infrastructure) of the Adopted Core Strategy DPD, Policy DM2 (Transport Requirements of Development Sites) of the Adopted Delivery and Site Allocation Plan, policy H2 and Appendix 2 of the Adopted Local Plan, policies CP7 (Delivering the Infrastructure to Support Growth), PR4 (The Main Expansion Area Development Framework), PR6 (Main Expansion Area Development Principles), PR7 (Development Requirements) and PR17 (Princes Risborough Delivery of Infrastructure) of the Wycombe District Council Local Plan (Submission Version), the aims of the Buckinghamshire Local Transport Plan 4 and the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The development would not safeguard, deliver and equitably contribute for on and off-site infrastructure arising from the development and for infrastructure across the total requirements of the for the Princes Risborough expansion area. As such the development would prejudice the comprehensive delivery of the Princes Risborough expansion area as set out within the Wycombe District Local Plan (Submission Version). The development would be contrary to policies CS19 (Raising the Quality of Place Shaping and Design), CS18 (Waste/Natural Resources and Pollution), CS21 (Contribution of Development to Community Infrastructure) of the Adopted Core Strategy DPD, policy DM16 (Open Space in New Development) and DM19 (Infrastructure and Delivery) of the Delivery and Site Allocations DPD, policies CP7 (Delivering the Infrastructure to Support Growth), PR3 (Princes Risborough Area of Comprehensive Development including Relief Road), PR4 (The Main Expansion Area Development Framework), PR6 (Expansion Area Development Principles), PR7 (Development Requirements), PR8 (Provision and Safeguarding of Transport Infrastructure), PR17 (Princes Risborough Delivery of Infrastructure) of the Wycombe District Local Plan (Submission Version) and the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.

4. The development fails to make adequate provision and secure affordable housing as such it would not contribute to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the required level of affordable housing the development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; Policy CS13 (Affordable Housing and Housing Mix) of the Adopted Core Strategy DPD, policy DM24 (Affordable Housing) of the Wycombe District Local Plan (Submission Version) and the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.

5. In the absence of a legal agreement the development would fail to make adequate provision to maximise sustainable travel options. The development will therefore be heavily reliant on the use of the private car contrary to policy CS20 (Transport and Infrastructure) of the Adopted Core Strategy DPD (Adopted July 2008), policy DM2 (Transport Requirements of Development Sites) of the Delivery and Site Allocations Plan July 2013) and policies CP7 (Delivering the Infrastructure to Support Growth), PR7 (Princes Risborough Development Requirements), PR8 (Provision and Safeguarding of Transport Infrastructure), PR17 (Princes Risborough Delivery of Infrastructure) and DM33 (Managing Carbon Emissions: Transport and Energy Generation) of the New Local Plan Submission Version, the National Planning Policy Framework and the aims of Buckinghamshire's Local Transport Plan 4.

INFORMATIVE(S)

1. In accordance with paragraph 38 of the NPPF2 Wycombe District Council (WDC) approach decision-taking in a positive and creative way taking a proactive approach to development proposals focused on solutions and work proactively with applicants to secure developments. WDC work with the applicants/agents in a positive and proactive manner by offering a pre-application advice service, and as appropriate updating applications/agents of any issues that may arise in the processing of their application.

2. This application is the subject of an appeal against non-determination. The reasons for refusal are therefore the reasons that the Local Planning authority will defend at the forthcoming public inquiry. Please note that reasons for refusal 2, 3, 4 and 5 could be overcome if the applicant were to enter into an appropriate Section 106 legal agreement to secure relevant planning obligations.

- 2. To note that the Head of Planning and Sustainability will defend the appeal lodged against the non-determination of this planning application in line with these reasons, appropriately amended to reflect and align with any modifications to and progress of the New Wycombe District Local Plan and publication of Inspectors Report.**

