

## 1. Summary of key themes across all the feedback received

This first section analyses the comment themes per feedback form/feedback response, not per feedback question. This represents an overview of the number of times a specific theme/issue was mentioned per form. For example, if a respondent mentioned concerns over parking provision three times, this still counts as it only being mentioned by one person.

### Allocation and design

- Three people felt that the village had not been defined appropriately.
- 16 people felt that other sites, or more sites, should be included.
- Two people felt that the sites were evenly spread.
- Eight people felt that the proposed developments are of too high density but two people thought the density was appropriate.
- Eight people felt that the sites proposed are too large.
- Three people felt that 160 was too many houses.
- However, two commented that limiting developments would be damaging to farmers and one commented that policy has changed and this figure can now be increased.
- Six people felt that the infill/windfall calculations are inaccurate.
- Three people felt that there should be more affordable housing provision, but one person commented that the current affordable requirements should be reduced.
- Nine people felt that the plans for a shop were good, but three thought it would not be viable.
- Two people commented that any additional facilities must not burden the parish and two questioned who would be responsible for maintaining open spaces.
- One person felt that there would be no community benefits to the site.
- Nine people commented that there were not enough school places to meet the increase in demand, however, one person felt the provision was adequate.
- Two people felt doctors and other services could not support demand.
- Two people were concerned that developments would overlook existing homes.
- Nine people felt that the proposed developments would pose a flood risk.
- Five people had pollution concerns (light, noise, traffic).
- One person commented that they were pleased with the solar panel provision, however, one person felt more could be done to use renewable resources.

### Traffic and transport

- 15 people felt that the current road system is too dangerous to support more development.
- Nine people felt that the developments would create too much traffic.
- Three people commented that any proposed traffic calming measures need to be agreed with residents.
- Five people felt that the developments did not have enough parking provision, however, one person did feel there was too much parking allocated and it de-incentivised people from using public transport.

- 14 people felt that more needed to be done to improve pedestrian, cyclist and horse rider safety and access.
- Six people felt that there needed to be improvements to public transport in the area.

### Setting and ecology

- Eight people felt that the developments posed harm/damaged green spaces in the village and its rural character but one person did comment that the landscaping was good.
- Four people felt that the plans did not take into account the views and the AONB, however, one person commented that the plans were respectful of views.
- Three people commented that the developments would destroy Grade II agricultural land.
- 14 people felt that more needed to be done in order to protect wildlife and biodiversity with one person commenting that the wildlife mitigation measures were appropriate.
- 10 people felt that more needed to be done to protect the hedgerows, one person thought the current mitigation measures were appropriate.

### Planning approach

- Four people commented that they agree to all 5 sites.
- Four people said that they felt the residents' voices have been listened to and the consultation has been thorough.
- Two people commented that archaeological protections need to be included in the plans.
- Five people felt that the Community Survey had been ignored.
- Two people commented that the plans are not in accordance with the Wycombe Local Plan.
- One person felt the planning group is not credible and biased.
- Six people felt that the phased approach was not correct.

## **2. Summary per question on the feedback form or comment related to each question**

This second section includes the responses per specific question on the feedback form or comments relating to each question. This demonstrates the amount of times a specific theme was mentioned per question. For example, if a respondent mentioned concerns over parking provision for KIM 2, Site 10 and Site 15, the response would be noted under each question.

### KIM 1 – Settlement boundaries

#### NEGATIVE

- Five were unhappy that sites in other areas of village were not included.
- Three felt that the definition of the village was inappropriate.
- Three asked if sites could be included outside of the designated boundary as these would impact the village too.
- Two said that the development does not create an appropriate core and is too spread out.
- Two commented that the proposed calculations for infill/windfall were not appropriate.
- One mentioned that the plans were damaging to the countryside.

#### POSITIVE

None

### KIM 2 – Design principles

#### NEGATIVE

- Five commented that not enough parking spaces has been allocated but one felt that too much parking had been allocated.
- Two felt that more wildlife protection is needed and more hedges need to be preserved.
- Two commented that more sites are needed in order to decrease density of the current developments.
- Two highlighted that more work needs to be done to preserve views.
- One was concerned that there was no reference to affordable or specialist housing.

#### POSITIVE

- One said that they were pleased there was provision for solar panels.
- One felt the landscaping was good.
- One felt that the developments were respectful of views.

### KIM 3 – Housing site allocations

#### NEGATIVE

- Five felt that not enough sites had been chosen.

- Six felt that the proposed developments are too high density.
- Four felt there was an unfair spread of sites around the village.
- Two commented that there were not enough small properties or affordable included.
- One felt that there was not enough pedestrian/cyclist/horse rider provision.
- One felt that the proposed allocation for windfall was too low.
- One felt that the developments were too visually intrusive.
- One highlighted a flood risk.

POSITIVE

None

#### KIM 4 – Schools

NEGATIVE

- Nine felt that there were not enough school places to meet the increase in demand.
- Four felt that the road near the school was too dangerous.

POSITIVE

- One said that the school provision was adequate.

#### KIM 5 – Landscape buffer

NEGATIVE

- Five felt that the definition of 'small scale' was too vague.
- Two mentioned that the buffer should be expanded to both sides of Smokey Row.
- One felt that the allocation was not comprehensive enough.
- One felt that the development will have an adverse impact on the countryside and green spaces.

POSITIVE

None

#### KIM 6 – Employment

NEGATIVE

- Two commented that there are already too many commuters.
- Two claimed there would be no increased employment.
- Two were worried that limiting developments would be damaging to farmers.

POSITIVE

None

## KIM 7 – Community and leisure uses

### NEGATIVE

- Two wanted reassurance that additional facilities must not be a burden to the parish.
- One felt the shop is not viable.
- One commented that more facilities are needed for the elderly and disabled.
- One commented that more pedestrian/cyclist provisions are needed.
- One was concerned as to who would be responsible for maintaining the open spaces.

### POSITIVE

None

## KIM 8 – Protecting international habitats

### NEGATIVE

- Six felt that more needs to be done to protect wildlife and biodiversity.
- Six were concerned that the ancient hedgerows would not be adequately protected.
- One was concerned about pollution in ponds.
- One felt that any development on green space is harmful.

### POSITIVE

- One felt that the mitigation measures were appropriate.

## Site 1 – Land at Grove Land (Left of Free Church)

### NEGATIVE

- Seven mentioned that the road is too dangerous for the proposed development.
- Three felt that parking provision is inadequate.
- Three thought that the proposal was too high density/too many units.
- Two mentioned a flood risk on the site.
- Two were in opposition to the shop.
- Two were concerned about maintaining hedgerows and wildlife in watercourses.
- One felt that not enough affordable is included.
- One felt that the development was not considerate of views or the setting of AONB.

### POSITIVE

- Five are in support of the shop.
- Two felt that that the number of units was appropriate.
- Two mentioned they are in support of development on the site.
- One is pleased that the development will not overlook the existing homes.

### Site 10 – Land at the Laurels

#### NEGATIVE

- 14 mentioned that the road is too dangerous to accommodate the proposed development.
- Three felt that that the road is inappropriate for development as there is already too much traffic.
- Five were concerned by the lack of footpath.
- Five felt that parking provision is inadequate.
- Five thought the proposal was too high density/too many units.
- One thought the gardens were too small.
- Seven were concerned about a flood risk on site.
- One was concerned by sewage issues.

#### POSITIVE

- One commented that the rating for transport should be changed to 'lively positive effect' due to rail and bus links.

### Site 14 - Least east of Kimblewick Rd (Behind the Swan PH)

#### NEGATIVE

- Eight thought the proposal was too high density/too many units.
- Six commented that the site is too large.
- Six felt that the road is inappropriate for development as there is already too much traffic.
- Two felt that parking provision is inadequate.
- Four thought that there needs to be a footpath/cycle/horse rider provision included.
- Four were opposed to development as it is Grade II agricultural land.
- Two felt that the development would impact the rural character of the village.
- One felt the proposals are not considerate of views or setting in the AONB.
- One has concerns over destruction to wildlife and hedgerows.
- One is concerned by the lighting and fencing.
- One is concerned with pollution; (traffic, light, noise).

#### POSITIVE

None

### Site 15 – Land at Grove Lane (Behind Redding Court)

#### NEGATIVE

- Seven thought the proposal was too high density/too many units.
- Five were unhappy the development will overlook existing properties.

- Four thought that the road is dangerous and there is already too much traffic to accommodate the proposed development.
- Two felt that parking provision is inadequate.
- Two felt that a footpath/ footway is needed.
- One felt concerned that there was not enough room to upgrade the railway.
- Four felt the proposed houses are too high and will ruin the view and the AONB setting.
- One has concerns over destruction to habitats.
- Two were concerned by the flood risk on the site.

#### POSITIVE

- Two mentioned that the site was sensible for development.
- Two felt that improvements to the bridge and roads should be made before the work on the development begins.

#### Site 17A Doe Hill Farm (Lower plot by Brook Cottage)

#### NEGATIVE

- Six thought the proposal was too high density/too many units.
- One thought that the site is too large.
- Three felt that the road is too dangerous to accommodate the proposed development.
- One felt the footpath needs to be improved.
- One felt that parking provision is inadequate.
- Two felt that views and the AONB setting had not been considered.
- Three were concerned by the flood risk on the site.
- One is opposed to the development on green spaces.
- One is opposed to the development as it is on Grade II agricultural land.

#### POSITIVE

- Three mentioned that the site was sensible for development.
- One felt that more units could be included in this site.
- One commented that this development was low density.

#### Other comments

#### NEGATIVE

- Size and density of sites
- Seven felt that the proposals are too high density/too many units.
- Five felt that the sites are too big.
- Three felt that future windfall has not been appropriately considered.
- Three mentioned that there needs to be more affordable housing.
- One commented that the area does not need more development and it can go elsewhere.

- One commented that 160 new homes is an unnecessarily large figure.

#### POSITIVE

- Four felt that residents' voices have been listened to and the consultation has been thorough.
- Four mentioned that they agree to the five sites.
- Two said they were happy the developments were evenly spread around the village.
- One mentioned that the density of the developments was appropriate.
- One felt that the number of proposed homes could increase as policy has changed.
- Two felt the shop was good.
- One commented that they are glad to see the hedgerows are protected.

#### Infrastructure

##### NEGATIVE

- Seven felt that more infrastructure improvements were needed.
- Two felt that improvements to public transport are needed.
- One commented that the railway service report was inaccurate.
- One commented that there should be more solar and water storage.
- One felt that a shop/café is not viable.

##### POSITIVE

None

#### Traffic

##### NEGATIVE

- Four were concerned by an increase in traffic.
- Three commented that any traffic calming measures need to be agreed with residents.
- One commented that too much parking has been included and people should be encouraged to use public transport.
- Five felt that there needs to be more pedestrian/cyclist/horse rider provisions.
- One commented that there needs to be more cycle parking and car charging stations at each site.

##### POSITIVE

None



## Ecology / Green space

### NEGATIVE

- Four felt that there need to be more adequate protections for wildlife.
- Two commented that hedgerows will need to be replaced if they are lost.
- Two felt that the AONB has not been adequately protected.

### POSTIVE

None

## Planning approach

### NEGATIVE

- Six commented that the phased approach was not correct.
- Five said that they were unhappy the Community Survey had been ignored.
- Two though the proposals were not in accordance with the Wycombe Local Plan.
- One thought that the planning group was not credible as the majority are parish councillors and it contains four people applying for sites and three councillors from Marsh where no development is proposed.
- Two mentioned that archaeological protections need to be included.
- One thought there would be no community benefits to the sites.

### POSTIVE

None

## Recommendations

- Six people felt that other sites should be considered (in general).
- Eight people wanted Site 17B reconsidered.
- Two people wanted Site 19 reconsidered.
- One person wanted Site 7 reconsidered.
- One person wanted Site 5 reconsidered.
- One person wanted Site 20 reconsidered.
- Two people felt the shop should be on Site 14.
- Two people felt the shop should be on Site 1.
- One person felt the shop should be on Site 17.