

Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
HK Moor	No						
Bruce Holborn	No		Draft Plan.	Supporting	A well considered plan for the future of Gerrards Cross.	Noted	No action taken
DAVID ANTHONY BRADLEY	No		Policy 4 Orchehill Rise Car Park	Objecting	<p>The proposed development at Orchehill Rise Car Park would be directly adjacent to our house/ rear garden. I strongly object to the proposed development for the following reasons: - It would significantly negatively impact on my privacy. I purposely purchased our house on Orchehill Avenue because it did not have any onlooking properties to the rear. - In addition, the proposed development would significantly negatively alter my view from the back of our property. Being in the Conservation Area, we currently have a lovely green view of trees. I must also add that we are not allowed to do anything to the trees in our garden without seeking approval from the Council and so we are astounded that there is now a proposal to build a block of flats at the bottom of our garden. - The proposed development would significantly negatively impact on a number of existing residential properties, all of which are very high value properties. I consider this loss of property value to be of huge concern. This loss of value is driven not only by a loss of privacy and view but also by a further push out of properties in Orchehill Avenue from the catchment area of the very highly regarded and Ofsted excellent Gerrards Cross Church of England School at Moreland Drive. A number of properties in Orchehill Avenue currently just make it into the catchment area and this development could put an end to that for a number of existing residents. - The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on noise levels in the neighbourhood. Not only from increased road traffic but also from the proposed dense level of population in such a small area. - As identified in the neighbourhood plan, Orchehill Rise Car Park is in the Conservation Area and so I object to the proposal of a number of new and additional houses, or a block of flats, being built in the area given how unsympathetic this would be to the surroundings. - The majority of couples and families in today's society have more than one car. On such a small site, how is parking going to be adequately provided without having a negative impact on surrounding neighbourhood streets? - I strongly object to Orchehill Rise Car Park being contemplated as a potential site for development of high density housing (by which I assume we are talking about a block of flats) as this would be entirely out of character in the Conservation Area. And if the site is not developed as flats, how is it really large enough to make any significant impact on delivering moderate/ affordable housing? - Orchehill Rise is already very congested at the beginning and end of the day when commuters treat the street as a car park for the station. This situation would clearly get worse with a development on the street too and be extremely difficult during construction of the site. - As has been acknowledged in the draft plan, Gerrards Cross does not have its own NHS GP surgery and already has to rely on overwhelmed surgeries in Chalfont St Peter. Any increase in density in population in Orchehill Rise will simply exacerbate that problem further.</p>	The GXNP allocates 7 dwellings for the Orchehill Rise car park site, with 35-40% to be delivered in the form of two/three bedroom houses. It also identifies the need to ensure appropriate landscaping is provided to minimise the landscape and visual effect of development.	No action taken

Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
HOLLY LOUISE BRADLEY	No		Policy 4 Orchehill Rise Car Park	Objecting	<p>The proposed development at Orchehill Rise Car Park would be directly adjacent to our house/ rear garden. I strongly object to the proposed development for the following reasons: - It would significantly negatively impact on my privacy. I purposely purchased our house on Orchehill Avenue because it did not have any onlooking properties to the rear. - In addition, the proposed development would significantly negatively alter my view from the back of our property. Being in the Conservation Area, we currently have a lovely green view of trees. I must also add that we are not allowed to do anything to the trees in our garden without seeking approval from the Council and so we are astounded that there is now a proposal to build a block of flats at the bottom of our garden. - The proposed development would significantly negatively impact on a number of existing residential properties, all of which are very high value properties. I consider this loss of property value to be of huge concern. This loss of value is driven not only by a loss of privacy and view but also by a further push out of properties in Orchehill Avenue from the catchment area of the very highly regarded and Ofsted excellent Gerrards Cross Church of England School at Moreland Drive. A number of properties in Orchehill Avenue currently just make it into the catchment area and this development could put an end to that for a number of existing residents. - The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on noise levels in the neighbourhood. Not only from increased road traffic but also from the proposed dense level of population in such a small area. - As identified in the neighbourhood plan, Orchehill Rise Car Park is in the Conservation Area and so I object to the proposal of a number of new and additional houses, or a block of flats, being built in the area given how unsympathetic this would be to the surroundings. - The majority of couples and families in today's society have more than one car. On such a small site, how is parking going to be adequately provided without having a negative impact on surrounding neighbourhood streets? - I strongly object to Orchehill Rise Car Park being contemplated as a potential site for development of high density housing (by which I assume we are talking about a block of flats) as this would be entirely out of character in the Conservation Area. And if the site is not developed as flats, how is it really large enough to make any significant impact on delivering moderate/ affordable housing? - Orchehill Rise is already very congested at the beginning and end of the day when commuters treat the street as a car park for the station. This situation would clearly get worse with a development on the street too and be extremely difficult during construction of the site. - As has been acknowledged in the draft plan, Gerrards Cross does not have its own NHS GP surgery and already has to rely on overwhelmed surgeries in Chalfont St Peter. Any increase in density in population in Orchehill Rise will simply exacerbate that problem further.</p>	The GXNP allocates 7 dwellings for the Orchehill Rise car park site, with 35-40% to be delivered in the form of two/three bedroom houses. In addition, the policy stipulates that the maximum building height is not expected to exceed the surrounding buildings. It also identifies the need to ensure appropriate landscaping is provided to minimise the landscape and visual effect.	No action taken
Andrew White	No						

Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
Kate Norris	No		Objective #4; The development of Orchehill Rise car park.	Objecting	Our family have lived in Orchehill Avenue and been part of the Gerrards Cross community for more than 45 years. Whilst we recognise the need to identify and propose development sites we are not convinced that housing on Orchehill Rise delivers any material benefit to the community or that it would be in accordance with the Conservation policies. Comments: 1. Number of dwellings is contradicted - Appendix J indicates up to 21 dwellings could be accommodated in a 'high-density' development, contradicting the information contained in the Summary document and issued pamphlet which both state 7 dwellings (within objective #4). Therefore which is it, and why is this important detail hidden in an appendix? This may invalidate the public consultation process as residents may not have read the appendix. 2. Appendix J also refers to a potentially larger site area – but this is not explained. 3. Loss of character – Development of this site would be in conflict with the conservation objectives which are in place to maintain the character of the homes and gardens. The homes adjacent to this proposed site would lose privacy and outlook. High-Density housing is not in character. 4. Car Parking contradiction – Whilst the plan states that this site as an exception, objectives #3 and #11 refer to having adequate parking in the town. Whilst there has been a change in demand for the train station parking, there is an increasing number of large employers asking staff to return to offices in London. How does The Plan justify or mitigate this risk if existing infrastructure is removed, population rises and office working returns in the near future? 5. Precedent - Development of this site would set a precedent for the surrounding homes and area. Families would consider moving out and developers would have the necessary precedent to re-develop homes along Orchehill Avenue e.g. to executive flats (as in several other GX roads e.g. Oval Way and Packhorse Rd). Once you change the character within the conservation area then the argument is lost and further change will follow. In our view The Plan should acknowledge this inevitable development of Orchehill Rise and Avenue – bring more homes in the form of apartments. Missing clarifications that would improve the consultation process: a. What type of housing could be put on such a site given its narrow dimension? b. Would the public footway be impacted, replaced by a road (the site is very narrow, at approx. 12 m across)? c. What does the plan propose for the existing Telecoms mast Conservation Area The designation to a Conservation Area was, we thought, a positive and much needed step to protect a beautiful part of GX. Recently however we're concerned that its purpose has been lost with development after development eroding the very character it was to protect. In 2017 a classic example of an Arts and Crafts home, as cited in Conservation documents, 43 Orchehill Avenue, was demolished and replaced. Continuous Disruption When sites like this are proposed there should be better consideration of impacted residents. I'd welcome an addition to The Plan that talks to how residents will be protected from developments e.g. bonfires, noise, dust, unsociable hours. These things are sometimes mentioned in planning consent but there's little evidence of any control or consideration. Such a policy would really add to our community which is under increasing pressure of large home re-development as well as new sites.	1. Appendix J is a site assessment which identifies the <u>maximum</u> potential for all the sites assessed. The Gerrards Cross Neighbourhood Plan Policy 4 has allocated 7 dwellings at Orchehill Rise car park. 2. This information can be found in the South Bucks HELAA. 3. Noted 4. Car park policy wording amended. 5. Noted.	No action taken
Anna Stokes	No						
Valerie Fisher	No		Objective 4	Supporting	This is a site that is under used currently (especially post covid) and would add much needed housing close to the town centre.	Noted	No action taken
George Lawley	No						
John wheeler	No		Policy 4	Objecting	I believe That the orchehill rise, Station car Park Should remain as a car park. Often in the past the main station car park has been full so I have had to use the OrchHill car Park. There is already a shortage of car park space in Gerrards Cross.	Noted	No action taken

Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
GX Community Association	No		Policy 15	Objecting	We have received the summary document giving brief details of the Neighbourhood Plan and are writing with our comments. Firstly, it would appear that National Guidance has not been followed by the Town Council, in that land owners should be informed of the outcome of an assessment and the proposal for designation of that land as Local Green Space within the Draft Local Plan. To our knowledge, no such communication was received prior to the production of the Executive Summary. The first we knew of the proposal to designate four areas of the Gerrards Cross Community Association land as Local Green Spaces was when the Draft Plan was delivered to the town. We would also point out that Policy 15 mentions the Memorial Centre War Memorial whilst Policy 17 includes the Gerrards Cross Memorial Building. We would be grateful for clarification as to which building/s this refers to. As Trustees of the Gerrards Cross Community Association site, we would ask that areas GS8 Memorial Centre Allotments, GS9 Memorial Centre Tennis Courts and GS10 Memorial Centre Green Area are removed from the proposed Local Green Space designation.	Noted	Historic England Ref for Memorial Centre (community building) 1124424 and Historic England Ref for Memorial Building (war memorial) 1430052 added into policy wording for clarity. No sites removed from NP
HK Moor	No		Obj 1	Commenting	I understand in the detail of this proposal it says that there will be emphasis on maintaining retail properties unless after a <i>minimum</i> of six months of marketing it is apparent that it is no longer needed for retail/commercial purposes. Instead, given increases of online shopping, my view would be to consolidate Gerrards Cross retail premises into Packhorse Road where appropriate. As retail premises become available on the streets off Packhorse Road, my opinion would be to turn these to residential. Retail units on all streets in the town centre can be vacant for a long time (sometimes years) before they are re-let for commercial/retail purposes. Empty units are unappealing and detract from the vibrancy of the town centre. Therefore, I favour consolidation of retail into a smaller space. If retail units on Packhorse Road can't be re-let for retail/commercial after a maximum of 12 months, these, too, should be turned over to residential in my view.	Noted	Policy 1 BP (B) marketing time increased from 6 months to 12 months
Thames Water	No			Commenting	<b>*For full info see 4pg Document 'Thames Water'*</b> ...we agree that the Neighbourhood Plan should include a specific reference to the key issue of the provision of wastewater/sewerage and water supply infrastructure to service development proposed in a policy. This is necessary because it will not be possible to identify all of the water/sewerage infrastructure required over the plan period due to the way water companies are regulated and plan in 5 year periods (Asset Management Plans or AMPs). We recommend that the Neighbourhood Plan include the following policy/supporting text: "Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades." "The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/waste water company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements. Where there is a capacity constraint the Local Planning Authority will, where appropriate, apply phasing conditions to any approval to ensure that any necessary infrastructure upgrades are delivered ahead of the occupation of the relevant phase of development..."	Noted	policy evidence wording added at BP 8.3.7: Where appropriate, planning permission for developments which result in the need for off-site upgrades, will be subject to conditions to ensure the occupation is aligned with the delivery of necessary infrastructure upgrades. 8.3.8: The Local Planning Authority should seek to ensure that there is adequate water and wastewater infrastructure to serve all new developments. Developers are encouraged to contact the water/wastewater company as early as possible to discuss their development proposals and intended delivery programme to assist with identifying any potential water and wastewater network reinforcement requirements.

Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
Thames Water	No			Commenting	<p>*For full info see 4pg Document 'Thames Water'* "...It is our understanding that the water efficiency standards of 105 litres per person per day is only applied through the building regulations where there is a planning condition requiring this standard (as set out at paragraph 2.8 of Part G2 of the Building Regulations). As the Thames Water area is defined as water stressed it is considered that such a condition should be attached as standard to all planning approvals for new residential development in order to help ensure that the standard is effectively delivered through the building regulations.</p> <p>Within Part G of Building Regulations, the 110 litres/person/day level can be achieved through either the 'Calculation Method' or the 'Fittings Approach' (Table 2.2). The Fittings Approach provides clear flow-rate and volume performance metrics for each water using device / fitting in new dwellings. Thames Water considers the Fittings Approach, as outlined in Table 2.2 of Part G, increases the confidence that water efficient devices will be installed in the new dwelling. Insight from our smart water metering programme shows that household built to the 110 litres/person/day level using the Calculation Method, did not achieve the intended water performance levels..."</p>	Noted	Policy 4 BP (i) added: i. Development must be designed to be water efficient and reduce water consumption. Refurbishments and other non-domestic development will be expected to meet BREEAM water-efficiency credits. Residential development must not exceed a maximum water use of 105 litres per head per day (excluding the allowance of up to 5 litres for external water consumption) using the 'Fittings Approach' in Table 2.2 of Part G of Building Regulations. Planning conditions will be applied to new residential development to ensure that the water efficiency standards are met.
Thames Water	No			Commenting	<p>*For full info see 4pg Document 'Thames Water'* "...It is our understanding that the water efficiency standards of 105 litres per person per day is only applied through the building regulations where there is a planning condition requiring this standard (as set out at paragraph 2.8 of Part G2 of the Building Regulations). As the Thames Water area is defined as water stressed it is considered that such a condition should be attached as standard to all planning approvals for new residential development in order to help ensure that the standard is effectively delivered through the building regulations.</p> <p>Within Part G of Building Regulations, the 110 litres/person/day level can be achieved through either the 'Calculation Method' or the 'Fittings Approach' (Table 2.2). The Fittings Approach provides clear flow-rate and volume performance metrics for each water using device / fitting in new dwellings. Thames Water considers the Fittings Approach, as outlined in Table 2.2 of Part G, increases the confidence that water efficient devices will be installed in the new dwelling. Insight from our smart water metering programme shows that household built to the 110 litres/person/day level using the Calculation Method, did not achieve the intended water performance levels..."</p>	Noted	Policy 5 BP (i) added: i. Development must be designed to be water efficient and reduce water consumption. Refurbishments and other non-domestic development will be expected to meet BREEAM water-efficiency credits. Residential development must not exceed a maximum water use of 105 litres per head per day (excluding the allowance of up to 5 litres for external water consumption) using the 'Fittings Approach' in Table 2.2 of Part G of Building Regulations. Planning conditions will be applied to new residential development to ensure that the water efficiency standards are met.
Thames Water	No			Commenting	<p>*For full info see 4pg Document 'Thames Water'* "...Flood risk sustainability objectives and policies should also make reference to 'sewer flooding' and an acceptance that flooding can occur away from the flood plain as a result of development where off site sewerage infrastructure and capacity is not in place ahead of development.</p> <p>With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of the developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, watercourses or surface water sewer. It is important to reduce the quantity of surface water entering the sewerage system in order to maximise the capacity for foul sewage to reduce the risk of sewer flooding.</p> <p>Limiting the opportunity for surface water entering the foul and combined sewer networks is of critical importance to Thames Water. Thames Water have advocated an approach to SuDS that limits as far as possible the volume of and rate at which surface water enters the public sewer system. By doing this, SuDS have the potential to play an important role in helping to ensure the sewerage network has the capacity to cater for population growth and the effects of climate change..."</p>	Noted	policy evidence added BP 8.3.9: It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding."

Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
Cynthia Patterson	No			Commenting	I think most of the plan is excellent but have a couple of suggestions. Speed limit on Packhorse Road from the traffic lights at the A40 junction to the the Junction with East Common should be 30 mph. I walk across the Common and cross this section of Packhorse road regularly and the speed of some vehicles is frequently far too fast . 30mph from the lights , and all through the Town would be far safer. The parking on Packhorse Road should be removed and the pavement widened outside the shops and restaurants there. Cars today are far too large to fit into these spaces and they stick out into the road and cause problems . Vans and lorries frequently use these spaces too ,and also cause congestion. As do people who insist on using these spaces when they are travelling down the road in the wrong direction to slip into the spaces ( ie from the bridge towards the A40 ). The cafes there would appreciate the wider pavement for tables and maybe flower tubs i am sure . I would not like to sit there with cars manoeuvring into the parking spaces as there is always the potential for an accident ,as happened a few years ago ,when a car went through the window of a cafe , narrowly missing customers.	Outside scope of NP	Community Aspiration(2) added to NP: Investigate opportunities to encourage outdoor eating/socialising areas within the town centre
Susan A Mills	No		Policy 10	Commenting	The speed limit on the A40 is 40mph. The many junctions near Bull Lane, Bulstrode Way, Bull Hotel and Bp Garage. I have witnessed so many accidents, recently and over the years. Including fatalities. People exiting the Bull hotel are often unfamiliar with the area. The garage also has a cash machine allowing on road parking. Bull Lane, Bulstrode Way exit onto the A40 is frequently backed up leading to frustration. Just 3 weeks ago another motor cyclist was seriously hurt. Could you look at either lowering the speed or installing a roundabout. Anything would help.	Outside the scope of Neighbourhood Plans.	No action taken
Christopher Veys	No		Policy 5, 7 & 17	Commenting	I believe more emphasis and strength of policy should be given to retaining the historic buildings in Gerrards Cross ie the houses that were built when Gerrards Cross was first created in the early 20 <sup>th</sup> century, particularly in the conservations areas.	Noted	No action taken
Christopher Veys	No		Policy 12	Commenting	I believe the oblique pull in parking by the shops in the centre of Gerrards Cross (outside the shops on the West side of the road and the south side of the bridge) should be removed and the space turned into pavement and an area where temporary / weekend market stalls could be created. This would significantly enhance the centre of Gerrards Cross. These parking spaces are also dangerous particularly when cars reverse out, but also when longer cars park in these spaces projecting into the road and forcing cars driving towards the bridge to come very close to the cars on the opposite side. Also, traffic builds up when cars try and park in these spaces from the opposite side of the road; or do 3 point turns when leaving the spaces.	Outside scope of NP	Community Aspiration added to NP: Investigate opportunities to encourage outdoor eating/socialising areas within the town centre
Christopher Veys	No		Policy 12	Commenting	I realise not necessarily the scope of the plan, but please note that as a resident of Gerrards Cross, I usually visit the shops in Chalfont St Peter because the first hour is free and parking is relatively easy! The charges at all times in the public car parks are a significant consideration in where to shop for those pop in or individual items.	Outside scope of NP	No action taken
Graham Lister	No		Policy 10	Commenting	Comments. It is evident that concern for the safety of pedestrians and congestion shows the need to control driving speeds through the town centre and on "short cut" routes indicated by car navigation systems such as the use of Bulstrode Way to bypass the traffic lights from the A40 and the use of Lower Road. A limit of 20 mph throughout the central area of GX would improve safety and reduce congestion. It could also reduce pothole damage caused by heavy vehicles moving at speed in areas where roadside parking forces vehicles to use the edges of roads. While the temporary designation of Lower Road as a protected walking and cycle route was clearly a failure this is not a reason to ignore this road or it adjacent green space (in the Parish of CSP). Better facilities for walkers and cyclists, traffic calming and rubbish collection is urgently required.	Outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken

Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
Graham Lister	No		Policy 4	Commenting	Comments The use of Orchehill Rise Car Park as a site for 7 houses will do little to meet the local demand for housing in our area. It risks greatly increasing the misuse of roads such as Lower Road as a car park from which to access the station. While demand for parking spaces has declined in recent years due to Covid and working from home, it is not yet clear that demand will not return to previous levels when illegal or uncontrolled parking was a major problem in GX. The once proposed multi storey car park in Station Road was in part a result of this demand. It is not logical to reduce parking for commuters until British Rail redevelop their main car park. This should be one element of the GXPlan.	Noted	No action taken
Graham Lister	No		Policy 7	Commenting	While I hope that vibrant local shops will be retained in our town centre. It is important to face the reality of a reduction in high street trading as more retail moves online. It is therefore important for the GXplan to put forward a more creative plan for the evolution of shops and business premises. This could accept greater use of sites as office work stations and residential premises while promoting local market-places (and congratulations on the once a month street market).	Noted	No action taken
Graham Lister	No		Comm Asp 4	Commenting	Comments While supporting the long-held hope for the return of primary care facilities in GX the reality is that primary care has changed radically in the last 25 years. GPs now work in Primary Care Networks with a team of health and care workers working with local organisations and groups to support physical and mental health and wellbeing. The hope for GX might be that the Gerrards Cross Community Association might serve as a hub for such support with input from our local Chalfonts Primary Care Network BHT and the Oxfordshire Mental Health Partnership. It is not realistic to suggest that simply providing a site for a GP practice will solve this problem.	Noted	No action taken
David Price				Commenting	Having lived on Mill lane since 1999, I am writing to inform and bring to your attention the bridge on Mill lane is an accident waiting to happen especially in the morning when the Children go to school. We walk our 9 year old to school, but we witness every day people taking off on the bridge as they are late for work etc. Mill Lane is a rat run between the A40 and the A413 at this time of the morning, skip lorries with full loads hurtle down the road. Have mentioned a quick and cheaper alternative to the mayor but as usual Mill lane is at the back of the village and low profile. The economical solution would be to make it one way, install a pavement for safe passage on the bridge and on Mill lane, and then instal speed humps before and after the bridge to reduce the speed. The bridge was built back in the 30's when cars were slimmer, now with Range Rovers a popular family choice its simply not wide enough for two cars and pedestrians. I invite you to come and walk the lower part of the road during school term between 8.30am and 9am and you will witness the inconvenience of being a pedestrian and the lack of safety in the road for someone looking to not use their car to take the children to school.	Outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken
Chris Brown				Commenting	4.4 I think this should say that the Medical Infrastruture in Gerrards Cross is non-existent as there are no GPs and no hospital facilities.	Noted	No action taken
Chris Brown				Commenting	5.1 Vision mentions lack of bus services. It should also mention lack of alternative access (walking and cycling) to/from neighbouring towns.	Noted	No action taken
Chris Brown				Commenting	Businesses in the Town Centre are supported (section 7) but what about businesses in the periphery, such as farming.	Noted	No action taken
Chris Brown				Commenting	8.2.6 Which site is this referring to?	8.2.1-8.2.10 all refer to Orchehill Rise car park	No action taken

Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
Chris Brown				Commenting	8.1.13 "Sites have been identified which infill or flatten out the current Green Belt boundary" Which sites does this refer to?	See BP 8.1.5 '8.1.5 In addition to the allocated site, the GXNP has identified five sites (GX3, GX4, GX5, GX6, GX7 on the site assessment) Appendix E currently in the Green Belt (Appendix C) in the Settlement Policy Boundary (SPB), which would be suitable for removal from Green Belt, if the need arose.' NB: GX7 has since been removed from the Plan.	No action taken
Chris Brown				Commenting	9.3.5 The Station Travel Plan only addresses access to Gerrards Cross Station. Cycling and walking between communities eg Denham, Hedgerley, Beaconsfield, Chalfont, Amersham should also be included.	Outside scope of Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken
Chris Brown				Commenting	Policy 14 on page 38 states: "Outside the settlement boundary within the Safeguarded Land, only development that is not prejudicial to the potential future use of this land to meet Gerrards Cross' longer term development needs will be acceptable." It is not clear what this means. Could some further explanation be included. What is the Safeguarded Land?	Safeguarded land is land between the urban area and the Green Belt	Definition added to NP
Chris Brown				Commenting	Map F2 Settlement Boundary map on page 39 is blurred and unreadable.	Noted	final maps to be drawn for examination copy of NP
Chris Brown				Commenting	What is the Settlement Boundary? We live within the Parish boundary but outside the Settlement boundary. Does this plan not apply to us?	settlement boundaries separate built up areas from the surrounding Open Countryside or Green Belt. The Neighbourhood Plan covers the whole Parish of Gerrards Cross.	No action taken
Chris Brown				Commenting	10.5.1 Could do with a map of the Green Belt gaps.	See maps I-IV	No action taken
Chris Brown				Commenting	10.5.1 A note of the current use of Green Belt gaps such as farming and wildlife would help prevent these being developed. Also Wapseys Wood should be returned to agricultural and recreational use.	Noted	No action taken
Judy Fearn				Commenting	Please can you explain how: 1) the consultation was conducted and why I wasn't given the opportunity to participate. I do not share your confidence that the plan "meets our needs". You claim it's "your town" but evidently without "your voice"	There have been various consultations carried out during the process of creating the Neighbourhood Plan. This (Regulation 14) is the first formal consultation. Comments can also be made during Regulation 16, which will be carried out by Buckinghamshire Council.	No action taken
Judy Fearn				Commenting	2) protecting Burnham Beeches is relevant to the GX plan. I assume that the document posted through my letterbox was proof read before the town council went to the expense of getting the document printed (page 7 point h. talks about protecting Burnham Beeches from recreational pressure)	This is a requirement due to Gerrards Cross falling within the Zone of Influence of Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation	No action taken
Judy Fearn				Commenting	3) Removing car parking in Orchehill rise solves your stated challenge point 3 on page 3 of "adequate parking to address the needs of commuters".	Noted	Reference to commuters removed



Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
Ian Holdstock			Obj 12	Commenting	this plan pay lipservice to objective 12 to provide more cycle routes and footpaths in order to cut the volume of traffic and promote a healthy lifestyle, the current provisions of cycleways are poorly marked, not direct and do not protect the cyclist in anyway from the traffic. there is no evidence that anything Well be done under this plan to improve the situation and reverse the trend of car is king within GX. careful consideration should be given to 1. protected cycle routes to all schools in the area. thus promoting cycling and lifestyle form an early age. 2. marked cycle lanes within the town centre with dramatically improved road surfaces. 3. consideration of widening some of the footpaths to be joint cycle and walking usage, specifically those alongside and over the railway line to the west of the town centre. 4. improved town centre infrastructure and security to encourage weekend leisure cyclists to stop off in the town centre and increase the business (cafe) use.	Outside the scope of Neighbourhood Plans.	No action taken
Helen Gladstone				Commenting	Thank you for the summary of values for the development of GX to 2040. This reads admirably conservative of the many beautiful features in the town. I have lived in the same house in GX since 1961 and seen much seemingly unregulated growth. Succeeding generations of house owners have been allowed to knock down vernacular buildings and replace them with much larger, ugly, pretentious houses. There is no attempt to keep the original character of street after street in the Dukes Wood area. How could this happen with such a clear development vision? These house replacements mitigate against neighbourliness.	Noted	No action taken
Andrew White				Commenting	Areas identified for development within Gerrards Cross: We wholeheartedly support the conclusions reached in Annex J ('Site Selection'), particularly in relation to GX2 'Overflow car park'. However, the Plan does not address the important issue of the potential location of a future GP's building. Could we suggest that the Town Council ("TC") consider the following options: (1) that the GPs is located at site GX1 'Orchehill Rise Car Park', (2) if site GX8 'Site GX8 Land either side of Camp Road' is developed, a condition in any such permission is added forcing the creation of a GPs sufficiently large to serve the town's growing population, (3) the car park opposite Waitrose (near the library) would appear to be a good location, possibly with the addition of quality parking above, (4) should any of the other commercial buildings in GX fail to rent for commercial purposes it would be better that one is repurposed for a GPs rather than residential purposes,	The GXNP identifies the community aspiration to provide appropriate space for the provision of a new GP surgery within GX. This will be taken on by the Town Council.	No action taken
Andrew White			4.6 Public Transport:	Commenting	the Policy states, "... with trains into and out of London (Marylebone) approximately every 20 minutes from 6am to 8pm." This statement is <b>highly</b> misleading. As a community we cannot accept the poor and deteriorating rail service we receive. Trains between GX and Marylebone are frequently jam packed, frequently there isn't enough space on the train for all passengers to squeeze on at Marylebone. On Monday 21 <sup>st</sup> August 2023, there are 53 services scheduled between GX and Marylebone, at approximately every 20 minutes. However, there are only 42 services between Marylebone and GX, further these return services often run a few minutes apart (e.g. 10:06 and 10:10, 13:06 & 13:10, 15:40 & 15:44) then they tend to run every 30 minutes (e.g. 18:19, 18:49, 19L:14, 19:40, 19:46). The following statement would be more accurate: "There is a railway station in Gerrards Cross with trains into and out of London (Marylebone). The service delivered to the community has deteriorated significantly, the frequency of services (particularly from Marylebone to Gerrards Cross has declined), residents frequently experience an unacceptable level of overcrowding." The point is that our community Plan shouldn't suggest that the community is happy with the rail service, because the community isn't!	Noted	Wording amended 'There is a railway station in Gerrards Cross with regular trains into and out of London (Marylebone)'

Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
Andrew White			Obj 11	Commenting	As the nature of our highstreets change, effectively towards offering personal services, not 'things one can buy from Amazon, et al', so does the need for parking. Although we have an occasional traffic warden, vehicles are still frequently witnessed 'fly parking', etc. We live near the cinema and can attest to the fact that Gerrards Cross doesn't have enough parking near the town centre. The problem appears to be more of a relatively short-term parking (less than 3 hours), very close to the town centre problem, for example during popular cinema screenings, or take-away collections. Due to WFH, there appears to be space at the station car parks. There are car parking facilities in the town centre that don't market to this demand, for example: at the Ethorpe Hotel, or at Site 2 (Annex J) (although this site may not be suitable due to very restricted access).	Noted	No action taken
Andrew White			Town Centre Policies, Policy 1	Commenting	<b>Policy States, "Where premises meet the criteria at 'a' above, applications for the conversion of the ground floor existing retails and commercial premises to residential dwellings will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the premises are no longer required and/or that there is no other viable use, following the active marketing of the property for a minimum of 6 months. "</b> In the current economic climate this test isn't strong enough where the desire amongst property owners strongly favours conversion to residential. It is often said that commercial rents in Gerrards Cross are "too high", as a community, we would benefit from market forces lowering retail rentals, rather than developers converting retail space to residential, effectively because their rental price is too high. Perhaps, the time period should be 12 months active marketing, where if it can be shown that starting at the previous rental level and with a 10% drops every 3 months the property hasn't let then it may be considered for alternative use.	Noted	Policy 1 BP (B) marketing time increased from 6 months to 12 months
Andrew White			EP18: Telecommunications Development	Commenting	The Plan mentions EP18 but makes no further mention of telecommunications infrastructure. Given changing working patterns (work from home WFH) an excellent telecommunications infrastructure is essential to GX2030. Could we suggest that we add a section to the Plan and support the excellent work of Swish.	Noted	No action taken
Andrew White			Objective 9	Commenting	We wholeheartedly agree with this Objective. Gates whether installed on individual properties or developments discourage the development of "lifetime neighbourhoods".	Noted	No action taken
Catriona White				Commenting	Areas identified for development within Gerrards Cross: We wholeheartedly support the conclusions reached in Annex J ('Site Selection'), particularly in relation to GX2 'Overflow car park'. However, the Plan does not address the important issue of the potential location of a future GP's building. Could we suggest that the Town Council ("TC") consider the following options: (1) that the GPs is located at site GX1 'Orchehill Rise Car Park', (2) if site GX8 'Site GX8 Land either side of Camp Road' is developed, a condition in any such permission is added forcing the creation of a GPs sufficiently large to serve the town's growing population, (3) the car park opposite Waitrose (near the library) would appear to be a good location, possibly with the addition of quality parking above, (4) should any of the other commercial buildings in GX fail to rent for commercial purposes it would be better that one is repurposed for a GPs rather than residential purposes,	The GXNP identifies the community aspiration to provide appropriate space for the provision of a new GP surgery within GX. This will be taken on by the Town Council.	No action taken

Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
Catriona White			4.6 Public Transport:	Commenting	States, "... with trains into and out of London (Marylebone) approximately every 20 minutes from 6am to 8pm." This statement is <b>highly</b> misleading. As a community we cannot accept the poor and deteriorating rail service we receive. Trains between GX and Marylebone are frequently jam packed, frequently there isn't enough space on the train for all passengers to squeeze on at Marylebone. On Monday 21 <sup>st</sup> August 2023, there are 53 services scheduled between GX and Marylebone, at approximately every 20 minutes. However, there are only 42 services between Marylebone and GX, further these return services often run a few minutes apart (e.g. 10:06 and 10:10, 13:06 & 13:10, 15:40 & 15:44) then they tend to run every 30 minutes (e.g. 18:19, 18:49, 19L:14, 19:40, 19:46). The following statement would be more accurate: " <i>There is a railway station in Gerrards Cross with trains into and out of London (Marylebone). The service delivered to the community has deteriorated significantly, the frequency of services (particularly from Marylebone to Gerrards Cross has declined), residents frequently experience an unacceptable level of overcrowding.</i> " The point is that our community Plan shouldn't suggest that the community is happy with the rail service, because the community isn't!	Noted	Wording amended 'There is a railway station in Gerrards Cross with regular trains into and out of London (Marylebone)'
Catriona White			Obj 11	Commenting	As the nature of our highstreets change, effectively towards offering personal services, not 'things one can buy from Amazon, et al', so does the need for parking. Although we have an occasional traffic warden, vehicles are still frequently witnessed 'fly parking', etc. We live near the cinema and can attest to the fact that Gerrards Cross doesn't have enough parking near the town centre. The problem appears to be more of a relatively short-term parking (less than 3 hours), very close to the town centre problem, for example during popular cinema screenings, or take-away collections. Due to WFH, there appears to be space at the station car parks. There are car parking facilities in the town centre that don't market to this demand, for example: at the Ethorpe Hotel, or at Site 2 (Annex J) (although this site may not be suitable due to very restricted access).	Noted	No action taken
Catriona White			Town Centre Policies, Policy 1	Commenting	<b>Policy</b> States, " <i>Where premises meet the criteria at 'a' above, applications for the conversion of the ground floor existing retails and commercial premises to residential dwellings will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the premises are no longer required and/or that there is no other viable use, following the active marketing of the property for a minimum of 6 months.</i> " In the current economic climate this test isn't strong enough where the desire amongst property owners strongly favours conversion to residential. It is often said that commercial rents in Gerrards Cross are "too high", as a community, we would benefit from market forces lowering retail rentals, rather than developers converting retail space to residential, effectively because their rental price is too high. Perhaps, the time period should be 12 months active marketing, where if it can be shown that starting at the previous rental level and with a 10% drops every 3 months the property hasn't let then it may be considered for alternative use.	Noted	Policy 1 BP (B) marketing time increased from 6 months to 12 months
Catriona White			EP18: Telecommunications Development	Commenting	The Plan mentions EP18 but makes no further mention of telecommunications infrastructure. Given changing working patterns (work from home WFH) an excellent telecommunications infrastructure is essential to GX2030. Could we suggest that we add a section to the Plan and support the excellent work of Swish.	Noted	No action taken
Catriona White			Objective 9	Commenting	We wholeheartedly agree with this Objective. Gates whether installed on individual properties or developments discourage the development of " <i>lifetime neighbourhoods</i> ".	Noted	No action taken

Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
Alistair White				Commenting	Areas identified for development within Gerrards Cross: We wholeheartedly support the conclusions reached in Annex J ('Site Selection'), particularly in relation to GX2 'Overflow car park'. However, the Plan does not address the important issue of the potential location of a future GP's building. Could we suggest that the Town Council ("TC") consider the following options: (1) that the GPs is located at site GX1 'Orchhill Rise Car Park', (2) if site GX8 'Site GX8 Land either side of Camp Road' is developed, a condition in any such permission is added forcing the creation of a GPs sufficiently large to serve the town's growing population, (3) the car park opposite Waitrose (near the library) would appear to be a good location, possibly with the addition of quality parking above, (4) should any of the other commercial buildings in GX fail to rent for commercial purposes it would be better that one is repurposed for a GPs rather than residential purposes,	The GXNP identifies the community aspiration to provide appropriate space for the provision of a new GP surgery within GX. This will be taken on by the Town Council.	No action taken
Alistair White			4.6 Public Transport:	Commenting	States, "... with trains into and out of London (Marylebone) approximately every 20 minutes from 6am to 8pm." This statement is <b>highly</b> misleading. As a community we cannot accept the poor and deteriorating rail service we receive. Trains between GX and Marylebone are frequently jam packed, frequently there isn't enough space on the train for all passengers to squeeze on at Marylebone. On Monday 21 <sup>st</sup> August 2023, there are 53 services scheduled between GX and Marylebone, at approximately every 20 minutes. However, there are only 42 services between Marylebone and GX, further these return services often run a few minutes apart (e.g. 10:06 and 10:10, 13:06 & 13:10, 15:40 & 15:44) then they tend to run every 30 minutes (e.g. 18:19, 18:49, 19:14, 19:40, 19:46). The following statement would be more accurate: " <i>There is a railway station in Gerrards Cross with trains into and out of London (Marylebone). The service delivered to the community has deteriorated significantly, the frequency of services (particularly from Marylebone to Gerrards Cross has declined), residents frequently experience an unacceptable level of overcrowding.</i> " The point is that our community Plan shouldn't suggest that the community is happy with the rail service, because the community isn't!	Noted	Wording amended 'There is a railway station in Gerrards Cross with regular trains into and out of London (Marylebone)'
Alistair White			Obj 11	Commenting	As the nature of our highstreets change, effectively towards offering personal services, not 'things one can buy from Amazon, et al', so does the need for parking. Although we have an occasional traffic warden, vehicles are still frequently witnessed 'fly parking', etc. We live near the cinema and can attest to the fact that Gerrards Cross doesn't have enough parking near the town centre. The problem appears to be more of a relatively short-term parking (less than 3 hours), very close to the town centre problem, for example during popular cinema screenings, or take-away collections. Due to WFH, there appears to be space at the station car parks. There are car parking facilities in the town centre that don't market to this demand, for example: at the Ethorpe Hotel, or at Site 2 (Annex J) (although this site may not be suitable due to very restricted access).	Noted	No action taken
Alistair White			Town Centre Policies, Policy 1	Commenting	<b>Policy</b> States, " <i>Where premises meet the criteria at 'a' above, applications for the conversion of the ground floor existing retail and commercial premises to residential dwellings will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the premises are no longer required and/or that there is no other viable use, following the active marketing of the property for a minimum of 6 months.</i> " In the current economic climate this test isn't strong enough where the desire amongst property owners strongly favours conversion to residential. It is often said that commercial rents in Gerrards Cross are "too high", as a community, we would benefit from market forces lowering retail rentals, rather than developers converting retail space to residential, effectively because their rental price is too high. Perhaps, the time period should be 12 months active marketing, where if it can be shown that starting at the previous rental level and with a 10% drops every 3 months the property hasn't let then it may be considered for alternative use.	Noted	Policy 1 BP (B) marketing time increased from 6 months to 12 months

Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
Andrew White			EP18: Telecommunications Development	Commenting	The Plan mentions EP18 but makes no further mention of telecommunications infrastructure. Given changing working patterns (work from home WFH) an excellent telecommunications infrastructure is essential to GX2030. Could we suggest that we add a section to the Plan and support the excellent work of Swish.	Noted	No action taken
Andrew White			Objective 9	Commenting	We wholeheartedly agree with this Objective. Gates whether installed on individual properties or developments discourage the development of "lifetime neighbourhoods".	Noted	No action taken
Emily White				Commenting	Areas identified for development within Gerrards Cross: We wholeheartedly support the conclusions reached in Annex J ('Site Selection'), particularly in relation to GX2 'Overflow car park'. However, the Plan does not address the important issue of the potential location of a future GP's building. Could we suggest that the Town Council ("TC") consider the following options: (1) that the GPs are located at site GX1 'Orchehill Rise Car Park', (2) if site GX8 'Site GX8 Land either side of Camp Road' is developed, a condition in any such permission is added forcing the creation of a GPs sufficiently large to serve the town's growing population, (3) the car park opposite Waitrose (near the library) would appear to be a good location, possibly with the addition of quality parking above, (4) should any of the other commercial buildings in GX fail to rent for commercial purposes it would be better that one is repurposed for a GPs rather than residential purposes,	The GXNP identifies the community aspiration to provide appropriate space for the provision of a new GP surgery within GX. This will be taken on by the Town Council.	No action taken
Emily White			4.6 Public Transport:	Commenting	States, "... with trains into and out of London (Marylebone) approximately every 20 minutes from 6am to 8pm." This statement is <b>highly</b> misleading. As a community we cannot accept the poor and deteriorating rail service we receive. Trains between GX and Marylebone are frequently jam packed, frequently there isn't enough space on the train for all passengers to squeeze on at Marylebone. On Monday 21 <sup>st</sup> August 2023, there are 53 services scheduled between GX and Marylebone, at approximately every 20 minutes. However, there are only 42 services between Marylebone and GX, further these return services often run a few minutes apart (e.g. 10:06 and 10:10, 13:06 & 13:10, 15:40 & 15:44) then they tend to run every 30 minutes (e.g. 18:19, 18:49, 19L:14, 19:40, 19:46). The following statement would be more accurate: "There is a railway station in Gerrards Cross with trains into and out of London (Marylebone). The service delivered to the community has deteriorated significantly, the frequency of services (particularly from Marylebone to Gerrards Cross has declined), residents frequently experience an unacceptable level of overcrowding." The point is that our community Plan shouldn't suggest that the community is happy with the rail service, because the community isn't!	Noted	Wording amended 'There is a railway station in Gerrards Cross with regular trains into and out of London (Marylebone)'
Emily White			Obj 11	Commenting	As the nature of our highstreets change, effectively towards offering personal services, not 'things one can buy from Amazon, et al', so does the need for parking. Although we have an occasional traffic warden, vehicles are still frequently witnessed 'fly parking', etc. We live near the cinema and can attest to the fact that Gerrards Cross doesn't have enough parking near the town centre. The problem appears to be more of a relatively short-term parking (less than 3 hours), very close to the town centre problem, for example during popular cinema screenings, or take-away collections. Due to WFH, there appears to be space at the station car parks. There are car parking facilities in the town centre that don't market to this demand, for example: at the Ethorpe Hotel, or at Site 2 (Annex J) (although this site may not be suitable due to very restricted access).	Noted	No action taken

Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
Emily White			Town Centre Policies, Policy 1	Commenting	<b>Policy</b> States, "Where premises meet the criteria at 'a' above, applications for the conversion of the ground floor existing retails and commercial premises to residential dwellings will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the premises are no longer required and/or that there is no other viable use, following the active marketing of the property for a minimum of 6 months." In the current economic climate this test isn't strong enough where the desire amongst property owners strongly favours conversion to residential. It is often said that commercial rents in Gerrards Cross are "too high", as a community, we would benefit from market forces lowering retail rentals, rather than developers converting retail space to residential, effectively because their rental price is too high. Perhaps, the time period should be 12 months active marketing, where if it can be shown that starting at the previous rental level and with a 10% drops every 3 months the property hasn't let then it may be considered for alternative use.	Noted	Policy 1 BP (B) marketing time increased from 6 months to 12 months
Emily White			EP18: Telecommunications Development	Commenting	The Plan mentions EP18 but makes no further mention of telecommunications infrastructure. Given changing working patterns (work from home WFH) an excellent telecommunications infrastructure is essential to GX2030. Could we suggest that we add a section to the Plan and support the excellent work of Swish.	Noted	No action taken
Emily White			Objective 9	Commenting	We wholeheartedly agree with this Objective. Gates whether installed on individual properties or developments discourage the development of "lifetime neighbourhoods".	Noted	No action taken
Jas Uppal			Policy 4	Objecting	I am writing to object to the development proposed at in the GXPlan, specifically under the Gerrards Cross Neighbourhood Plan Pre-Submission Consultation (Regulation 14). I am very concerned about the proposal, especially as it refers to high density development that appears to be totally out of character for the local area, does not respect local amenities for local residents as well as raising concerns for highway safety. We list below our specific points of objection: (1) High density development is proposed for Orchehill Rise Car Park, although the number of dwellings and type of dwellings is unclear, potentially ranging from 21 – 60. Based on the use of the term high-density, the plot size of the proposed development does not fit in with the local street pattern in SL9 8QE where the properties are characterised by large plots with large spacing between. No actual information is provided on the design of the development, other than the term "affordable housing", which would make the development stand out and not respect the character of the surroundings. It does not respect local context and street pattern or, in particular, the scale and proportions of surrounding buildings, and would be entirely out of the character of the area, to the detriment of our local environment. (2) Development of full extent of Orchehill Rise Car Park would create traffic issues. Gerrards Cross railway and three schools nearby already generate significant traffic and congestion during peak times. This traffic, in addition to access being desired to Gerrards Cross town centre, already creates parking issues for local residents. More buildings equals more cars, so issues with inadequate parking would inevitably put more of a burden on highway safety. Therefore, the development is likely to further contribute to local traffic and congestion issues. (3) The proposed development site of Orchehill Rise Car Park is adjacent to a railway line which already generates noise for residents; therefore additional noise issues arising for local residents from noise related to both initial development and from the residential properties constructed is of concern. (4) In addition, the increased traffic is expected to generate air quality issues in the vicinity as the new residents are likely to have cars. (5) The proposed development in Orchehill Rise Car Park will also overlook a number of Orchehill Avenue properties, creating overshadowing for our property with loss of natural light and loss of privacy. The council has a responsibility to its residents, under the Human Rights Act (in particular Protocol 1, Article 1), to	The GXNP allocates 7 dwellings for the Orchehill Rise car park site, with 35-40% to be delivered in the form of two/three bedroom houses. It also identifies the need to ensure appropriate landscaping is provided to minimise the landscape and visual effect of development.	No action taken
Louise Dandy Historic England				Commenting	See 6 page document 'Historic England'	Noted	No action taken
David Barnes Star Planning	yes	Richborough	multiple	Objecting	See 5 page document 'Richborough Star Planning'	Noted	No action taken
David Broadley Bucks Council				Commenting	See 12 page document 'Bucks Council'		

Address	Are you acting as an Agent for someone else?	Clients Details	To which part of the neighbourhood plan does this representation relate?	Is your representation	Please say why you are supporting or objecting to the plan, or make your comments here. Please be as precise as possible. You can expand the box by clicking and dragging the lower right hand corner with three bars.	SG response	Action taken
Name	Response	Name	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response		
Jane Bristow			Vision	Commenting	Within the "Vision" there is no reference to secondary education. All the children of secondary age who pass the 11+ have to travel, they are also the furthest from the schools so when catchment rules are applied they often end up travelling even further – often to Chesham. The plan should have an ambition to rectify this.	Outside the scope of Neighbourhood Plans.	No action taken
Jane Bristow			Appendices	Commenting	The maps included online are illegible they should be uploaded in an improved format to enable comments. They also lack explanation/identification of colour coding etc.	Noted	final maps to be drawn for examination copy of NP
Jane Bristow			Traffic & transport	Commenting	There seems to be little in the document to support the ease of walking versus the volume of traffic. It is presently very difficult to cross the main road. The pedestrian crossings are all light controlled and do not allow elderly people sufficient time to cross. The delay in response to the lights and sequencing means that traffic flow is prioritised over pedestrians – which often results in people crossing the road in a gap and then the lights changing which slows/stops the traffic even further and unnecessarily. There should be further references to pedestrian needs including flow surveys, clearing the "walkways" to enable people to walk on them and making them accessible to wheelchairs (overgrown, tree roots, poorly lit etc).	Outside scope of the Neighbourhood Plan	No action taken
Jane Bristow			Cycle routes	Commenting	It would be good to understand more of the intention in terms of cycle routes and provision for cyclists. The map is unclear on any improvements or ambitions and the provision for cyclists is presently appalling – whilst it is noted you can cycle on the commons you are lucky to get there without being knocked off your bike by a car driving with little to no regard for cyclists.	Noted	No action taken