



LOCAL PLAN for Buckinghamshire

Buckinghamshire Settlement
Review

May 2025



Table of Contents

Buckinghamshire Settlement Review	1
1.0 Introduction.....	3
2.0 Purpose of the Settlement Review and national policy context	4
2.1 Purpose	4
2.2 National policy context	4
3.0 Methodology	6
3.1 Stage 1: Preliminary list of settlements included in review	6
3.2 Stage 2: Desk top study and questionnaire survey.....	8
3.3 Stage 3: Construction of hierarchy	15
4.0 Settlement Hierarchy	17
4.1 Settlement Hierarchy	17
4.2 Points to Note.....	22
4.3 Summary	23
Appendix 1: Summary of previous Settlement Review approaches in former Wycombe district and Aylesbury Vale district.....	24
Appendix 2: Copy of questionnaire sent to all parish/ town councils and parish meetings	25
Appendix 3: Data on smaller settlements (100 – 500 population) not included in final hierarchy.....	28
Appendix 4: Summary of responses to Part 2 questions.....	32
Appendix 5: Comparison of the settlement hierarchy with the emerging retail hierarchy	71

1. Introduction

1.1. In April 2020, a new single unitary council was formed, replacing Buckinghamshire County Council and Aylesbury Vale, Chiltern, South Bucks and Wycombe District Councils. This authority, known as Buckinghamshire Council, serves a population of just over 550,000 people across an area of almost 1,900 km².

1.2. One of Buckinghamshire Council's key corporate priorities is to produce a Local Plan for Buckinghamshire (LP4B) to shape the direction of growth throughout the new unitary area over the next 15 – 20 years. Work has started on gathering information for the evidence base that is necessary to ensure the LP4B will be robust and justifiable, and that it will help to shape a sustainable future for Buckinghamshire. This Settlement Review forms part of the evidence base.

2.0 Purpose of the Settlement Review and national policy context

2.1 Purpose

2.1.1. The Settlement Review seeks to understand how well residents' everyday needs are met within the area that they live by providing an up-to-date picture of services and infrastructure in those settlements. The information gathered will enable a hierarchy of settlements to be drawn up based on current levels of services and facilities provision. This will be used to inform the emerging spatial strategy for the LP4B. It will also influence how identified development needs are to be met across the county.

2.1.2. The review is not intended to ascertain the potential development capacity of individual settlements. The overall level of new development in Buckinghamshire, and its location, will be determined by taking account of a wide range of evidence studies and other policy documents which will be brought together in the new LP4B. It will contribute to the development of the infrastructure development plan that will support the LP4B.

2.2 National policy context

2.2.1. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF December 2024) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these should be applied. Several sections of the NPPF are relevant to the purpose of the Settlement Review, and the key references are outlined below.

2.2.2. The NPPF states (paragraph 7) that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development which it defines as *'meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs'*. It goes on to explain that sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching and interdependent objectives to consider – economic, social and environmental. These objectives are central to the intentions and methodology of the Settlement Review. Paragraph 9 further states that planning policies should play *'an active role in guiding development towards sustainable solutions, but in doing so should take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area'*.

2.2.3. On housing, the NPPF states (paragraph 83) that *'to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive, especially where this will support local services. Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby'*.

Identifying these opportunities in Buckinghamshire requires that we understand what settlements exist where and how they function both individually and with others.

2.2.4. Furthermore, the NPPF states that planning policies regarding employment should *'recognise and address the specific locational requirements of different sectors'* (paragraph 87) as well enable *'the retention and development of accessible local services and community facilities, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, open space, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship'* (paragraph 88). Paragraph 110 of the NPPF states that *'Significant development should be focussed on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes'*.

3.0 Methodology

3.0.1. In some parts of Buckinghamshire, the production of settlement reviews and hierarchies is not a new idea. Similar studies have previously been undertaken in the former Wycombe and Aylesbury Vale districts. Elements of the methodologies of these two studies have been taken forward into the current study. The earlier studies are outlined in Appendix 1. The Buckinghamshire Settlement Review has been conducted in four stages, set out below.

3.1 Stage 1: Preliminary list of settlements included in review

3.1.1 Before data collection commenced, a preliminary list of settlements to be included in the review was drawn up. These were settlements which have a population of at least 100 people as it is considered that those with populations any smaller are highly unlikely to be able to support any services. The settlements initially identified were:

Addington	Adstock	Akeley	Amersham	Ashendon
Ashley Green	Aston Abbotts	Aston Clinton	Aston Sandford	Aylesbury
Barton Hartshorn	Beachampton	Beaconsfield	Biddlesden	Bierton
Boarstall	Bradenham	Brill	Bledlow-cum-Saunderton	Bryants Bottom & Denner Hill
Buckingham	Buckland	Burnham	Calvert Green	Chalfont St Giles
Chalfont St Peter	Charndon	Chartridge	Chearsley	Cheddington
Chenies	Chepping Wycombe	Chesham	Chesham Bois	Chetwode
Chilton	Cholesbury-cum-St Leonards	Coldharbour	Coleshill	Creslow
Cryers Hill	Cublington	Cuddington	Dagnall	Denham
Dinton	Dorney	Dorton	Downley	Drayton Beauchamp
Drayton Parslow	Dunton	East Claydon	Edgcott	Edlesborough
Ellesborough	Farnham Common/ Royal	Fawley	Fleet Marston	Ford
Foscote	Fulmer	Gawcott	Gerrards Cross	Granborough
Great & Little Hampden	Great & Little Kimble	Great Brickhill	Great Horwood	Great Kingshill
Great Marlow	Great Missenden	Grendon Underwood	Haddenham	Halton
Hambleton	Hardwick	Hazlemere	Hedgerley	Hedsor

High Wycombe	Hillesden	Hoggeston	Hogshaw	Hughenden Valley
Hulcott	Hyde Heath	Ibstone	Ickford	Iver
Ivinghoe	Ivinghoe Aston	Little Kingshill	Kingsbrook	Kingswood
Kingsey	Lacey Green	Lane End	Latimer & Ley Hill	Leckhampstead
Lillingstone Dayrell & Luffield Abbey	Lillingstone Lovell	Little Chalfont	Little Horwood	Little Marlow
Little Missenden	Long Crendon	Longwick	Ludgershall	Maids Moreton
Marlow	Marlow Bottom	Marsh Gibbon	Marsworth	Medmenham
Mentmore & Ledburn	Middle Claydon	Naphill & Walters Ash	Nash	Nether Winchendon
Newton Longville	Northall	North Dean	North Marston	Oakley
Oving	Padbury	Penn	Piddington	Pitchcott
Pitstone	Poundon	Preston Bissett	Princes Risborough	Quainton
Radclive & Chackmore	Radnage	Rowsham	Seer Green	Shabbington
Shalstone	Slapton	Soulbury	Steeple Claydon	Stewkley
Stoke Hammond	Stoke Mandeville	Stokenchurch	Stoke Poges	Stone & Bishopstone
Stowe & Dadford	Swanbourne	Taplow	The Lee	Thornborough
Thornton	Turville	Twyford	Upper Winchendon	Upton
Waddesdon	Water Stratford	Watermead	Weedon	Wendover
West Wycombe	Westbury	Westcott	Weston Turville	Wexham
Whaddon	Wheeler End	Whitchurch	Widmer End	Wing
Wingrave	Winslow	Wooburn & Bourne End	Woodham	Worminghall

Wotton Underwood				

3.2 Stage 2: Desk top study and questionnaire survey

Services and facilities

3.2.1. The next stage of the process was a desk-top study to gather information on populations, facilities and services, as well as public transport provision, in the identified settlements. Sources of information used were:

- ONS Census population estimates 2020
- Town and parish council websites
- Google Search and Maps
- Local knowledge
- Buckinghamshire/ bus company timetables
- Aylesbury Vale Settlement Hierarchy 2017
- Wycombe District Council Settlement Hierarchy 2016

3.2.2. Services and facilities were split into key and non-key service and facilities. Key services are those considered the most important in supporting local residents to meet their needs. Non-key services are those which also help to meet needs but are less important on a day-to-day basis and which, because they require larger populations to support them, tend to be found in larger settlements.

Key Services	Non-Key Services
Food shop	Secondary school
Pub	Place of worship
Post office	Pharmacy
GP	Library
Community/ village hall	Dentist
Recreation ground/ playing field/ sports facilities	Leisure/ indoor sports centre
Primary school	

3.2.3. It is recognised that town and parish councils have valuable local knowledge as well as opinions as to how their local area should develop in the future. Therefore, the next stage was to contact all 171 town / parish councils and parish meetings in Buckinghamshire to ask them to review the data collected and to add to or amend it as necessary. This was done using a questionnaire (see Appendix 2), which was sent out in December 2022. The questionnaire was in two parts, the first asked for updates to the services/ facilities matrix. The second part was more qualitative and asked questions about issues which the councils felt could be addressed through the LP4B, what they want to preserve or enhance and any aspirations for the future. It also asked whether they have, or are considering producing, a Neighbourhood Plan.

3.2.4. The Settlement Review was also raised at the Council's Planning & Environment Town and Parish Forum in January 2023 in order to raise awareness and to encourage responses. A total of 82 replies to the questionnaire were received.

Limitations of data

3.2.5. Some parishes contain two or more settlements but when data is parish-based, as much of it is in this study, it is not always straightforward to separate them from each other. The exception to this is where parish councils themselves have provided information relating to individual settlements or where useful sources of data could be found. Where possible, multiple settlements within a single parish have been assessed individually.

In addition, information pertaining to a whole parish area might not be the same as that for the settlement(s) within it, even where there is only one settlement, particularly if the parish includes an extensive rural area. Every effort has been made to address these issues through desktop research, estimation and local knowledge, and to amend the hierarchy appropriately.

Finally, many of the indicators used in the study reflect services and facilities which are liable to change over time, for example shops and pubs are constantly opening and closing, and bus timetables change regularly. It is therefore important to regard this survey as a 'snapshot' of the situation in early 2023, updated in 2025 (see 3.2.16).

Settlements included in review

3.2.6. The information on population figures, questionnaire responses plus a review of the earlier Wycombe and Aylesbury documents were used to refine which settlements were included within the Buckinghamshire review.

3.2.7. A decision was then taken to raise the population threshold to include only settlements of 500 people and above. It was felt that this was more appropriate to a

Buckinghamshire-wide study as those below this threshold consistently demonstrated, in the data acquired, that they had too few services and facilities within them to be considered as potentially sustainable locations. Settlements removed from the study at this point were:

Addington	Adstock	Ashendon	Aston Abbots	Aston Sandford
Barton Hartshorn	Beachampton	Biddlesden	Bishopstone	Boarstall
Bryants Bottom & Denner Hill	Chackmore	Chenies	Chetwode	Chilton
Cholesbury & St Leonards*	Creslow	Cryers Hill	Cublington	Dagnall
Dinton	Dorney**	Dorton	Drayton Beauchamp	Dunton
East Claydon	Edgcott	Fawley	Fleet Marston	Ford
Foscote	Great & Little Hampden	Hardwick	Hedsor	Hillesden
Hoggeston	Hogshaw	Hulcott	Ibstone	Ivinghoe Aston
Kingsey	Kingswood	Latimer & Ley Hill***	Leckhampstead	Lillingstone Dayrell
Lillingstone Lovell	Little Horwood	Little Missenden	Ludgershall	Mentmore
Middle Claydon	Nash	Nether Winchendon	Northall	North Dean
Oving	Pitchcott	Poundon	Preston Bissett	Radclive
Rowsham	Shalstone	Swanbourne	Thornton	Turville
Turweston	Upper Winchendon	Upton	Water Stratford	Weedon
Westbury	Westcott	Wexham****	Wheeler End	Woodham
Wotton Underwood				

* the three settlements in Cholesbury & St Leonards parish (Cholesbury, St Leonards and Buckland Common) all have fewer than 500 residents and so the parish has been removed

** the two settlements in Dorney parish (Dorney and Dorney Reach) both have fewer than 500 residents and so the parish has been removed.

***Latimer and Ley Hill have been separated and Ley Hill assessed with Botley.

**** Wexham parish contains one settlement of more than 500 residents, George Green, which has been added to the study. Therefore, the name 'Wexham' has been removed. Wexham Street is in Stoke Poges parish and the area commonly known as Wexham is functionally part of Slough (see 'Additional Settlements' below).

Data gathered for these settlements and parishes has been retained and included in Appendix 3 for reference.

3.2.8. At the other end of the scale, a number of settlements close to the two largest towns, High Wycombe and Aylesbury, were also removed from the study in recognition that in reality they function as single urban areas as far as services and facilities are concerned. For the purposes of this study, the High Wycombe urban area is considered to include the following parishes/ settlements:

- Downley
- Hazlemere
- Widmer End
- Chepping Wycombe (Tylers Green, Loudwater, Penn and Flackwell Heath)
- Holmer Green

The Aylesbury urban area is considered to include the parishes of

- Coldharbour
- Watermead
- Berryfields
- Buckingham Park
- Kingsbrook

3.2.9. Data gathered for these areas has been included with that for their respective urban areas.

3.2.10. Furthermore, it was considered reasonable to combine Gerrards Cross and Chalfont St Peter's data as the two settlements form a contiguous area with no functional distinction between them.

3.2.11. Where parish/ town councils and parish meetings had provided qualitative data in response to Part 2 of the questionnaire prior to being either removed or combined with the larger urban areas, it has been retained and still included in Appendix 4.

3.2.12. Following the questionnaire survey, a further desktop study took place to update the data held for those parish/ town councils and meetings which had not responded.

Employment

3.2.13. In order to gauge levels of employment provision, data on every property in Buckinghamshire rated by the Valuation Office Agency for business purposes was obtained. From this, the following categories were selected and the number of properties within them per parish area identified using the Councils Geographic Information System (GIS), which is a mapping system:

- Offices
- Warehouses
- Factories
- Workshops
- Business units

3.2.14. This data was then incorporated into the settlement matrix as outlined below and used to help refine the hierarchy. This data was only available at a parish level.

3.2.15. There can, of course, be many other sources of employment provision within any settlement such as shops, health and leisure facilities. As the presence/ absence of these is already considered in the review they were not included in the employment provision figures to avoid double-counting.

Accessibility

3.2.16. For many smaller settlements, non-key services such as secondary schools and leisure centres are unlikely to be present within their boundary. However, it is important to recognise that these may be accessible nearby and that the ease with which this can be done is important in determining the settlement's sustainability. In order to reflect this in the hierarchy, the following factors were looked at:

1. The travel distance by road between the mid-points of the settlement and the nearest Tier 1 or 2 settlement (within Buckinghamshire) or similar (outside of the county) which offers a secondary school, indoor sports or leisure centre, permanent library, dentist and pharmacy (the non-key services).

2. The availability of public transport – the frequency and hours of operation of public transport to the nearest higher tier settlement was assessed and classified as one of the following:

- Excellent: at least 7am – 7pm all day service with a minimum 45 minute daytime frequency (Monday to Saturday) with reduced service on evenings and Sundays; Presence of both bus and rail services and a choice of destinations
- Good: at least 7am – 7pm all day bus service with a minimum of 45 minute daytime frequency (Monday – Saturday) with reduced service evenings and Sundays
- Limited: less than 7am – 7pm daily weekday bus services at daytime frequencies of greater than 45 minutes and with limited or no evening and weekend services
- Extremely limited/ none: fewer than two daily regular scheduled bus services

3.2.17. The outputs from this audit were entered into the Settlement Audit Matrix and used to help refine the results.

‘Additional’ settlements

3.2.18. Following internal review of the initial hierarchy, several ‘additional’ settlements (with populations over 500 people) were identified which it was felt should be included. They had all originally been included as part of a parish area, however these in particular were identified as being physically and/ or operationally distinct from nearby settlements and separation, where possible, would make the hierarchy more accurate. Data for each of them was obtained using desktop study, ONS Census 2021 data and existing parish council responses. Data for the remaining parts of the parishes were amended to reflect the changes.

3.2.19. Settlements added at this stage were:

Bellingdon	Botley & Ley Hill	Denham Green	George Green	Higher Denham
Hyde Heath	Iver Heath	Jordans	Little Kingshill	New Denham
Prestwood	Richings Park	South Heath	Wexham Street	Winchmore Hill

Data update 2025

3.2.20. In December 2024 all parishes were re-contacted as part of a wider data-gathering exercise and asked for any updates to the data originally provided for the Settlement Review. A total of 49 parishes responded. Updates were considered and assessed to check whether any amendments to the hierarchy were needed. It was found that changes were very minor and did not impact on the hierarchy. An assumption was made that where parishes did not respond, the data already held from the previous assessment was correct.

3.3 Stage 3: Construction of hierarchy

3.3.1. The data was used to place each settlement initially into one of five categories as follows, each criteria set being the minimum required:

Tier	Key Services	Non-Key Services	Employment Premises	Public Transport
1 – Major Urban Areas	7/7	6/6	+100	Excellent
2 –Large Market/ Other Town	7/7	6/6	+10	Good
3 - Small Market Town/ Other Large Settlement	6/7	4/6	+5	Good
4 –Large Village	5/7	1/6	1-4	Limited/ Good
5 – Medium/ Small Village	1/7	1/6	0-4	Extremely Limited/ none

What do these categories indicate?

Tier 1: Major Urban Areas

3.3.2. Two towns are considerably larger and better provisioned with services and facilities than others in the study and are therefore placed in a category of their own to reflect their importance. High Wycombe has a built-up urban area of 83,731 residents (Census 2021). It is home to several secondary schools, a large library, university buildings and a hospital, as well as a wide employment offer and extensive shopping and leisure facilities. It has a mainline train station and an extensive bus network including a park and ride. Aylesbury has an urban area population of 88,165 residents across the built-up area and has large-scale residential allocations on its edge which will mean it will grow significantly over the next decade. It contains a similar range of services and facilities to High Wycombe.

Tier 2: Large Market/ Other Town

3.3.3. Tier 2 settlements contain all of the services and facilities expected in any main centre, including shops, secondary and primary schools, indoor and outdoor leisure facilities, a range of employment opportunities and good public transport provision.

Tier 3: Small Market Town/ Other Large Settlement

3.3.4. The third tier consists of other towns and larger settlements which also have an extensive range of services and facilities although not all of the key or non-key services are present, often lacking an indoor recreation facility for example. They have a good range of employment and transport options available.

Tier 4: Large Village

3.3.5. These are the larger villages and settlements which have at least a good level of key service provision and some non-key provision. There is usually some employment offer and public transport ranges from good to limited.

Tier 5: Medium/ Small Village

3.3.6. These are the settlements that have some of the key services but few, if any, non-key services. Employment and transport options range are usually good or limited and in some cases absent.

3.4 Stage 4: Qualitative assessment and sense check

3.4.1. In order to refine the hierarchy a number of additional issues were considered for each settlement and this information was used to move individual settlements into more appropriate categories where deemed necessary. Some of this information was quantitative:

- Settlement population – the population of a settlement is usually key to the number of facilities and services it can support, as well as to levels of public transport.
- Distance from settlement to nearest Tier 1 or 2 town – ease (or lack of it) of access to the largest settlements, where all the non-key services and facilities as well as major employment opportunities exist, is an important factor in the sustainability of smaller settlements which do not contain these services themselves. Although geographical distance is not itself the main indicator of accessibility, it is still a useful indicator of how easy it may be for residents to access service centres.

3.4.2. In addition, more qualitative information was used to help in finalising the hierarchy, particularly that received from the responses to the study questionnaire as well as in-house and local knowledge about settlements' circumstances and current plans for the future.

4. Settlement Hierarchy

4.1 Settlement Hierarchy

4.1.1. Using the data gathered, each settlement has been assigned to one of the five tiers as follows:

Tier 1 – Major Urban Areas	Aylesbury, High Wycombe
Tier 2 – Large Market/ Other Town	Amersham, Beaconsfield, Buckingham, Chalfont St Peter & Gerrards Cross, Chesham, Marlow, Princes Risborough, Wendover
Tier 3 – Small Market Town/ Other Large Settlement	Aston Clinton, Burnham, Chalfont St Giles, Farnham Common/ Farnham Royal, Great Missenden, Haddenham, Iver, Little Chalfont, Stoke Mandeville, Stokenchurch, Wing, Winslow, Wooburn and Bourne End
Tier 4 – Large Village	Bledlow-cum-Saunderton, Botley & Ley Hill, Brill, Chartridge, Cheddington, Cuddington, Denham, Edlesborough, Grendon Underwood, Hambleden, Hedgerley, Hughenden Valley, Hyde Heath, Ickford, Iver Heath, Ivinghoe, Jordans, Lane End, Little Marlow, Long Crendon, Longwick, Marlow Bottom, Marsh Gibbon, Naphill/ Walters Ash, Newton Longville, North Marston, Prestwood, Quainton, Richings Park, Seer Green, Steeple Claydon, Stewkley, Stoke Hammond, Stoke Poges, Stone, Taplow, Thornborough, Tingewick, Twyford, Waddesdon, Weston Turville, West Wycombe, Whitchurch, Wingrave
Tier 5 – Medium /Small Village	Akeley, Ashley Green, Bellingdon, Bierton, Bradenham, Buckland, Calvert Green, Charndon, Chearsley, Chesham Bois, Coleshill, Denham Green, Drayton Parslow, Ellesborough, Fulmer, Gawcott, George Green, Granborough, Great Brickhill, Great Horwood, Great Kingshill, Great/ Little Kimble, Great Marlow, Halton, Higher Denham, Lacey Green, Little Kingshill, Ludgershall, Maids Moreton, Marsworth, Medmenham, Mursley, New Denham, Oakley, Padbury, Piddington, Pitstone, Radnage, Shabbington, Slapton, Soulbury, South Heath, Stowe & Dadford, The Lee, Wexham Street, Whaddon, Winchmore Hill, Worminghall.

4.1.2. The data used to allocate for each settlement is summarised in a matrix below, along with additional information used in Stage 3 to refine and sense-check the placing of each settlement.

Tier	Settlement	Population (2021)*	Key Services	Non Key Services	Employment premises	Distance to nearest Tier 1/2 settlement / similar town outside Bucks (miles)	Public Transport availability
1	Aylesbury	88,165	7/7	6/6	450+	N/A	Excellent
	High Wycombe	83,731	7/7	6/6	350+	N/A	Excellent
2	Amersham	15,212	7/7	6/6	88	N/A	Excellent
	Beaconsfield	12,156	7/7	6/6	12	N/A	Excellent
	Buckingham	14,299	7/7	6/6	143	N/A	Good
	Chalfont St Peter & Gerrards Cross	21,825	7/7	6/6	13	N/A	Excellent
	Chesham	23,099	7/7	6/6	136	N/A	Excellent
	Marlow	14,784	7/7	6/6	22	N/A	Excellent
	Princes Risborough	8,532	7/7	6/6	29	N/A	Excellent
	Wendover	8,204	7/7	6/6	36	N/A	Excellent
3	Wooburn and Bourne End	11,174	7/7	5/6	75	5.4 to High Wycombe (from Wooburn Town)	Excellent
	Burnham	12,508	7/7	5/6	21	4.2 to Maidenhead	Excellent
	Great Missenden	2,425*	7/7	5/6	No data	6.0 to Amersham	Good
	Little Chalfont	6,916	7/7	5/6	3	2.3 to Amersham	Excellent
	Winslow	5,240	7/7	5/6	16	6.4 to Buckingham	Good
	Aston Clinton	4,982	7/7	4/6	38	4.1 to Aylesbury	Good
	Chalfont St Giles	5,936	7/7	4/6	7	2.2 to Chalfont St P/ Gerrards Cross	Good
	Farnham Common/ Royal	6,376	7/7	4/6	0	3.0 to Slough	Good
	Haddenham	5,735	7/7	4/6	61	6.5 to Aylesbury	Excellent
	Stokenchurch	5,125	7/7	4/6	19	9.9 to High Wycombe	Good
	Wing	2,986	7/7	4/6	28	3.1 to Leighton Buzzard (from Wing)	Good
	Iver	3,265	7/7	3/6	116	4.1 to Uxbridge	Excellent
	Stoke	6,596	7/7	1/6	19	2.7 to Aylesbury	Excellent

	Mandeville						
4	Long Crendon	2,630	7/7	3/6	94	2.6 to Thame	Limited
	Prestwood	7,600	7/7	3/6	No data	7.1 to Amersham	Limited
	Steeple Claydon	2,555	7/7	3/6	1	6.0 to Buckingham	Limited
	Waddesdon	1,968	7/7	3/6	7	5.5 to Aylesbury	Good
	Edlesborough	2,945	7/7	2/6	19	3.8 to Dunstable	Limited
	Lane End	3,743	7/7	2/6	18	5.0 to High Wycombe	Limited
	Stoke Poges	5,026	7/7	2/6	5	3.4 to Slough	Good
	Brill	1,154	7/7	1/6	23	14.1 to Aylesbury	Limited
	Hambleden	1,305	7/7	1/6	13	4.4 to Henley	Good
	Whitchurch	995	7/7	1/6	7	5.2 to Aylesbury	Limited
	Ivinghoe	994	6/7	3/6	3	6.8 to Dunstable	Limited
	Iver Heath	5157	6/7	2/6	No data	3.9 to Hillingdon	Good
	Naphill/ Walters Ash**	7,990	6/7	2/6		5.0 to High Wycombe (from WA)	Good
	Taplow	2,409	6/7	2/6	9	2.3 to Maidenhead	Excellent
	West Wycombe	1,320	6/7	2/6	3	2.8 to High Wycombe	Good
	Cheddington	1,901	6/7	1/6	0	6.3 to Leighton Buzzard	Excellent
	Ickford	677	6/7	1/6	1	5.5 to Thame	Limited
	Longwick	1,756	6/7	1/6	3	1.5 to P Risborough	Limited
	Marsh Gibbon	987	6/7	1/6	6	6.0 to Bicester	Limited
	Newton Longville	1,872	6/7	1/6	3	2.4 to Bletchley	Limited
	Quainton	1,309	6/7	1/6	22	7.6 to Aylesbury	Limited
	Stone	2,800*	6/7	1/6	6	3.4 to Aylesbury	Limited
	Wingrave	1,644	6/7	1/6	13	5.9 to Aylesbury	Good
	Marlow Bottom	3,209	5/7	3/6	28	4.1 to High Wycombe	Good
	Chartridge	1,693	5/7	2/6	6	2.3 to Chesham	Limited
	Bledlow-cum-Saunderton	2,648	5/7	1/6	18	3.7 to Princes Risborough	Limited
	Botley & Ley Hill	700*	5/7	1/6	No data	2.1 to Chesham	Limited
	Cuddington	587	5/7	1/6	6	6.3 to Aylesbury	Limited
	Denham	1,500*	5/7	1/6	No data	2.9 to Uxbridge	Excellent
	Hedgerley	920	5/7	1/6	1	5.7 to Slough	Good
	Hyde Heath	1,046	5/7	1/6	No data	3.6 to Amersham	Extremely limited/ none
	Grendon Underwood	1,627	5/7	1/6	10	7.6 to Bicester	Limited

	Hughenden Valley**	1,400*	5/7	1/6	41	2.8 to High Wycombe	Good
	Jordans	700*	5/7	1/6	No data	2.7 to Beaconsfield	Extremely limited/ none
	Little Marlow	1,447	5/7	1/6	6	6.0 to Maidenhead	Limited
	North Marston	689	5/7	1/6	3	7.4 to Aylesbury	Limited
	Richings Park	1,788	5/7	1/6	No data	1.3 to Langley	Limited
	Seer Green	2,322	5/7	1/6	4	3.8 to Beaconsfield	Good
	Stewkley	1,888	5/7	1/6	9	5.4 to Leighton Buzzard	Extremely limited/ none
	Stoke Hammond	2,044	5/7	1/6	17	4.4 to Leighton Buzzard	Limited
	Thornborough	632	5/7	1/6	1	3.6 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
	Tingewick	1,320	5/7	1/6	26	2.7 to Buckingham	Limited
	Twyford	541	5/7	1/6	0	7.9 to Bicester	Limited
	Weston Turville	3,896	5/7	1/6	8	2.9 to Wendover	Good
5	Akeley	494	4/7	1/6	2	2.7 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
	Bierton	2,107	4/7	1/6	13	1.6 to Aylesbury	Good
	Calvert Green	1,137	4/7	0/6	0	9.3 to Bicester	Limited
	Chearsley	544	3/7	2/6	1	8.0 to Aylesbury	Limited
	Chesham Bois	2,951	4/7	1/6	2	1.0 to Chesham	Good
	Coleshill	566	4/7	1/6	1	2.7 to Amersham	Limited
	Fulmer	600	4/7	1/6	6	5.0 to Slough	Limited
	Gawcott	900	4/7	1/6	15	2.5 to Buckingham	Limited
	Great/Little Kimble	1,049	4/7	1/6	9	3.8 to Princes Risborough	Excellent
	Great Brickhill	852	4/7	1/6	7	5.4 to Bletchley	Extremely limited/ none
	Lacey Green	2,372	4/7	1/6	10	3.1 to Princes Risborough	Good
	Little Kingshill	1471	4/7	1/6	No data	5.2 to Amersham	Extremely limited/ none
	Maids Moreton	857	4/7	1/6	1	1.5 to Buckingham	Limited
	Marsworth	756	4/7	1/6	27	7.5 to Aylesbury	Good

	Oakley	1,151	4/7	1/6	8	15.4 to Aylesbury	Limited
	Padbury	888	4/7	1/6	0	2.6 to Buckingham	Good
	The Lee	693	4/7	1/6	0	5.3 to Chesham	Extremely limited/ none
	Whaddon	515	4/7	1/6	1	5.4 to Milton Keynes	Extremely limited or none
	Great Kingshill**	1,700*	4/7	0/6		3.9 to High Wycombe	Limited
	Pitstone	3,584	4/7	0/6	9	8.7 to Aylesbury	Good
	Denham Green	3,200*	3/7	2/6	No data	3.3 to Gerrards Cross	Good
	Ashley Green	989	3/7	1/6	17	2.6 to Chesham	Limited
	Drayton Parslow	665	3/7	1/6	3	4.8 to Bletchley	Limited
	Ellesborough	951	3/7	1/6	0	3.2 to Princes Risborough	Limited
	Granborough	578	3/7	1/6	0	8.3 to Buckingham	Limited
	Mursley	697	3/7	1/6	6	6.8 to Bletchley	Limited
	New Denham	1,788	3/7	1/6	No data	1.1 to Uxbridge	Good
	Piddington	582	3/7	1/6	25	4.3 to High Wycombe	Limited
	Radnage	710	3/7	1/6	1	6.4 to High Wycombe	Extremely limited/ none
	Shabbington	529	3/7	1/6	0	3.9 to Aylesbury	Limited
	Soulbury	833	3/7	1/6	17	3.3 to Leighton Buzzard	Extremely limited/ none
	Worminghall	588	3/7	1/6	29	14.5 to Aylesbury	Limited
	Wexham Street	669	3/7	0/6	No data	3.6 to Slough	Limited
	George Green	993	3/7	0/6	No data	2.4 to Slough	Limited
	Winchmore Hill	663	3/7	0/6	No data	3.6 to Amersham	Good
	Bellingdon	720*	2/7	1/6	No data	2.3 to Chesham	Extremely limited/ none
	Bradenham	614	2/7	1/6	3	4.5 to High Wycombe	Good
	Great Horwood	1,073	2/7	1/6	22	6.3 to Buckingham	Limited
	Medmenham	939	2/7	1/6	7	4.8 to Henley	Good
	Slapton	612	2/7	1/6	2	3.5 to Leighton Buzzard	Extremely limited/

							none
	Stowe & Dadford	873	2/7	1/6	1	4.1 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
	Charndon	266	2/7	0/6	0	8.5 to Bicester	Limited
	Great Marlow	1,324	2/7	0/6	7	4.6 to High Wycombe	Extremely limited/ none
	Higher Denham	657	2/7	0/6	No data	3.5 to Gerrards Cross	Good
	Buckland	678	1/7	1/6	0	4.3 to Aylesbury	Limited
	Halton	1,424	1/7	1/6	0	1.8 to Wendover	Good
	South Heath	1281	0/7	0/6	No data	4.8 to Amersham	Limited

*2021 Census parish populations, except for instances where parishes contain two or more significant settlements which have been assessed individually. In these cases, individual settlement populations are estimated from the 2021 census data and asterisked. Populations for Aylesbury and High Wycombe are Census 2021 'built-up areas'.

**Hughenden Valley employment data covers Great Kingshill, Hughenden Valley, Naphill and Walters Ash.

4.2 Points to Note

4.2.1. Buckingham has been retained as a Tier 2 settlement despite being the only one in the category without a train station, as it is an important service centre for the extensive rural surrounding area, in particular providing important retail services and employment opportunities.

4.2.2. Little Chalfont and Farnham Common/ Royal employment figures are surprisingly low. Each have populations of over 6,000 people and are important service centres, however with limited employment in offices, warehouses, factories, workshops and business units. Little Chalfont also has excellent transport options. They are therefore retained in Tier 3.

4.2.3. Stoke Mandeville has excellent transport links, however it has been categorised as Tier 3 given it only has 1/6 non-key services. It is likely that its close proximity to Aylesbury enables residents to make good use of services and facilities provided there.

4.2.4. Taplow has been kept as a Tier 4 settlement despite having a railway station with excellent links to London. Its population of just over 2,000 people is considerably lower

than any of the Tier 3 settlements and it only has two non-key services (a church and a pharmacy).

4.3 Summary

4.3.1. This Settlement Review summarises the evidence that supports a settlement hierarchy for Buckinghamshire. It describes the settlements as they are at this point in time, indicating how they function both individually and with other nearby settlements.

4.3.2. The hierarchy can be used to help inform the level of growth which may be appropriate to settlements in order to promote sustainable development, bearing in mind many other factors linked to settlement characteristics and constraints need to be considered.

4.3.3. This Settlement Review forms part of the evidence base for the LP4B and should be considered alongside the rest of the evidence submitted.

Appendix 1: Summary of previous Settlement Review approaches in former Wycombe district and Aylesbury Vale district

Local Authority	Summary of Settlement Review
Aylesbury Vale DC (2017)	Purpose To determine the capacity of settlements to accommodate sustainable development. Approach • Classification of Strategic Settlements by population size only (4000+) • Classification of villages according to how many services and facilities they have plus population size Criteria Indicators used to assess settlement capacity to accommodate sustainable development were: settlement size; settlement connectivity; employment; facilities and services ('key' and 'non-key'). Plus a qualitative assessment Hierarchy • Strategic Settlement • Larger Village • Medium Village • Small Village • Other
Wycombe DC (2016)	Purpose To provide a snapshot of the current provision of services and infrastructure in settlements and to ascertain any shortages which might be addressed through new development requirements. Approach Classification of settlements by audits of services and facilities, employment and accessibility. Criteria Indicators used to place settlements in hierarchy were: presence/ absence of 'key' and 'higher order' services, a measurement of employment provision using ward based jobs figure and an accessibility audit of travel distances and public transport availability. Plus a qualitative assessment Hierarchy • Tier 1 – Large Urban Area • Tier 2 – Market Town and Other Major Settlement • Tier 3 - Higher-Order Service Village • Tier 4 - Other Service Centre • Tier 5 - Small Village • Tier 6 - Hamlet

Appendix 2: Copy of questionnaire sent to all parish/ town councils and parish meetings



Dear * Parish Council,

Buckinghamshire Council is conducting a Settlement Review of all Towns and Parishes within the Council area. This review will form part of the evidence base for the [Local Plan for Buckinghamshire](#) and has been split into two parts - Part one: review of the services and facilities, and Part two: general feedback.

Part One:

We carried out an initial desk-based audit of the facilities and services for each Town and Parish Council/Meeting area. We have identified the following for your area:

Name of Parish/Meeting:

Population: ***

No. of households: ***

Key Services	Number of Services/ Facilities	Address and Details (e.g., opening times)	Amendments/ Comments
Food Shop (supermarket/ local store/ garage)	*		
Pub	*		
Post Office	*		
GP	*		
Community/ Village Hall	*		
Recreation grounds/ Playing	*		

fields/ sports facilities			
Primary School	*		

Non-key Services	Number of Services/ Facilities	Address and Details (e.g., opening times)	Amendments/ Comments
Secondary School	*		
Places of Worship	*		
Pharmacy	*		
Library	*		
Dentist	*		
Leisure Centre	*		

Public Transport	Number of Services/ Facilities	Address and Details (e.g., opening times)	Amendments/ Comments
Train station	*		
Bus Transport Services (frequencies are approximate as vary depending on the route and time)	*		
School Bus Transport Services (x1 am and return pm service)	*		

Sources: ONS Census population estimates 2020, Household populations 2011, Town and Parish Council websites, Google search, Google maps, local knowledge, Buckinghamshire Council bus timetables, Aylesbury Vale Settlement Hierarchy 2017, Wycombe District Council Settlement Hierarchy 2016.

We'd be very grateful for your help in reviewing the data from our desk-based audit and confirming whether this information is correct, or if we need to adjust anything.

Part Two:

It would also be useful if you could answer the following questions:

1. Does your Town/ Parish have any issues that the Local Plan might help to solve? E.g., road junction capacity, bus services, school places or localised flooding.
2. What would you most like to preserve or improve about your Town/ Parish? E.g., local green space, historic character, local shops and services. We are also still

interested to hear about any sites that we might have missed in the [Call for Sites](#) engagement exercises.

3. What are your aspirations for your Town/Parish over the next 20 years?
4. If you have not already done so, do you aspire to produce a Neighbourhood Development Plan? If so, what are your reasons for doing so, or not doing so?

The deadline for response is 28 February 2023

Appendix 3: Data on smaller settlements (100 – 500 population) not included in final hierarchy

Settlement	Population (2021 Census)	Key Services	Non Key Services	Employment Premises	Distance to Nearest Tier 1/2 settlement / similar town outside Bucks (miles)	Public Transport availability
Addington	152	0/7	1/6	3	5.0 to Buckingham	Good
Adstock	371	3/7	1/6	1	4.2 to Buckingham	Limited
Ashendon	264	2/7	1/6	0	9.9 to Aylesbury	Very limited or none
Aston Abbotts	427	2/7	1/6	3	5.6 to Aylesbury	Limited
Aston Sandford	183*	0/7	1/6	2	4.5 to Princes Risborough	Good
Barton Hartshorn	82	0/7	1/6	0	6.0 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
Beachampton	161	1/7	1/6	5	6.4 to Buckingham	Very limited or none
Biddlesden	138	0/7	1/6	3	5.0 to Brackley	Extremely limited/ none
Bishopstone	275*	2/7	0/6	No data	4.1 to Aylesbury	Extremely limited/ none
Boarstall	101	0/7	1/6	0	7.2 to Bicester	Extremely limited/ none
Bryants Bottom/ Denner Hill	269*	3/7	0/6	No data	5.9 to High Wycombe	Extremely limited/ none
Chenies	287	3/7	1/6	2	4.0 to Rickmansworth	Limited
Chetwode	84	0/7	1/6	0	7.1 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
Chilton	302	0/7	1/6	2	10.5 to Aylesbury	Limited
**Cholesbury-cum-St Leonards	942	5/7	1/6	12	4.2 to Chesham	Limited
Creslow	25*	0/7	0/7	0	6.6 to Aylesbury	Very limited/ none
Cryers Hill	358*	4/7	1/6	No	3.0 to High	Good

				data	Wycombe	
Cublington	342	3/7	1/6	0	6.1 to Leighton Buzzard	Limited
Dagnall	495*	4/7	0/6	No data	4.7 to Dunstable	Extremely limited/ none
***Dinton	240*	4/7	1/6	30	5.1 to Aylesbury	Good
Dorton	149	0/7	1/6	No data	11.8 to Aylesbury	Extremely limited/ none
Drayton Beauchamp	162	0/7	1/6	0	5.6 to Aylesbury	Extremely limited/ none
Dunton	88	0/7	1/6	1	7.8 to Aylesbury	Extremely limited/ none
East Claydon	407	3/7	1/6	1	6.8 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
Edgcott	260	1/7	1/6	0	8.2 to Bicester	Extremely limited/ none
Fawley	228	0/7	1/6	1	3.5 to Henley	Good
Fleet Marston	< 200*	0/7	1/6	No data	3.8 to Aylesbury	Good
***Ford	260*	1/7	0/6		5.0 to Aylesbury	Limited
Foscote	297*	0/7	0/6	0	2.3 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
Great/ Little Hampden	251	5/7	1/6	0	3.1 to Princes Risborough (from GH)	Extremely limited/ none
Hardwick	260	3/7	1/6	0	4.1 to Aylesbury	Good
Hedsor	101	0/7	1/6	3	5.1 to Maidenhead	Limited
Hillesden	205	0/7	1/6	0	4.2 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
Hoggeston	120	0/7	1/6	0	8.3 to Aylesbury	Extremely limited/ none
Hogshaw	79	0/7	0/6	5+	9.3 to Aylesbury	Extremely limited/ none
Hulcott	100	0/7	1/6	0	3.3 to Aylesbury	Good
Ibstone	241	3/7	1/6	1	11.3 to High Wycombe	Limited
Kingsey	143	0/7	1/6	2	2.3 to Thame	Limited
Kingswood	111	1/7	0/6	0	9.5 to	Limited

					Aylesbury	
Latimer	370*	0/7	1/6	0	3.8 to Amersham	Extremely limited/ none
Leckhampstead	197	1/7	1/6	1	4.6 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
Lillingstone Dayrell	100	0/7	1/6	No data	3.5 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
Lillingstone Lovell	136	1/7	1/6	2	5.5 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
Little Horwood	492	3/7	1/6	36	6.2 to Bletchley	Limited
Little Missenden	276	4/7	1/6	No data	2.7 to Amersham	Extremely limited/ none
Ludgershall	393	3/7	1/6	1	13.3 to Aylesbury	Extremely limited/ none
Mentmore	410	3/7	1/6	11	4.6 to Leighton Buzz	Extremely limited/ none
Middle Claydon	165	0/7	1/6	2	7.0 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
Nash	469	2/7	1/6	1	7.0 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
Nether Winchendon	144	0/7	1/6	1	7.8 to Aylesbury	Extremely limited/ none
Northall	456*	3/7	1/6	No data	3.9 to Leighton Buzzard	Extremely limited/ none
North Dean	325*	2/7	0/6	0	4.9 to High Wycombe	Extremely limited/ none
Oving	456	3/7	1/6	0	6.3 to Aylesbury	Limited
Pitchcott	59	0/7	0/6	3	7.0 to Aylesbury	Limited
Poundon	136	1/7	0/6	1	6.9 to Bicester	Limited
Preston Bissett	294	3/7	1/6	14	5.1 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
Radclive & Chackmore	257	3/7	1/6	0	1.9 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
Rowsham	140*	0/7	0/6	No data	3.6 to Aylesbury	Good
Shalstone	101	1/7	1/6	1	4.3 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/

						none
Swanbourne	419	6/7	1/6	3	8.4 to Bletchley	Limited
Thornton	160	0/7	1/6	0	5.1 to Buckingham	Extremely limited/ none
Turville	313	2/7	1/6	0	8.0 to High Wycombe	Extremely limited/ none
Turweston	197	3/7	1/6	6	1.5 to Brackley	Extremely limited/ none
Upper Winchendon	111	0/7	1/6	0	6.7 to Aylesbury	Extremely limited/ none
***Upton	310	0/7	0/6		4.4 to Aylesbury	Good
Water Stratford	124	1/7	1/6	1	3.3 to Buckingham	Limited
Weedon	377	3/7	1/6	0	3.5 to Aylesbury	Limited
Westbury	480	3/7	1/6	5	2.5 to Brackley	Limited
Westcott	445	4/7	1/6	83	8.2 to Aylesbury	Limited
Wheeler End	< 500	3/7	0/6	No data	4.3 to High Wycombe	Limited
Woodham	54	0/7	0/6	No data	8.7 to Aylesbury	Limited
Wotton Underwood	135	0/7	1/6	No data	13.2 to Aylesbury	Extremely limited/ none

*2020 estimates used where 2021 Census data does not provide a figure

**Cholesbury and St Leonards includes three separate settlements, all with a population of less than 500 each.

*** Dinton employment figure includes Ford and Upton

Appendix 4: Summary of responses to Part 2 questions

Individual parish responses to the Part 2 questions are included here, summarised if necessary.

Akeley Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Narrow roads through Akeley
- Old and failing drain system
- Two site school causing additional car journeys
- Leckhampstead Road needs traffic calming and traffic management through the village.

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- To preserve the green spaces within the village boundary & those to rear of houses on the village outskirts in order to maintain the open character
- Footpaths need to be maintained
- Village Hall is excellent and well used
- Roads in and out of the village, particularly Leckhampstead Rd and Chapel Lane, are not suitable for larger volumes of traffic so further development would cause traffic problems
- Some residents wish to have a village shop – only viable option would be for pub to stock non-perishable items
- Community orchard being looked into – site needed

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- To refurbish the play area
- To maintain open spaces within village and preserve wildflower area
- To develop the recreational area to best meet the needs of residents
- To continue to support residents in maintaining the rural village community
- To preserve and support wildlife in and around the village
- Any housing development to be small starter homes on small sites – village has more than enough 4/5 bed detached homes. Growth to be in line with village amenities

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

‘We aspire to produce a neighbourhood plan, it is knowing how to get started and motivating other members of the community rather than just the Councillors to participate that is holding us back’

Amersham Town Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Insufficient housing, in particular affordable housing
- Inadequate infrastructure including lack of school places, primary care capacity and community provision
- Localised flooding in several areas, in particular at the top of Rectory Hill, the corner of Sycamore Road and Grimsdells Road, School Lane and on the High Street
- Poor road safety in Amersham on the Hill outside Dr Challoners, outside Amersham Station and in the Old Town at the bottom of Rectory Hill
- Traffic flow and pedestrian safety at the junction of A404 Stanley Hill/White Lion Rd and A4154 Woodside Road outside St George's School and by the railway bridge, King George V Road by the Bucks Council offices and Chilterns Lifestyle Centre, Woodside Road zebra crossing near Green Lane.
- The speed limit on Rectory Hill, especially outside the Jubilee Hall
- Speeding traffic on Stanley Hill, Station Road, Grimsdells Lane/Planation Road
- Regular reliable bus services aligned with reducing private vehicle movements and pollution around town
- Parking provision in Old Amersham
- Consideration of creation of shared spaces (rather than outright pedestrianisation)
- Increase doctor practices as the two existing are already overloaded, and the increasing local population is only exacerbating this further.
- Pavements at a number of sites to be more user friendly for those using prams, push-chairs, mobility scooters and wheelchairs. Many curbs do not include a suitable ramp at key junctions, such as the roundabout on Woodside Road/Chiltern Avenue.

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Preserve historic character, particularly buildings/houses at threat, ensure they are on the historic buildings list
- Maintain face to face access to key community services - council services, police, banking, libraries, postal services
- Maintain the strong local independent retail and hospitality presence on our high streets
- Development of a Community Hub to incorporate services needed for the town, providing a facility for community groups and small charities
- More amenities and services for younger people, particularly teenagers and young adults
- Maintain and improve sustainability, recycling, environmental projects, green spaces and woodlands
- Upgrade the children's playgrounds

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- A thriving town and dynamic high street areas, with an attractive and varied retail offer including independent shops to encourage people to shop local
- A dynamic local economy in which local SME businesses can operate and thrive
- More affordable housing to help local people stay in the area instead of being forced out by high prices, helping provide a local workforce for local businesses
- Measures to improve the long term sustainability of housing by incorporating insulation, sustainable materials, renewable energy and carbon neutral standards
- Leading the development of a sustainable environment, improving biodiversity, green spaces, woodland, parks and gardens
- Provision of suitable high quality care for the elderly - catering for their health and wellbeing, as well as their housing
- A community that works together for everyone

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

‘Amersham does not have a Neighbourhood Development Plan as it was not felt that there was sufficient benefit to justify the expense of developing such a plan. As this decision was taken some years ago it may that the town should review and consider this again - to assess the objectives, benefits and costs involved were such a plan to be developed.’

Ashendon Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

No

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Keep the local pub open (currently closed)
- Character of Pollicott hamlets to be preserved

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Retain a small rural community
- Limit development to existing developed areas only

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

‘Given Ashendon is classified as a small village, and National Planning Guidance now gives great weight to the Local Plan, it does not consider a Neighbourhood Plan necessary. Ashendon is a small hill-top village that has grown organically – significant development cannot be supported by the local infrastructure and services. Concern is expressed for outlying communities (Upper and Lower Pollicott. Hill Farm and Watbridge have been threatened by connecting/creeping development. ‘

Ashley Green Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- More resistance to development to prevent overdevelopment of village

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Prioritise retaining green areas of village and those surrounding parish, distinguishing it from neighbouring towns
- Preserve Grade 2 listed buildings in addition to pubs and church

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Maintain unique village environment and maintain separation from two neighbouring towns
- Resist unwanted development
- Extension of AONB to encompass the village
- Become more sustainable with increase in solar/ electronic power

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

‘No – it is an expense the parish cannot currently afford’.

Aston Clinton Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- The London Road/Upper Icknield junction capacity .
- The lack of school places and inability to increase capacity.
- The lack of NHS GP/Dentist capacity.

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Prevention of coalescence with the surrounding areas.
- Preserving Local Green Space.
- Preserving the Settlement Boundary.
- To be static to allow for the influx of incoming developments to be absorbed and integrated into the community.

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- To protect biodiversity and respect the ecosystem.
- To encourage agriculture
- Restoring the native hedgerows

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

‘Neighbourhood Plan has been developed; however, it is due for a review. This review is currently in the beginning stages and further information is being gathered.’

Aston Sandford Parish Meeting

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i>
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> To maintain the village Conservation status and for that of the surrounding fields
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> To preserve the village atmosphere and remain clear of the encroaching villages, preserving the unique small village ambience
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i>

Beachampton Parish Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> - Poor state of roads - Lack of public transport - Road liable to flooding and being surrounded by light industrial development/ solar farms on all roads to/ from village
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> Preserve it as a village rather than a few houses in middle of an industrial park
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> Survive!
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i>

Beaconsfield Town Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> - Insufficient large halls especially in new town centre - Centrally located library on bus route in centre of new town - No accessible park/ open space in town - Bus stops need upgrading with live information - A40 bus stops to be in more accessible locations - Need permanent air quality monitoring - Blocked/ inadequate drains causing localised flooding - Electric charging points including on-street where off street parking is limited
--

- Traffic jams on A40 and surrounding roads
- B474 road junction capacity
- A355/ Ledborough Lane dangerous junction
- General poor road standards
- Poor standard of footway surfaces, where possible to be wider for non-car users
- Better upkeep of street furniture
- Missing and broken lampposts
- Old Town damaged character lampposts and surrounding setts
- Inadequate old town road crossings
- Insufficient zebra crossings
- 20mph speed limit needed Penn/Station Rad in particular
- Poor parking provision in Old Town
- Lack of on street/ free parking in New Town
- Parking capacity at Wattleton Rd for school drop off/ pick up required
- Primary school places insufficient
- Insufficient numbers of doctors/ nurses/ dentists (NHS)
- No local A&E at Wycombe or Amersham; long wait times

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Full protection of green belt
- Preserve shops and services in town centres, no out of town commercial wanted

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Protection of green belt in line with NPPF Para. 11b footnote 7
- Improvement in air quality and nurturing of nature
- Maintain and cherish what already exists
- Reduce carbon footprint
- Reduce waste
- Revitalise New Town centre and create a sense of community
- New Town playground for under 7s
- More GP appointments

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- NDP in progress, completed Reg. 14 Stage and progressing to Reg. 15

Bierton Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Traffic calming proposals currently with Buckinghamshire Council

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- All (local green space, historic character, local shops and services) with no further

development in the village due to large Kingsbrook development
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> Retain rural character and avoid becoming a suburb of Aylesbury
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> In progress but currently halted due to Kingsbrook Parish wishing to be excluded

Bradenham Parish Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> Want improvement to junction A4010/ Bradenham Woods Lane and improved pedestrian safety at junction of Bradenham Woods Lane – New Road/ Main Road Walters Ash
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> Historic character of Bradenham village and green spaces
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> To enhance and preserve the community
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> Complicated by fact parish is split into two parts and includes only part of Walter's Ash. Future development restricted as parish wholly within AONB with several areas of green belt. MOD and National Trust are major landowners

Burnham Parish Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> - In need of a non-selective secondary school - Single existing health facility is stretched
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> - Preserve – Heritage, green spaces, local shops including High Street - Improve – School provision at secondary level, police presence and high street footfall.
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> Maintain a 'village feel'; keep a distinction from Slough
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> In progress

Chalfont St Giles

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Dealing with flooding in CSG centre
- Improved bus services including 'on demand' service
- Traffic management/ calming in village
- Better Rights of Way maintenance
- Rapid implementation of Phase 3 of Buckinghamshire Greenway

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Preservation of designated green belt and AONB areas
- Protection and maintenance of 11 local green spaces designated in Neighbourhood Plan
- Maintain parish boundary and prevent settlement close to it to prevent urban sprawl/ protect parish identity
- Maintenance and improvement of parish conservation areas
- Protection for local and/or independent shops and businesses
- Ensure HS2 continues to be 'respectful' to residents/visitors and areas affected by works are returned to their original state after the construction phase

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Preservation of parish history
- The survival of shops and businesses
- Improved walking and cycling routes from north and south of the county, especially pavement along A413 Amersham to CSG as bus service has been cancelled
- Maintenance of rural village nature of parish
- Maintenance of public conveniences within town centre

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Yes, made in 2019

Chalfont St Peter

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Highways infrastructure under pressure from commuter/ school traffic
- On street residential parking – house enlargements leading to more cars
- Parking on yellow lines/ restricted areas – need more parking wardens
- More yellow line restrictions at junctions
- More bus services, smaller/more frequent buses, including to local hospitals and to Gerrards X station

• A cap on school places at the Community College – is causing traffic jams/ parking issues • Sewage contaminated water flooding the village
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> • Maintenance of the green belt separating CSP from Hertfordshire and outer London. Create new settlements rather than turn villages into towns • Better retail design in CSP. • Market Place, Gold Hill Common and the area from the Greyhound roundabout encompassing listed buildings should be conservation areas • Adequate off street parking • Community use for the ambulance depot if it becomes redundant - hall/ meeting rooms/ TIC/museum • Concern that too many retail units becoming service type businesses, need retail businesses which help to sustain the village centre • Preservation of CSP historic character and identity • Loss of small business units to residential, often with insufficient/ no parking
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> • Any new development will have been ring fenced within existing green belt and village has not been merged with another community. Large redundant space not to be replaced with dense housing and inadequate parking • Extend the AONB into CSP • An end to sewage contamination in the Misbourne chalk stream, • Ensure that Chalfonts and GX Hospital remains in the village • Encourage Hospital Community and Wellbeing Centre to work with private sector as well as NHS if space permits, it is a valuable asset • A new, larger community centre • Encourage more volunteering • The River Misbourne to flow continuously again • More outdoor activities on Mill Meadow • Establish a village museum
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> • Have a plan 2016 – 2028, currently updating this with expanded heritage information and a design code

Chearsley Parish Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> • Finalisation/ funding of multi-way road junction in village centre • Removal of HGVs from unsuitable country roads. Full support for BC TRO is needed from councillors • Additional speed reduction measures especially through village. A 20mph limit would be supported • More parking in particular for the village hall and houses without parking space • Improved bus services at weekends, smaller buses on lighter routes.
--

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Preservation of the village's distinct character
- Maintenance of conservation area, area of attractive natural landscape and 'Small Village' designations, and their role in protecting the village, in the new Local Plan
- Any infill building to comprise smaller housing units for younger residents
- Aim to create a heritage trail around the village's historical buildings and features

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Chearsley to remain an attractive place to live, so to improve and protect existing rather than seek any large scale expansion or change
- Reduction of traffic damage. Currently working on kerbing to mitigate this
- Installation of broadband fibre to be sensitively done
- Overhead electricity and 'phone lines to be moved underground
- Better mobile 'phone coverage

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Not at present but under review. Would like advice on benefits

Chesham Town Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Have an Air Quality Management Plan; main road through town suffers from congestion
- Bus service improvements are needed
- Surface and ground water flooding are a significant issue
- Untreated sewage releases into the River Chess which current Thames Water works will not sufficiently address
- School places in Chesham are an issue

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Preserve/ improve green spaces, high street, theatre, historic buildings, conservation area, bus and tube services
- Hilltop Estate and Codmore area need local shop(s)
- Infrastructure supporting active travel is needed
- Significant car parking issues in some residential streets
- River Chess is a globally rare habitat and requires improvement/ protection
- Sections of the Vale Brook culvert need to be de-culverted to improve habitat and make pollution easier to detect

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- High quality social, recreational and cultural facilities in the town
- A thriving and vibrant high street
- Green and blue spaces that are conserved and protected
- Maintenance and celebration of Chesham's unique heritage and identity
- A net zero carbon community

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- 'We are preparing a neighbourhood plan with the main aim of focusing future development in the town rather than extending it into the Green Belt and Chilterns AONB that surround us. Reusing brownfield land creates fewer demands on existing infrastructure, on our roads and allows us to tread more lightly and sustainably upon the planet whilst also supporting more activity and prosperity within Chesham's precious town centre.'

Chetwode Parish meeting

- The population of this parish has greatly reduced owing to HS2.
- Several dwellings have been demolished and more are empty.
- Until we can see what the situation is once construction is completed it is hard to know what will be needed.
- The only community asset we have is our church which can be used as a meeting place and village hall. Maintenance is obviously very important and we struggle to raise funds.

Cholesbury-cum-St. Leonards Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Planning policies relating to conservation areas and settlement infilling need to be reviewed and made more robust
- Better provision for Travellers and Gypsies in the county

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

Aspirations for next 20 years?

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Have decided not to do this due to resources required and expense

Coleshill Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Improvements to bus services especially for commuters using rail services, pupils going to Amersham/ Beaconsfield schools and during evenings/ weekends
- Road surfaces need improvement and maintenance
- Removal of HGVs from village
- Local surface water flooding issues

• Installation of fibre broadband needs to be accelerated • Maintain the lack of pavement and street lighting as this prevents light pollution
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> • The rural nature of the village and its open spaces • Maintenance of the infant school • Funding for the maintenance and continued management of the two recreation facilities • Protection of village pubs from development • Maintenance and development of the capabilities of the village hall • Support for the cricket and tennis clubs into the future • Protection of green and open spaces and woodland surrounding the village from development • No development that results in Coleshill becoming joined with Winchmore Hill
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> • Maintain the rural aspect and qualities of the village, with necessary infrastructure and public services in support
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> • No – cost is prohibitive

Creslow Meeting

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> • Lack of local housing in the parish, 3-4 more houses needed • More employment in the parish
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i>
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i>
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> • No, due to cost

Dinton with Ford and Upton

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Dinton – dangerous road junction accessing A418 at top of New Road and road narrowing at crossroads
- Ford – effective traffic calming and /or 20mph limit through village required; upgrade of existing sewer; safe pavement along main road Bridge Farm to Little London
- Upton – dangerous road junction accessing A418 at top of Upton Road

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Dinton/ Upton – historic character and tranquil rural village atmosphere. Preservation of conservation areas
- Ford – historic character and tranquil rural village atmosphere; support for the Dinton Hermit pub; important that village maintains its identity distinct from adjoining conurbations

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Improvements to existing /or a new village hall (if new, possibly funded by development of affordable housing on site of existing hall)

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No aspirations to produce a Plan. Anticipate that any additional housing will be infill, replacement or windfall. Refurbishment of existing facilities should be promoted

Dorton Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Village has no bus services so all residents rely on access to a car, including for schools.
- Roadside paths not well maintained, residents forced to walk on roads in places

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Would like to replace footpath stiles with kissing gates to enable less mobile people to use paths
- Traffic speeds mean roads around the village are dangerous to walk on
- Village would like an allotment area to grow produce
- Bus service is wanted
- Village does not want street lights

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- as above

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No

Drayton Beauchamp Parish Meeting

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Traffic using the village lane as a rat run – alternative routes should be considered to encourage drivers to avoid village
- A dog waste bin would be helpful on canal towpath near Wendover Arms

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- The quiet, rural setting. Residents value having no streetlights as it reduces light pollution.

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- To maintain the quiet, rural and historic nature of the village with its surrounding green environment

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No. Population is too small and most of the parish is designated AONB, green belt or conservation area constraining any opportunities for notable change

East Claydon Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Existing footpaths require upgrading and improving.
- Bus services need improving
- More effective flood management needs to be implemented before any new developments in the village are considered.

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Green space to be largely retained
- Green buffer to remain between East Claydon and Botolph Claydon and nearby villages

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Major infrastructure projects in the area to cease
- The two villages to retain their character and size by allowing only very small and sensitive development when needed
- Reduce HGV traffic using rural lanes
- Support for agricultural heritage and contribution to food production and local economy

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No plans for NDP

Edgcott Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Existing footpaths require upgrading and improving, parts of village have no footpath at all.
- A footpath from Calvert Green to Edgcott would be beneficial

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Green space to be largely retained
- Green buffer to remain between Edgcott and nearby villages
- Village pond area to be reinstated and improved

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Major infrastructure projects in the area to cease
- Village to retain its character and size by allowing only very small and sensitive development when needed

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No plans for NDP as rely on VALP planning policies to control development

Edlesborough, Dagnall and Northall

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

Edlesborough:

- Improved bus services including bus connections to the nearest rail stations at Cheddington, Tring and/or Leighton Buzzard. Residents are currently reliant on private cars
- Improvements to the B440 at Church End, Edlesborough, to relieve the existing pinch point at the Church
- Improved footpath provision along the B440 connecting the three villages that make up the Parish.

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- We would like to retain all our local green space, historic character, local shops and services

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- To preserve and if possible enhance the existing village ambience and sense of community. Growth must be limited to small individual developments. Large housing developments tend to overwhelm and urbanise the feel of the village.

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Yes, have a NDP in place

Foscote Meeting

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> • Increased traffic on narrow blind bend • Recurring burst water pipes
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> • Mending of recurring potholes
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> • To preserve unspoilt nature of hamlet
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> • No – too small and no facilities

Fulmer Parish Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> • Maintaining the green setting of the village • Rural street scene is threatened by poorly designed new developments • Conversion of existing agricultural and equestrian buildings and subdivision of buildings/ plots threatens intensification of land occupation as well as endangering road traffic users • Numerous traffic incidents leading to destroyed walls, hedges and fences • Flooding – improved drainage needed to reduce problems
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> • Preserve the look and feel of the village including the type, character and intensity of dwellings within it. The green setting is a special part of the connection to nature. Biggest threat is overdevelopment of large residences which are then left empty by absent owners. • Preservation of the green belt and extension of the conservation area
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> • Keep Fulmer special – protect green belt. • Local community institutions also need support, depending on effective communication between residents, parish council, Buckinghamshire Council and other bodies to prevent activities that threaten to destroy it
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> • No NDP but have aspiration to do one. Concern over resources as well as communications from other parishes stating that NDPs are not sufficiently taken into account during the decision making process

Gerrards Cross Town Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Lack of GP surgery and secondary school places
- Traffic through town centre / main crossroads
- Flooding along the A40

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Using brownfield before greenbelt for new builds
- Ensuring that appropriate infrastructure accompanied any new development
- New development was sympathetic to existing environment
- Good design is encouraged and enforced
- There are protections for heritage assets and historic buildings
- Preserve the green belt
- Maintain strategic gaps with other towns and villages
- Maintain town centre retail units and avoid converting too many into dwellings
- Have good parking provision for the town centre and any new businesses

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- A thriving town that is a destination for residents and residents from outside too

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- In progress

Granborough Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Local primary school has insufficient places
- Have tried to get support with creating a cycle path/ footway between North Marston and Granborough but no success so far
- Traffic problems on Green End need a solution

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- See Neighbourhood Development Plan

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- See Neighbourhood Development Plan

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Yes, have produced an NDP

--

Great and Little Hampden Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- more bus services
- traffic redirected away from the main village on other more appropriate roads, rather than down Memorial Road
- measures to reduce traffic speed throughout the village, but particularly any road where there are residential properties on one or more of the sides of the road.

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Preservation of the existing area is important

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Housing growth should not exceed 10% of the existing stock and 'brown field' locations are preferred

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No NDP

Great and Little Kimble Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Severe flooding in the Marsh needs addressing, especially drainage clearance

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Preserve the village feel and contain development

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Contain development in accordance with Neighbourhood plan

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Yes, have a Neighbourhood Development Plan in place

Great Horwood Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Need Active Travel route to Winslow to be implemented
- Have objected to the possible allocation of Little Horwood airfield as a brownfield site
- High Street needs a 20mph speed limit and a pedestrian crossing; or a village bypass
- Need an innovative transport system to connect Winslow station with the local villages, such as Demand Responsive Transport
- Lack of proper GP service
- Poor state of roads, particularly the High Street
- Lack of police presence in parish
- Road closures and works by utility service
- Concern over plans for widening A421 which could affect land used by GH Cricket Club

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Concerns over possibility that GH becomes part of greater Winslow or Milton Keynes

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Maintenance of the integrity of settlements in Aylesbury Vale

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

?

Great Missenden Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Local bus service – am and pm rush hours
- Improve road layout and access to GM station
- Improve local pavements, recover verges and cut back hedges especially on main/ busy roads

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Improve local public rights of way to enable walking/ cycling to schools, station, church and High Wycombe
- Retain all current green spaces and infrastructure

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Improve cycling to school safety
- Improve local tranquillity particularly a reduction in the number of light aircraft and helicopters
- Ensure complete renovation of areas impacted by HS2

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Aspire to produce one

Hambleden Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- parking for visitors
- oversized vehicles such as HGVs using unsuitable roads
- introduction of 20mph speed limits through villages

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Current characteristics of the AONB to keep it as a tranquil, peaceful environment to live in
- No sites for building development

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- To maintain the current way of life for residents
- To reduce traffic throughout the village, particularly large vehicles
- To encourage more sustainable transport such as bus travel
- To improve the mobile phone signal in the parish

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No plans to produce NDP due to resources involved

Hardwick Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- A418 junction with village road needs additional safety measures
- Road and footpath surfaces have deteriorated and need addressing

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- To preserve historical character, green space and improve sense of community

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- To enhance and retain the tidy upkeep of the village, to retain its character, nature and community feel
- To support local decisions and maintain open discussions with residents and to look to improve the village without losing its soul, character and feel

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Was considered but not progressed due to the resources required

Hazlemere Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Proposed housing at Terriers Farm – impact on roads, doctors, dentists, schools and social facilities

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Would like Sure Start building/Beaumont Way public toilets to be devolved to the parish council, as well as the Buckinghamshire owned part of Hazlemere Recreation ground

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Maintenance of separation as a village from High Wycombe and Holmer Green
- Maintenance/ improvement in living and working conditions for residents

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Is underway

Ibstone Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Concern over pressure on school places, particularly secondary, increased housing will bring
- Flooding issues on highway
- Speeding traffic in the village

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Keep the green spaces and maintain village character
- No sites for wider housing are available within the parish

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Maintain the current rural quality of life – sense of community and a positive feel
- Improve current levels of services such as GPs

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No aspiration to produce NDP due to resources required

Ivinghoe Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Ivinghoe / Ivinghoe Aston: Lack of bus service to nearest rail stations and towns
- Ivinghoe Aston: speeding traffic problem

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Preserve openness of green belt and protect from inappropriate development.
- Preserve the AONB and protect the character and appearance of conservation area and listed buildings
- Maintain public rights of way network

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Ivinghoe / Ivinghoe Aston: Allow settlement to grow incrementally in an appropriate manner while being mindful of constraints of green belt, AONB and Ivinghoe Conservation Area, through small scale brownfield infill development
- Ivinghoe Aston: traffic calming

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Yes, has an NDP

Little Chalfont Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- A404 – many adverse issues caused by the road running through the village centre. Need to take account of disproportionate increase in congestion, danger to pedestrians, pollution and loss of amenity caused in LC whenever developments are permitted
- 4 road junctions identified as being particularly in need of mitigations measures, or as reasons for objection to a proposal, whenever large developments are proposed
- School places and medical services are under great pressure – any opportunity to improve these, including requiring large developments to fund them, should be taken
- Car parking capacity at the train station needs to be monitored. Improvements to the station and the rail service are needed to relieve overcrowding on trains

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- The semi-rural nature of LC, the green belt and AONB surrounding the village, the convenient rail travel to London
- Do not wish to see any proposal for future release of green belt land in the new local plan
- Preserve and improve local shopping centre
- Preserve green spaces
- Encourage visitors and educational trips to the Nature Park off Cokes Lane
- Preserve low-rise character of LC, taller buildings should not be permitted
- 8.9ha employment site at the Grove Centre is likely to be disposed of by current owners over the next few years – Bucks Council may wish to consider its future
- LC expect normal windfall development etc but further large strategic developments will overwhelm the village through pressure on roads, parking and other infrastructure
- Where new developments are permitted, affordable housing is welcome. However any claims that LC is short of affordable housing should be discounted

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Many aspirations are contained in the LC Community Improvement Plan (2018)
- A key aspiration is the development of a new community centre at Cokes Lane for which a planning application is currently being put together
- A further priority is the replacement of the Westwood Park Pavilion
- A redevelopment of Station Approach would be supported as it currently is an unattractive introduction to the village

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Consider it would be useful and are seeking volunteers to undertake it. Would also wait on outcome of appeal for Lodge Lane/ Burtons Lane development, and any subsequent detailed proposals on village amenity and infrastructure, before starting

Little Missenden Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- A413 traffic issues – request a roundabout at the Chiltern junction and the prevention of traffic turning right at Deep Mill junction
- No GP facilities and minimal public transport in LM – local plan should restrict large development where there is no infrastructure to support it

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Green spaces between built areas need to be maintained and the green belt preserved.
- Preserve the character and amenity of villages to ensure they do not become towns

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Continue to give each ward and village in the parish a clear identity
- To see new homes built but ensure there is still a community feel
- Encourage infill rather than green belt development

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Under development

Marlow Bottom Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Dangerous junction Marlow Bottom and Burroughs Grove Hill/ Wycombe Road
- Surface water flooding during heavy rain at Brewery end of MB

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- 160 bus route is under threat – is a lifeline which is needed by residents
- A local GP surgery would be of great benefit

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Better parking provision for local shops
- School bus service to bring children to Burford School would help reduce parking problems

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No aspiration to do NDP as area has no future potential development sites and cost is prohibitive

Marsh Gibbon Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Existing footpaths require upgrading and improving.
- Parts of the village have no footpaths at all.
- Bus services need improving
- More effective flood management needs to be implemented before any new developments in the village are considered.

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Green space to be largely retained as per the VALP policy for "smaller settlements" and a green buffer to remain in place between Marsh Gibbon and nearby villages.

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- For major infrastructure projects in this area to cease and for the village to retain its character and size by allowing only very small and sensitive development when needed.

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Have a Neighbourhood Plan

Marsworth Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- The junction at Vicarage Road and Lower Icknield Way is difficult especially with the school bus, but there aren't other options.

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Preserve the Red Lion and Anglers Retreat

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Retain Marsworth as a small village as no space to build additional amenities/ roads to enlarge it

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No, rely on AVLP

Mursley Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Road speed controls

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- The village pub

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Maintain the village character

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Currently underway

Nash Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Village approach roads significantly inadequate and in need of repair/ renovation
- Dangerous junction Dancers Grave/ A421 requires improvement
- Traffic calming in High Street
- Surface water flooding Stratford Rd/ Thornborough Rd due to inadequate drainage
- Need an hourly bus service to nearby towns for access to rail station and facilities/services
- New local plan needs to provide protection re. Traveller Sites to prevent the expansion of Nash Park which causes difficulties/ costs to the village

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Traveller site – could decision to make the site permanent be reviewed in the new plan
- Preserve the green spaces around the village, the historic buildings and character of certain parts, and maintain the agricultural feel

Aspirations for next 20 years?

1. To have the Neighbourhood Plan observed on an ongoing basis
2. Improved roads are required
3. Social and leisure facilities investment and support from Bucks Council would significantly improve the village

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Have produced an NDP

Oving Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

Roads – surface quality, traffic speeds and gritting on all roads when icy

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Development density is an issue – single houses being replaced by multiples.
- Traffic and parking also an issue to be addressed
- Additional properties do not appear to result in enhanced infrastructure or additional school places

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Maintain the feel and vibrancy of the village
- Thoughtful additional / replacement housing is not opposed but roads/ pavements must be of a sufficient standard

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Have a plan, about five years old

Padbury Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Flooding issues on Main Street and Ox Lane
- Issues with sewage works
- Increase in number and speed of traffic due to new developments
- Village school is full

<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> • The historic character and the conservation area
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> • To retain the village ethos and not be swamped by development
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> • Under consideration

Pitstone Parish Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> • Bus service & foot/cycle path needed between Pitstone & Tring station; bus shelters along Westfield Rd. • Proposed transport Safety Scheme requires funding • Additional primary school places needed • Bucks owned Local Green Space could be transferred to parish council • Sports/ leisure developments at Recreation Ground & Pavilion sites require funding • 'Green girdle' around village to prevent expansion into countryside • Expand network of green & community spaces within village • Protection of identified commercial/ community use sites adj. Recreation Ground from residential use • Assistance with delivering renewable energy/ sustainable transport within parish
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> • Want to see additional community/ commercial facilities delivered that were promised alongside housing developments • Increase in amount of public open space/ local green space & sporting leisure facilities • Greater emphasis on green issues/ sustainability for parish council delivered services and assistance for residents to become more environmentally aware/ friendly • Improved pedestrian & cyclist facilities/ connectivity • Preservation of village atmosphere and feel • Preserve/ enhance community facilities • Reduce antisocial behaviour/ crime
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> • As outlined in Neighbourhood plan – growth alongside protection of area character and countryside; approx. 180 new homes within existing settlement boundary; successful school(s); establishment of a village 'heart' on Pitstone Development Area; thriving shops / community services and a pub/ family restaurant; Green Business Park; new/ improved ring of green infrastructure.
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i>

- Yes

Quainton Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Transport links and infrastructure – issues of road damage, increase in volume and speed of vehicles

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Rural character of Quainton and beauty of surrounding countryside
- Support for sustainable development for rural economy while requiring biodiversity net gain and protection of areas of attractive landscape
- LP should not include further strategic settlements over and above those in VALP settlement hierarchy or create Major Development Areas near Quainton

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Maintain development as set out in Neighbourhood Plan
- Increase sport and recreational facilities, accessible by foot or cycling
- Improve range of community facilities and activities for all ages

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Made in June 2022. Includes allocated land for 24 homes, this should be taken into account by new LP. Figure is dependent on HS2 releasing sufficient safeguarding land.

Seer Green Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Have serious localised flooding problems
- Road junction issues

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Historic buildings and green spaces
- No more shops to be converted to housing

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- To preserve the village and enhance the facilities for the community to enjoy

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No NDP

Shabbington Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Road improvements for localised flooding.
- School places – Ickford and Long Crendon primary schools are oversubscribed.
- Long distance to visit GP.
- No footpath for children to walk to school bus stop on Crendon Road.

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- The Village Hut requires improvement.
- The green spaces need improvement, they are important for biodiversity.
- The facilities at the Millennium Field need improving.

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- The creation of a public footpath from Shabbington to the A418.
- A new Village Hall.

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Would like to produce a NDP to influence future development

Shalstone Meeting

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- To preserve the historic character

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- To remain as now

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No NDP

Stewkley Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Chronic under capacity of main foul water pipe through village to treatment plant
- Better connectivity to main public transport routes needed, also cycle path to Wing/

Leighton Buzzard • Traffic speed reduction to 40mph approaching village needed
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> • Additional recreation facilities needed • Policies in LP to protect ribbon development, settlement boundary & rural aspect from speculative development of large houses in surrounding fields
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i>
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> • Neighbourhood Plan completed 2021 and has already met its forecast housing needs. The made NP included a number of Community Actions which covered a range of aspirations for the parish, and whose realisations will depend on suitable opportunities and funding

Stoke Hammond Parish Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> • Significant pressure on High Ash junior school • Shortage of recreational facilities close to Stoke Hammond
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> • Preserve the identity of SH historic farms • Maintaining current boundaries so SH retains village identity • More local green space and sporting facilities needed
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> • To maintain SH as a village within protected green space so not encroached by development
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> • In production, to be delivered summer 2023

Stoke Mandeville Parish Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> • Traffic congestion / speeding; reduce traffic flows through the heart of the village; excess traffic because of housing development being ahead of road infrastructure. • Village centre flooding • Lack of amenities e.g., café, and shops

- No village gates to signal the start and end of the village vis a vie Aylesbury.
- Housing overdevelopment which will grossly affect or distort the nature of the village.
- Insufficient focus on infrastructure to support current state (additional road capacity, medical, dental, and educational services).
- Retention of green spaces and play areas for public use.
- Lack of medical facilities, specifically a GP surgery for Stoke Mandeville Parish.
- Asking housing developers to pay towards facilities outside the Parish is no longer sufficient because the facilities outside the Parish are over-subscribed.
- Local hospitals and NHS Trust facilities need to be extended due to population growth.
- Over-subscribed primary school - is essential that the Local Plan follows the VALP and the AGT1-SPD in requiring that a new Primary School be built on AGT1.
- Lack of sports facilities for football, cricket, tennis etc. which will be exacerbated if the Bucks Sports and Social Club is not re-opened as a local sports facility.
- Lack of green space and lack of free movement on historic public footpaths due to housing development, SEALR and HS2 being built on fields and over public footpaths. Green space for walking, cycling and leisure must be restored or provided within new development, and within infrastructure mitigation.
- A plan to cover the lack of usable leisure space and sports facilities for local clubs and residents to accommodate ATG1 and 2 at the northern end of the parish.
- A clear plan for local area transport links to cover the increase in population (i.e., pathways and footbridges to circumnavigate the new road and rail infrastructure safely (not traffic lights)).
- A clear infrastructure plan to provide enough medical and educational facilities to accommodate the planned expanding area population for the ATG1 and 2.
- A plan to provide an environment that meets a rural village environment with green open space that are easily accessed by all.

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- As above, plus..
- More climate action measures e.g in new housing developments
- Rural village aspects to be underpinned by an innovative service and energy supply
- Village to lead on in ecological race and green policy deployment. Bigger plans for EV charging points and other means of energy generation
- To not be swamped by Aylesbury
- Preserve: semi-rural nature; local green spaces; old village character
- Improve: local shops and services, need café/ meeting hub; only has one small grocery shop; lacking infrastructure e.g GP surgery, library; village signage

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- To improve accessibility as befits birthplace of Paralympics
- Preserve semi-rural character ensuring village life continues to thrive
- Conservation status to protect historic village
- Minimise damage caused by HS2 and recover some of the rural character
- Fewer traffic jams, more active travel, more community events, less litter, more green space for recreation/ travel, more local medical facilities, sufficient education and sports facilities, better connectivity for Active Travel with surrounding settlements

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

Stone-with-Bishopstone and Hartwell Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Bishopstone – flooding by Old Chapel in heavy rain

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Stone – maintain and preserve rural village nature despite HS2 and potential of village doubling in size with additional 1400 homes
- Bishopstone – reduce impact of HS2 and preserve rural nature of village

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No – expense and perceived little benefit

The Lee Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Needs a viable bus service – currently one bus each way each morning so essentially unusable
- Poor maintenance of storm drains causing localised flooding

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Preserve The Lee Green as a public space

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Better support from Bucks Council, village is overshadowed by larger towns

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No plans to produce NDP as AONB/ Conservation Area status provide sufficient protection, and have limited resources

Thornborough Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Roads – most in poor condition, several dangerous areas/ junctions (A421/ Lone Tree, rat run between A421 /A421, Nash Crossroads), volume/ speed of traffic, poor signage/ road markings
- Preschool has a pivotal role in contributing to infant school number to TPC works closely with it
- Absence of effective public and school transport. Need improved bus service as well as cycleway between Thornborough and Buckingham

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Preserve character of village – village hall and pond require funding for projects
- Preservation of conservation area in village centre is essential
- A village shop is desirable – many residents favour a community-run shop but accommodation is lacking

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- To maintain the rural and historical nature of the parish whilst encouraging the appropriate modernisation and extension of community infrastructure and services. The VALP classifies Thornborough as a small village - TPC wishes to emphasise the importance of retaining that status in future local plans.
- Although Thornborough is unable to accommodate large scale housing developments, there is scope for infill development for smaller 2/3 bedroom properties because there is currently a shortage of smaller housing in the village and surrounding area.
- TPC aspires to a community solar farm.
- See also previous mention above of transport requirements and the support/wish for a community run shop.

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- No plans at present as conclude PC does not have the resources and also not convinced plans are appropriately used in development management

Tingewick Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Improved number of school places at Roundwood School?
- improved pre-school facilities provided by Bucks Council
- localised flooding is an issue.

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Preserve historic nature of village and the views from/ within it
- Maintain and improve recreation ground
- Improve pond
- Keep local post office/ shop open

• Make best use of village hall
Aspirations for next 20 years? • Improved drainage • Improved road surfaces • Provide sports pavilion and pavement to recreation ground • Slow or no growth in number of houses
Neighbourhood Development Plan? • No plans to produce NDP – expensive, conclusions not adhered to

Turville Parish Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> • School places/ ability for catchment children to get to them • Tourism – no infrastructure to cope with high levels of visitors
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> • Ensure limited remaining services remain • No housing sites within parish
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> • To maintain the rural lifestyle of those who choose to live in AONB
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> • No plans to produce NDP – lack of resources

Waddesdon Parish Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> • See Neighbourhood Plan. Issues include traffic on A41, car parking, appropriate and sustainable development of sufficient housing
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> • The village heritage • Ensure it remains a village • Community facilities • Design to contribute to enjoyment of village and conservation area • Critical views into/ out of village and conservation area • Green infrastructure and biodiversity

• Local green spaces • Buildings of local note
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> • Sustainable development to achieve a level of growth that is required and can be accommodated realistically while meeting the community's criteria. • Enhancement of critical infrastructure must accompany development • Energy efficiency and overall sustainability as a focus is a priority
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> • Made in 2017 and now being updated

West Wycombe Parish Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> • Severe junction congestion at Pedestal Roundabout • Volume, speed and type of traffic through parish • Localised flooding from Pedestal Roundabout to Chorley Road • Car parking on pavements
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> • Reduction in traffic speed and volume • Increased parking provision on properties
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> To maintain and improve quality of life for residents
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> No intention as most land owned by National Trust or West Wycombe Estate/ in conservation area and green belt

Westbury Parish Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> • Issues related to traffic congestion • Inadequate pedestrian access within village • Very limited public transport • Outdated/ limited telecommunications • Ageing sewage infrastructure and poor drainage in some areas
--

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Preservation of existing settlement area
- Preservation of village hall, playing fields, Westbury Social Club and community shop/ café
- St Augustine's Church has significant potential for more uses but restricted due to lack of water supply and mains drainage
- Agricultural land has been lost to HS2 – strong support for protecting what remains and maintaining the rural village identity
- Neighbourhood Plan likely to propose a design code for conservation area and listed buildings
- underutilised light commercial sites could be potential sites for infill development / conversion to residential

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- Small scale development within proposed settlement boundary
- Improvement to public transport so nearby towns can meet unmet community facilities needs

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Underway, expected by Autumn 2023

Weston Turville Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Yellow box markings at junction New Road / Aston Clinton Road / Aston Reach
- Left filter on lights at Broughton Lane / Aston Clinton Road
- Improve bus service provision to whole of village, currently just Worlds End Lane / Marroway are covered by a bus service
- Flooding Broughton Lane
- Flooding in Main Street, near the shops

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- As above

Aspirations for next 20 years?

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- NDP adopted

Wexham Parish Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i>
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> Local Plan must provide for the protection of Black Park and Langley Park, retaining the rural openness of the parish
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i>
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i>

Whaddon Parish Council

<i>Issues that the LP might help to solve?</i> - Highways issues - upgrade existing traffic calming scheme to establish 20 mph limit through village; HGV restriction through village; S106 money from Salden Case/ Shenley Park to go towards highway improvements; Shenley Road closure; Coddimoor Lane improvements; immediate A421 dualling between Bottle Dump and the new Shenley Road Park roundabout access; future A421 dualling - Strengthening and expansion of historic woodland pockets to for boundary to the western edge of MK - Shenley Park policies to indicate how they will deliver and fund conservation activities - Possible lack of burial space within existing churchyard - Lack of water supply, toilets and paring for church - Improvement of village green to make it more welcoming and discourage parking - Improvement of parking areas for primary school and allotments - Improvements to existing footpath network in village
<i>What would you most like to preserve/improve?</i> - Character, historic importance and local identity – Shenley Park design must give care and consideration to these, especially re. landscaping, biodiversity and transport connectivity - Retention of the Lowndes Arms and open views to MK
<i>Aspirations for next 20 years?</i> - Successful integration with all new homes, businesses and leisure facilities - Health, wellbeing and safety of residents is of utmost importance. Public transport/ cycling/ walking access to facilities is needed
<i>Neighbourhood Development Plan?</i> No plans to produce NDP, primarily due to proximity with MK which will have major impact on the parish's future

Winslow Town Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- Traffic management on A413 north of Winslow
- The need for sufficient employment lands to meet town's needs

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Town's historic character, shopping and other town centre uses as well as green spaces

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- To improve town's sustainability through a significant increase in local employment sites

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- NDP in place

Wooburn and Bourne End Parish Council

Issues that the LP might help to solve?

- New LP settlement categorisation to reflect the Neighbourhood area consistent with the PCs area of responsibility, under a single tier
- New medical centre is required
- A clear strategy and plan for cycle way/ greenway joining Wooburn and Bourne End to Marlow and High Wycombe
- Substantially improved public transport connectivity
- Delivery of Little Marlow Lakes Country Park
- LP to state that further allocation of large development sites is resisted until above are resolved
- The large number of over-55 homes permitted is raising concerns – access for wheelchairs/ mobility scooters, pavement safety, parking, public transport provision, over stretched healthcare facilities

What would you most like to preserve/improve?

- Preserve green spaces separating settlements and other important green spaces, and acquire new green space where possible/ relevant
- Preserve character of the conservation areas
- Improve/ increase parking in parish
- Improved Council parking enforcement
- Bucks current parking guidance should be converted into Strategic Policy

Aspirations for next 20 years?

- The parish will continue to have its distinct settlements and six conservation areas and will be a thriving community
- New developments will have resulted in improved local infrastructure while preserving existing recreation amenities and creating additional open space

- Infill development will be sympathetic to the existing heritage and topography
- Biodiversity, wildlife, habitat, trees and hedgerows will continue to thrive
- Amenities supporting economic healthy will be seen as integral and are thriving
- The historic environment will be maintained and preserved
- Traffic flow, air quality and parking will have been improved
- New recreational green space will have been acquired
- Drainage and surface water issues will have been improved

Neighbourhood Development Plan?

- Currently under examination

Appendix 5: Comparison of the settlement hierarchy with the emerging retail hierarchy

Introduction

The emerging Buckinghamshire Retail evidence includes within it a recommended hierarchy for town centres in Buckinghamshire. This appendix compares the proposed hierarchy in this Settlement Review with that hierarchy proposed for town centres in the Retail evidence and considers if they are compatible.

The two hierarchies

The table below compares the position in the two hierarchies of those settlements that are within the retail hierarchy.

Settlement	Town Centre Hierarchy	Settlement Hierarchy
Aylesbury	Sub-Regional TC	Tier 1
High Wycombe	Sub-Regional TC	Tier 1
Amersham on the Hill	Town Centre	Tier 2
Beaconsfield New Town	Town Centre	Tier 2
Buckingham	Town Centre	Tier 2
Chesham	Town Centre	Tier 2
Gerrards Cross	Town Centre	Tier 2
Marlow	Town Centre	Tier 2
Princes Risborough	Town Centre	Tier 2
Amersham Old Town	District Centre	Tier 2
Beaconsfield Old Town	District Centre	Tier 2
Burnham	District Centre	Tier 3
Chalfont St Peter	District Centre	Tier 2
Great Missenden	District Centre	Tier 3
Wendover	District Centre	Tier 2
Winslow	District Centre	Tier 3
Bourne End	Local Centre	Tier 3
Chalfont St Giles	Local Centre	Tier 3
Denham Green	Local Centre	Tier 5
Farnham Common	Local Centre	Tier 3
Flackwell Heath	Local Centre	Included in Wycombe settlement (Tier 1)
Haddenham	Local Centre	Tier 3
Hazlemere/Tylers Green	Local Centre	Included in Wycombe settlement (Tier 1)
Holmer Green	Local Centre	Included in Wycombe settlement (Tier 1)
Iver	Local Centre	Tier 3
Little Chalfont	Local Centre	Tier 3
Prestwood	Local Centre	Tier 4

The retail evidence looks at the relative attractiveness of the centres from various sources, including national data sources, a household survey and variety of uses. Its purpose is to comply with paragraph 90 of the NPPF and define a network of town centres and promote their long-term vitality and viability.

Comparison

The hierarchies are broadly aligned, particularly in the top tier and second tiers. Some settlements / centres are considered separately in one hierarchy while they are merged in the other, e.g. Amersham, Beaconsfield, Great Missenden and High Wycombe. The retail evidence splits some centres as they are classified as different centres and perform different retail functions. Where settlements function as one urban area the settlement hierarchy treats them as one settlement. These differences are not considered problematic as the two hierarchies are undertaking different tasks. The retail hierarchy is considering the retail catchment and impact of the centres within it, it looks on a centre-by-centre basis. The settlement hierarchy is considering how residents' everyday needs are met within the area that they live by providing a picture of services and facilities in those settlements, it considers this on a settlement-by-settlement basis.

Where there are differences between the hierarchies this is down to the different mix of shops and facilities available. Those settlements / centres which are higher up the retail hierarchy than the settlement hierarchy tend to have a proportionally larger number of shops to other facilities. Conversely, those settlements / centres higher up the settlement hierarchy than the retail hierarchy tend to have proportionally larger number of facilities that are not shops.