



Planning Department
Chiltern District Council
King George V Road
Amersham
Buckinghamshire
HP6 5AW

22 January 2012

Dear Sir/Madam,

NEWLAND PARK DEVELOPMENT - CH/2011/0976/FA AND CH2011/0977/HB

As you will be aware SENSE4CSP (formerly SENSE) is an unincorporated association with an established committee and several hundred local residents as supporters in Chalfont St Peter formed to campaign against inappropriate development in the locality. We write to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed developments at Newland Park. Our principal concerns are as follows.

1 This development is essentially a completely isolated new village, with no village amenities whatsoever, all on its own in the Green Belt, within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Colne Valley Park. It is the very definition of, and is inherently, unsustainable. Local infrastructure is simply not capable of supporting 264 new dwellings in such an unsustainable site. All of the access roads, which are in fact a few very dangerous country roads, single track in places, are clearly insufficient for such a large development. There is clearly no adequate or effective traffic management plan and access to the site is severely limited. It is completely inappropriate to build this number of dwellings with such a significant access problem. The developer's plans in trying to limit car use are simply aspirational, completely impractical and frankly ridiculous. If the developer really thinks that residents will not use cars or will share cars with neighbours or use a shuttle bus (which in common with other similar developments will prove to be temporary and collapse after a few months and, due to lack of funding, simply stops being provided) then they are being disingenuous at worst, or naive at best. The plan currently ignores the car parking requirement which will cause even more problems for the site as all residents will simply need cars to get to anywhere locally or otherwise.

2 To try to get an idea of car usage from the site, if one assumes a six bed residence, a four bed residence and a three bed residence each has a minimum of two cars, with a two bed residence one and a half cars and a one bed residence one car then this adds up to over 430 new cars at this development. Assuming each car does a minimum of two journeys per day that is a further 900 car movements each day from that site along roads which are extremely dangerous. Add to that family visitors, grocery deliveries, cleaners, care workers, tradespeople, postmen etc and assuming ten extra car movements per dwelling per week then that is a further 370 odd daily car movements which makes approximately 1,250 daily car movements from that site alone. Clearly the roads are completely unable to cope with this.

3 We understand that locally all the schools are full and it is likely that some children from this development will be forced to travel a considerable distance to the nearest school with capacity. We understand that Bucks County Council is promoting a walk to school campaign yet any schoolchildren walking to school from that site along unlit country roads with no pavements are clearly dicing with death on a daily basis. One can assume there will be a minimum of 200 children on this development so where exactly are they going to be schooled? And how are they going to get there?

4 This development is likely to bring to the area another 600 minimum residents yet all of the doctors' surgeries locally are full. Clearly the pressure on doctors' surgeries as well as all other infrastructure locally will be impossible to sustain. This is an enormous development in an area completely not suitable for it.

5 The development looks to be of poor quality and is simply bad and cheap architecture. It contrasts with the excellent design of the proposed Audley Homes development at the NSE site in Chalfont St Peter. The development has taken no heed of the excellent Chalfont St Peter Village Design Statement and would be completely alien to its surroundings.

6 The sewerage system, even with the upgrade proposed by the developer would be unlikely to cope with this development given the existing problems that are known to exist within Chalfont St Peter.

7 It is within the Colne Valley Park, and conflicts with the key aims of the Park. It will have a huge detrimental effect on the Park and the Green Belt.

8 The development does not show the very special circumstances necessary to permit development in the Green Belt the Developer can point to no such circumstances and its attempts to do so are weak and unconvincing.

9 There is a significant loss of openness of the Green Belt caused by this development.

10 The build footprint of the proposals is materially in excess of the existing footprint, and as such, is a breach of the planning policies protecting the Green Belt.

11 The development is within the curtilage of a Grade II listed Georgian manor house of historic and architectural significance, and obviously detracts considerably from the setting of that important building.

This is yet another speculative and opportunistic proposal and it seems to us completely ridiculous that this development could in any way be granted planning consent despite it being earmarked in the Core Strategy (currently under legal challenge from Chalfont St Peter Parish Council) as a deliverable housing site. Whilst we accept that redundant buildings in the Green Belt have no purpose, the Green Belt could easily be returned to its natural state, or a more sustainable, appropriate and much less intensive development could be proposed. This is inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

We trust therefore that both of these applications will be refused out of hand.

Glyn Taylor
SENSE4CSP