

- 1) The development was not considered suitable for many reasons in the approved Vale of Aylesbury plan and Bucks are not short of their housing targets to enable a windfall development of this size and nature. The reasons the site is unsuitable remain the same.
- 2) The site is remote and, although a bus service is proposed, most dwellings will use cars, many more than one. This will create an unacceptable additional traffic volume through both Gubblecote and Marsworth village itself passing over a narrow humpback bridge and past a primary school where congestion occurs regularly.
- 3) The proposed widening of the road outwards towards Gubblecote to 6 metres with a 2 metre footpath seems impossible given the narrowness of the lane currently.
- 4) The road between Long Marston and Tring, passing through Gubblecote, has no pedestrian footpath and is dangerously narrow for such an additional volume of pedestrians and cyclists as proposed.
- 5) Similar sized housing developments in this area of Bucks have proposed facilities such as pubs, schools, employment hubs and shops but none have ever materialised, and these cannot be guaranteed by the applicant, nor can the proposed bus service.
- 6) The site is far more than the stated 20 minutes from most essential local facilities for pedestrians and cyclists. Banks, Doctors' Surgeries, and Supermarkets are all miles away.
- 7) There are no mitigation measures to protect the Chiltern Beechwoods SAC from the additional population which would arise. There will be considerable damage to the environment and biodiversity from such a development, especially during the construction phase.
- 8) The proposal suggests Tring school would handle children of secondary age, which is improbable given the size of additional developments occurring around Tring which Herts will need to prioritise over Bucks children. In any case, since it is nearer to Tring than most of Ivinghoe and Pitstone, families there would lose the option of sending children to Tring, possibly where siblings already go.
- 9) 2 previous large scale developments have been refused, including 1 at appeal, for reasons which should apply equally to this proposed development.
- 10) The site has been subject to continuous violations of planning regulations to the detriment of local people and the applicant should be disadvantaged accordingly.
- 11) Marsworth Parish Council and Tring Rural Parish Council have jointly arranged the attached report which addresses transport and highways matters more thoroughly.
- 12) The applicant states that the site is a brownfield site. In the NPPF Brownfield sites exclude land that is or was last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings for which the vast majority of buildings on the site have been used for many years. Most of the buildings which have been more recently used for non-agricultural uses have done so without planning permission and in clear breach of the findings of the 2 large scale development refusals/appeal. Those refusals/appeal both stated that the land was for agricultural use only and nothing has changed since then from a planning standpoint. It is understood that the land was requisitioned by the MOD for WW2 on condition that it was returned to agricultural use after the MOD no longer needed it, and that is what occurred. In any case the vast majority of the site cannot be claimed to be Brownfield.

13) The sewerage system serving Marsworth and nearby villages in Herts is already overloaded and frequently fails. Adding 320 dwellings would cause massive disruption regularly.

14) Similarly the water supply to the area from Thames Water has reduced pressure forcing the Fire Brigade to use canal water in a recent fire. Adding 320 houses would further limit supplies.

15) There is an underground oil pipeline running through the western end of the site (Dacorum) which will forbid any excavation nearby, see attached picture. This will limit drainage and water supply possibilities for the development and prevent housing or building in its immediate vicinity.

16) The humpback bridges at The Red Lion and Dixons Gap are under consideration for downgrading to 7.5tonnes as part of the Ivinghoe Freight Strategy which will limit commercial traffic to/from the site both during and after construction. Since there is no gas supply in the area most new homes will use oil, which is delivered in trucks over 16 tonnes.

In the unlikely event that Bucks CC approves this application we make the following representations:

- a) That the proposed facilities by way of shop, school, employment hub, and bus service are made legally binding.
- b) That the road widening towards Gubblecote is carried out completely before site construction or demolition commences
- c) That 2 separate access roads are put into the site to reduce congestion
- d) That a reasonably short time limit (suggested 2 years) for completion of total site build is put in place to limit the disruption to the locality from construction activity
- e) That additional signage preventing heavy goods vehicles from using the Red Lion bridge is put in place
- f) That no attempt is made to separate out the site from Marsworth Parish and village, as suggested by the applicant

In the event that this application is refused and it goes to appeal, then Bucks must insist all parties have much more time to prepare a thorough case against the appeal.