

# **Riley Road (M4 Site)**

## **Marlow**

**Development Brief**

**Approved April 2009**

## **Appendix I**

### **Extracts from Key Planning Policy Documents**

**Extracts from the Adopted Local Plan to 2011:**

- Policy M4

**Extracts from the Wycombe Development  
Framework Core Strategy (Adopted July 2008):**

- Policy CS 5 Marlow
- Policy CS 10 Town Centre Hierarchy

## **Appendix 2**

**Comments received during the  
Public Consultation Period  
(Nov - Dec 2008)**



Spatial Planning Division

April 2009

## **Appendix I**

### **Extracts from the Adopted Local Plan to 2011: Policy M4**

#### **Riley Road**

6.76 The rear of Riley Road and Central Car Park are currently under used and present a poor environment which is inconsistent with the Conservation Area. The area is in multiple ownership which has not previously assisted with its redevelopment. Part of the site is occupied by repair workshops and a car wash. An innovative solution to this backland area is necessary to maximise the full potential, assisted by a Development Brief to explore and test potential solutions: see Policy G4 and Appendix 3. This is a site which could accommodate the identified shopping/retail needs of the town.

6.77 Retaining/increasing public car parking is a central element of any proposal for this area; the provision of a decked car park with controlled aspect 'wraparound' development should be fully explored in any solution, in order to achieve a solution that provides quality townscape.

6.78 Contributions to traffic/accessibility and environmental improvements in the town centre may be appropriate towards the implementation of an agreed Transportation Strategy. Proposals for the redevelopment of the site must address both access to the site itself and the potential impact of further vehicles on the highway network and the environment of the town centre. A traffic impact assessment will be required to

be submitted with any planning application.

6.79 Where individual proposals are brought forward for the site, which do not comprise the comprehensive site area, these will only be permitted where they do not frustrate the overall objectives of the policy and would not prejudice the redevelopment of the remainder of the site.

#### **POLICY M4**

**(1) THE RILEY ROAD AREA AS SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP IS ALLOCATED FOR COMPREHENSIVE MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT PRIMARILY FOR RETAIL USE.**

**(2) FOOD RETAIL, AS A PRIMARY USE, (WELL INTEGRATED WITH EXISTING TOWN CENTRE RETAIL) WITH SOME ANCILLARY RESIDENTIAL USES WILL BE ACCEPTABLE. THE FOLLOWING WILL BE REQUIRED:**

- a. MAXIMUM USE OF THE AREA, THROUGH LAND ASSEMBLY, POSSIBLE REALIGNMENT OF RILEY ROAD, AND PROVISION OF A COMPREHENSIVE SERVICING AND REAR ACCESS TO THE WEST STREET FRONTAGE PROPERTIES;**
- b. THE ELEVATIONAL DESIGN AND EXTERNAL APPEARANCE OF NEW**

**Extracts from the Adopted Local Plan to 2011: Policy M4 (continued)**

**Extracts from the Wycombe Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted July 2008):**

**BUILDING(S) SHOULD EXPRESSLY REFLECT THEIR ESSENTIAL FUNCTION, WITH PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO THE OPEN ASPECT, SIZE AND SYMMETRY OF THE PUBLIC RECREATION GROUND TO THE NORTH, ITS SURROUNDING RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS AND THE MAIN PEDESTRIAN APPROACH FROM THIS DIRECTION;**

**c. PROVISION OF PUBLIC PARKING FACILITIES, REFLECTING PRESENT CAR PARKING FACILITIES AND ANY INCREASED USE OF THE SITE IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICIES T2, T17 AND APPENDIX 9;**

**d. RETENTION AND ENHANCEMENT OF 24 HOUR PEDESTRIAN LINKS THROUGH TO THE WEST STREET FRONTAGE AND THE TOWN CENTRE WHILST RETAINING THE SIGNIFICANT FRONTAGE ALONG WEST STREET; AND**

**e. IN ADVANCE OF ANY COMPREHENSIVE SCHEME, THE PROTECTION OF EXISTING REAR SERVICING.**

**Policy CS 5 Marlow**

**Marlow should remain an attractive, vibrant and accessible place that meets the day to day needs of those who live, work in or visit the town. In particular development will be expected to contribute towards meeting the following objectives for the town:**

- 1. The River Thames – Make the most of the town’s Thames-side location by:**
  - a) safeguarding its historic riverside and river valley setting**
  - b) encouraging the regeneration of the river landscape and its uses, including public access to the river and riverbanks**
  - c) supporting and enhancing the tourist industry**
  - d) protecting the floodplain around the town from development**
  - e) protecting and conserving the biodiversity (in terms of both species and habitats), and the landscape qualities of the river and its setting**
- 2. Transport – ensure that the town is not dominated by vehicular traffic, through appropriate traffic management and addressing parking problems, and encouraging greater walking and**

**Extracts from the Wycombe Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted July 2008): Policy CS 5 Marlow (continued)**

cycling and use of public transport

- Through the development control process

**3. Business - Maintain the strength of the town as a local employment centre in the Thames Valley, making best use of business land**

- Through close working with Buckinghamshire County Council on transport matters, including the Local Transport Plan

**4. Town centre - Maintain the vitality and viability of the town centre, conserving its historic core and improving its facilities and services to better serve the local catchment**

4.1 Marlow is a vibrant place with many assets, not least its historic core and its setting both on the banks of the River Thames and the edge of the Chiltern Hills. It has a strong economic base aided by its strategic location in the Thames Valley with good communications to the nearby Berkshire towns. It has a lively town centre which, together with its riverside setting, is popular with tourists.

**5. Housing – ensure that the limited opportunities for providing housing in the town address the needs of the community, particularly for affordable housing**

4.2 Some of its strengths also result in problems – such as traffic congestion in the town centre and Globe Park and house prices that are some of the highest in the District. It is also a constrained town in terms of its development potential - constrained by the floodplain on its southern side, the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to the north and west, and by the Green Belt on all sides.

**6. Country Park – facilitate the provision of a country park on the Little Marlow Gravel Pits area**

4.3 The strategic approach in Marlow is one that does not involve major change but seeks to support and maintain its assets and make the most of opportunities to address the problems, within a limited land supply situation. One opportunity is the potential to create a country park in the Little Marlow Gravel Pits area, bringing significant environmental and recreational benefits to the area.

**Indicator**

- Level of housing, business and retail and town centre uses development in the town
- Implementation of transport schemes for Marlow as set out in Local Transport Plan action plans

**Delivery**

- Through close working with other agencies, the local community and local businesses
- Through site allocations and policies in other Local Development Documents

**Extracts from the Wycombe Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted July 2008): Policy CS 10 – Town Centre Hierarchy**

The town centre hierarchy is set out below. Proposals for town centre uses will be directed to the appropriate level in the hierarchy according to the scale and function of the use:

**Tier 1 (Sub regional town centre) – High Wycombe town centre should**

- serve the District as a whole, being the main comparison shopping destination, and the main focus for leisure, entertainment and cultural activities
- be the main location for major retail developments, large scale leisure and office uses, and other uses that attract large numbers of people.

**Tier 2 (Other town centres) – Marlow and Princes Risborough:**

- the town centres should be important service centres serving their rural catchment areas.
- development in these centres should not seek to serve residents in other towns, or rural areas outside their primary catchment areas

**Tier 3 (District Centres) – Hazlemere, Bourne End, and Flackwell Heath centres should**

- provide basic food and grocery shopping facilities, supported by a limited range of other shops and non-retail services serving their local communities

**Tier 4 (Local Centres) – other local parades and village centres should:**

- provide a basic range of small shops and services of a local nature
- serve their predominantly local catchment within walking distance of the centre.

**Indicators**

- Amount of completed retail, office, and leisure floorspace, and hotel bedrooms completed in town centre and non-town centre locations

**Delivery**

- The extent of the town centres, district centres and primary shopping area (for retail planning purposes) will be defined in the Site Allocations DPD and shown on the proposals map
- Primary and secondary frontages will be identified through the Site Allocations DPD
- More detailed policies in other local development documents
- Through the development control process
- Through working in partnership with town centre partnerships and the development industry

4.33 Town, district and local centres are the heart of our communities and provide a focus where people shop, work, live and visit. We want them to be vibrant places. They are also easily accessible, particularly by public transport, making them sustainable locations

**Extracts from the Wycombe Development Framework Core Strategy (Adopted July 2008): Policy CS 10 – Town Centre Hierarchy (continued)**

for development, particularly those forms of development that attract a lot of people to them. 'Town centre uses' (those uses which should be located in town centres as a first preference) are defined in Government policy and include shops and restaurants, offices, leisure and entertainment/arts/culture/tourism facilities (including hotels).

4.34 Government and emerging regional policy encourages authorities to establish a network or hierarchy of centres to provide a more even distribution of functions and ensure that people's everyday needs are met at the local level. High Wycombe Town Centre is one of 23 primary regional town centres identified in the submitted South East Plan (March 2006) that form a regional network of strategic town centres. The hierarchy for Wycombe District is set out in Policy CS 10 and is illustrated on the key diagram (see Appendix 1). Despite being a smaller centre, Princes Risborough is shown as a second tier town centre along with Marlow. This recognises that Princes Risborough serves an extensive rural hinterland in the north of the District.

4.35 There is only limited scope for additional retail development and other commercial leisure uses in the District up to at least 2011 in addition to existing commitments. This is because major retail and other town centre use developments are already planned in the District up to 2011, chiefly as part of the 'Eden' town centre expansion in High Wycombe.

The approach up to 2011 is therefore to ensure the successful implementation of these developments and monitor their impact. Beyond 2011 there may be scope for further retail development but this will be assessed through monitoring of the development which has taken place and of changes in retailing, and through reviews of the needs studies.

4.36 Whilst town centres should first and foremost accommodate these uses, other uses such as community facilities and residential development should also be encouraged. The emphasis in town centres should be on the provision of mixed use developments that embrace such uses, as well as more traditional town centre uses. Whilst the Council would generally expect to see town centre developments providing a mix of uses, it is recognised that there may be some small sites where this is more difficult to deliver. However, even with small sites, every effort should be made to provide uses on the ground floor that ensure active frontages and these may well be different to uses on the upper floor.

4.37 Hotels should be located primarily in town centres in line with the town centre hierarchy. However, hotel development in business areas may support the business function of a designated prime or general business area, or may make a significant contribution towards the wider regeneration of an area.

## Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

### Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

#### Schedule of respondents:

Representation No	Respondent	Date response received
1	Riley Park Trust	27/11/08
2	Mr J. Evans, Spinfield Park, Marlow	28/11/08
3	Mr J. Campbell; Riley Park Trust	28/11/08
4	Dr S. Judge	1/12/08
5	Mr M Croxon	1/12/08
6	Mr C. Coupar, Oxford Road, Marlow	1/12/08
7	Mr A. Rackstraw, Saddle Safari, Crown Lane	4/12/08
8	Mrs P Clarry, Barnards Hill, Marlow	5/12/08
9	Ms. A. Rae, Oxford Road, Marlow	5/12/08
10	Mrs M. Silver, Sandygate Road, Marlow	5/12/08
11	Mr & Mrs Giddings, Chiltern Road, Marlow	5/12/08
12	Mr N. Druce, Cambridge Road, Marlow	5/12/08
13	Ms J. Richards, Frieth Road, Marlow	5/12/08
14	Ms K. Ansdell	5/12/08
15	Mr P. Stewart, Oxford Road	5/12/08
16	Mrs E.S.A. Lowden, Oxford Road, Marlow	5/12/08
17	Ms E. Collingwood, Oak Tree Road, Marlow	5/12/08
18	Mr S. Notton, Crown Road, Oxford	5/12/08
19	Mrs J. Pemberton, West Street, Marlow	5/12/08
20	Mrs J. Nightingale, Townswomen's Guild	11/12/08
21	Mr B J Platt, Platts Garage	11/12/08
22	Mrs R Robinson, Friends of Riley Park	15/12/08
23	Ms M. Spackman, Spinfield Mount, Marlow	15/12/08
24	Mr J.A. Shannon, Riley Park Trust	15/12/08
25	Mrs A. Teversham. Friends of Riley Park	19/12/08

## Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

### Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

Representation No	Respondent	Date response received
26	GVA Grimley Ltd acting on behalf of Waitrose Ltd	19/12/08
27	Mr & Mrs Hopkins, Conniston Close, Marlow	20/12/08
28	Mr & Mrs Smith, Garnet Court, Marlow	20/12/08
29	Mr P. Deriaz, Marlow Chamber of Commerce	20/12/08
30	WYG Planning and Design acting on behalf of Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd	20/12/08
31	Ms B. Richardson, Thames Property Solutions	20/12/08
32	Mr J. Burnham, Harwood Road, Marlow	20/12/08
33	Ms M. Richards	5/1/09 by prior arrangement
34	Mr C. Narrainen, Keats Road, Willenhall	22/1/09 by prior arrangement
35	Ms M. Hall, Oxford Road, Marlow	22/1/09 by prior arrangement
36	Mr A. Dunn, Terrington Hill, Marlow	22/1/09 by prior arrangement
37	Marlow Methodist Church	22/1/09 by prior arrangement

#### Schedule of comments:

(Note comments in bold type indicate amendments that will be made to the brief)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
	<b>General Comments:</b>		
	General support for the brief	3; 27; 28; 29; 30; 36	<i>Noted</i>
	General objection to the brief	24	<i>Noted – see comments below</i>
C1	Brief is rushed and contains contradictions	33	<i>Noted, but do not agree: the brief has taken a number of months to prepare, is consistent and follows policy M4 – no change</i>
C2	Unattractive nature of site is due to its function as a car park and servicing area and it is unrealistic to try and change this	33	<i>A rather fatalistic approach and to leave the site as it is not considered to be an acceptable solution or one that is envisaged under policy M4 – no change</i>

## Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

### Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
	<b>Consultation process</b>		
C3	Concern that no prior consultation with stakeholders/ landowners (e.g. Riley Park Trust or nearby residents) before brief was issued	4; 6; 32	<i>This current public consultation has been set up to give residents and adjacent landowners/ interests an opportunity to comment. During the latter stages of the brief's preparation the steering group did offer to meet with the main stakeholders individually - no change</i>
C4	Consultation period too short; badly advertised and at bad time over Christmas	32; 37	<i>Noted, but the period for consultation and advertising followed good practice and the exhibition was well attended - no change</i>
	<b>Status of the brief</b>		
C5	Make clearer in the document that brief is non statutory	26	<i>The document does state this on page 2 - no change</i>
C6	Postpone the brief until Local Plan is reviewed- the brief has been overtaken by recent economic events	32	<i>Noted, but do not agree. Local Plan Policy M4 remains in force until it is superseded by a policy in the emerging Local Development Framework (LDF), which will not happen until the latter part of 2011. In any event, both the Local Plan and the emerging LDF are required to take a long-term, strategic view that meets the predicted needs of the community over the period to 2026. In the meantime, the market will not implement development until it is felt to be commercially viable, but, if development is thought to be viable, an appropriate planning context needs to be in place. - no change</i>
	<b>Steering Group</b>		
C7	Concern regarding composition of steering group	6; 32	<i>Development briefs usually produced by WDC in-house before being issued for public consultation. Given the history of this site, a new approach was felt to be needed, to give the local community more direct involvement and ownership at an early stage, hence the Steering Group. The range of organisations invited to sit on the Steering Group was initially determined by local Town and District Councillors, with a view to representing a cross-section of Marlow interests; the Group's independent Chairman then added other nominees to further improve</i>

## Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

### Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
			<i>this balance (listed in the draft brief). Landowning interests on and adjoining the site were deliberately excluded from membership of the Steering Group to ensure that the Group and the brief were – and were seen to be – ‘developer neutral’, but meetings were held with some of these bodies as ‘key stakeholders’. All interested parties were then able to comment on the proposals during the consultation. - no change</i>
C8	Brief would have been more democratic if it had been produced by independent consultants, and questioned if an architect had been involved	32	<i>The brief was prepared by a qualified urban designer who had not had any previous involvement with the site, to the direction of the independently - chaired Steering Group. The composition of the steering group has ensured that the brief represented a wide range of interests. no change</i>
	<b>Overall layout of new development</b>		
C9	Make no structural changes just improve appearance of the area and the car park	6; 7; 14; 25	<i>Just making improvements without changing the layout would not accord with the M4 policy and not provide the extra retail capacity needed– no change</i>
C10	Support landscape improvements to car park	18; 35; 36	<i>Noted, the brief does include this –no change</i>
C11	Object to proposed tree planting in car park	32	<i>Tree planting in car parks is a requirement in design guidance such as Appendix 1 of the local plan and is an accepted and proven way to improve the appearance of car parks. With the selection of the right species and good maintenance, trees do not have to be a nuisance to cars – no change</i>
C12	Proposed trees in car park will need protection from cars	21	<i>Agree and this would be covered in the detail of any planning permission for the site– no change</i>
C13	Supermarket should be located on current car park to improve footfall for new smaller shops sited closer to West Street	31	<i>This approach would go against the principle of keeping the main shopping activity within the current town centre and close to West Street. – no change</i>
C14	Too many routes between West Street and car park will dilute footfall by new shops.	31	<i>The brief does not propose any additional routes but an improvement of the existing routes to encourage more people to use them and hence increase rather than dilute footfall. – no change</i>

## Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

### Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
C15	Supermarket cannot be accommodated off West Street with out adverse impact to existing streetscape and scale	31	<i>This was not the conclusion of the Local Plan inspector who said that a fairly sizable food store could be integrated without due impact upon the historic frontage and street picture – the brief follows this conclusion and principles included in policy M4– no change</i>
C16	The diagrams included in section six are vague and ambiguous and give inadequate guidance	32; 33	<i>The diagrams are designed to convey concepts and principles rather than be prescriptive due to the complexity and potential range of solutions that could be brought forward. – no change</i>
C17	Illustrative layout is as proposed by Sainsbury's earlier in the year	32	<i>The illustrative layout was put together without specific reference to proposals by others, but instead based on the principles contained in the brief–no change</i>
C18	Not clear how Riley Road Car Park would be replaced	32	<i>In the illustrative layout on page 16 the parking at Riley Road would be accommodated in the improved central car park. The development form of any new proposal on the Riley Road car park site could also contain some provision for parking. – no change</i>
C19	Illustrative layout does not show no exit from the car park into Dukes Place/ Crown Lane as at present	32	<i>The illustrative layout shown does not go down to that level of detail, however a no exit from the car park into Crown Road/ Dukes place is possible to accommodate in this layout. – no change</i>
C20	Suggest imposition of building line along line of Riley Road footpath	32	<i>As the brief is intended to outline principles rather than specifics this would not be helpful, it would also be against the M4 policy which advocates maximum use of the area and possible realignment of Riley Road. – no change</i>
C21	Object to residential along Town lane	32	<i>Other lanes such as Dukes Place have successful examples of residential use, some residential here would help to provide surveillance of this lane outside shopping hours. The exact merits of any scheme proposing residential in this part of the site would in any event be examined through the planning application process. – no change</i>
C22	Do not agree with missing link concept	32; 33	<i>The missing link analogy was put forward on the basis of the analysis, that has been supported through the consultation, that the site does not link well either with the town centre or the residential area. Linkage will be a key part of any successful scheme – no change</i>

## Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

### Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
	<b>Land Use – retail</b>		
C23	Question need for more retail space	6; 8:13; 18; 19; 20; 25; 32	<p><i>The need for more retail floorspace in Marlow - of both convenience and comparison shopping - has been identified in both the Retail and Town Centres Study, carried out by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners for the Council in 2004, and the update to that study published in 2007. The former recommended that the implementation of an enlarged store on the Riley Road site should be a priority and this allocation is embodied in an adopted Local Plan Policy. The latter study found that there is scope for a further 518m<sup>2</sup> of food store floorspace in the town up to 2021 above and beyond the enlarged Riley Road scheme.</i></p> <p><i>The exact type and range of shops provided is an issue for the market; not for planning policy. This will be influenced by levels of rent and other factors outside the Council's control. – no change</i></p>
C24	Question need for larger supermarket – instead need a more diverse range of shops in the town	7; 8; 16	See response for comment C23 above
C25	Advocate small expansion of supermarket only	7; 8:13; 26; 32	See response for comment C23 above
C26	Concern about increasing number of cafes and restaurants in the town reducing current retail space	23	<p><i>The majority of the town's core is designated as a Primary Shopping Frontage Zone (PSFZ), under which planning permission for change of use from a shop to a non-shop use is not permitted (except where the development would demonstrably assist in the continued preservation or rehabilitation of a listed building which might not otherwise be achieved, or where a development of vacant accommodation above shops would involve the creation of independently accessible residential units.)</i></p> <p><i>This policy reflects the Council's recognition that there is already a substantial amount of non-shop use in the Marlow PSFZ and that any further erosion of the retail content here is liable to damage the viability and attractiveness of the centre for shopping.</i></p> <p><i>The policy in the secondary shopping frontage zone is more flexible to allow</i></p>

## Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

### Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
			<i>other A uses to locate here, partly to reduce the pressure on the PSFZ. – no change</i>
C27	Suggest brief should have included a look at the wider town centre retail strategy including alternative town centre sites	26	<i>This was carried out when the M4 policy was included in the Local Plan. Further work will be carried out as part of the work on the emerging LDF. – no change</i>
C28	Suggest a two store strategy for the town centre	26	<i>The inspector for the Local Plan inquiry concluded that the M4 site was the best place for a larger food store in the town. Any potential change to the policy adopted in the local plan will be examined during the preparation of the Delivery and Site Allocations Document in the emerging LDF –no change</i>
C29	Support additional shop units here to reduce pressure on historic High Street	31	<i>Noted –no change</i>
C30	Object to additional shop units along Riley Road	32	<i>The brief follows the M4 policy which states the primary use for this site should be for retail use to accommodate the need for more retail space– no change</i>
C31	Support replacement and enlargement of supermarket	31	<i>The brief supports this view – no change</i>
C32	Include map showing retail catchment area for Marlow	32	<i>See Appendices A-C of the 2004 Nathaniel Lichfield Retail and Town Centre Uses study for an explanation of the retail zones used and penetration rates of various stores/shopping centres throughout the District. The study is on the Council's website: <a href="http://www.wycombe.gov.uk/uploads/documents/Environment/Planning/R6858-012%20(FINAL).pdf">http://www.wycombe.gov.uk/uploads/documents/Environment/Planning/R6858-012%20(FINAL).pdf</a> -no change</i>
C33	Retail studies do not take account of impact of current economic downturn or current level of vacant properties	32	<i>This aspect will be considered as part of the impending Delivery and Site Allocations document within the LDF – no change</i>

## Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

### Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
C34	Clarify size and location of smaller retail units	32	<i>This detail would be considered as part of any planning application, only general principles can be included in the brief. It does state that any smaller complementary units would need to be justified on the basis of their support of the vibrancy and connection with the existing town centre (page 17 of the brief) – no change</i>
	<b>Land Use – retail</b>		
C35	Object to any / additional residential use in the area	8; 25	<i>The brief follows the M4 policy in allowing only ancillary residential uses – no change</i>
C36	Support residential / affordable housing in place of Platt's	9; 17	<i>The brief includes this as an option if Platt's want to relocate – no change</i>
C37	Support residential houses in general over roads and parking	19	<i>The current role the site plays in providing parking should be retained as per policy M4. According to this policy - which the brief has to follow - residential can only be a ancillary use on this site - no change</i>
C38	Housing requirements too vague on page 17	32	<i>The specifics of any ancillary residential development would be examined as part of the planning application process: the purpose of the brief is to give guidance rather than prescriptive details – no change</i>
C39	Object to residential along Riley Road or Riley Park	32	<i>The local plan inspector did note that some residential could be provided to screen the park from a large store footprint or car park and this has been followed through in the brief. – no change</i>
	<b>Land Use – community facilities</b>		
C40	Support re-provision of public toilets potentially next to playground or park	9; 20; 24; 32	<i>The re-provision of the toilets is required on page 17 if the new layout involves removal of the current toilets. The redevelopment would need to fund any replacement - no change</i>
C41	Support provision of public seating	10	<i>The pedestrian areas could include seating although this would be a matter of detail that would be dealt with at the planning application stage – no change</i>

## Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

### Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
C42	Support provision of new play area	10	<i>Funding for improvements to the park could form part of any comprehensive redevelopment of the M4 site through developer contributions and would be worked out at the planning application stage – no change</i>
C43	Support provision of a post office	16	<i>Noted, but not something we can require through the brief – no change</i>
C44	Keep existing toilets	19; 25	<i>See comment C40 – no change</i>
C45	Inclusion of existing waste recycling facility in new plan?	21; 32	<i>This is included on page 17 under secondary uses that should be provided. – no change</i>
C46	Site for Marlow museum	2	<i>Noted and would be possible under uses indicated on page 17. Not explicitly proposed in brief, however, as outside remit. - no change</i>
	<b>Land Use – existing uses</b>		
C47	Object to redevelopment of Platt's Garage as it is a key employer and has been present for a long time	6; 14; 21; 32; 33	<i>It is not the brief's intention to move or redevelop existing areas/ uses that are successful and supported by local people, merely to provide a context should redevelopment be supported – see page 17 of the brief – no change</i>
C48	Support relocation/ redevelopment of Platt's	28: 29	<i>The brief does include for the redevelopment of the Platt's site if the current or future owners decide they would like to relocate or redevelop the site – no change</i>
C49	Suggest improvements to the frontage of Platt's to tie in with car park improvements	21	<b>Noted and will add this to the brief</b>
C50	Support for retention of Sawyers	14	<i>The brief illustrates how this could be achieved on page 16– no change</i>
C51	Suggest relocation of Sawyers to west side of Town Lane to enable development	31	<i>The illustrative plan on page 16 shows this site is identified for new business use which could include a relocated Sawyers. – no change</i>

Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
	<b>Riley Park Trust</b>		
C52	Object to or concerns about new entrance to park	4; 6; 9; 11; 12; 24; 25; 32; 33	<b><i>The plan shown on page 16 is illustrative only and any new entrance/ link to the park could only take place with the agreement of the trust. The brief will be amended to make clear that any changes to the entrances to the Park or additional entrances can only be made with the agreement of the Riley Park Trust.</i></b>
C53	Support for improving access to the park	7	<i>Noted –see C52 above</i>
C54	No development or encroachment in the park	8; 12; 32; 33	<i>The brief does not advocate any development or encroachment within the park and in any event this could not happen without the agreement of the Riley Park Trust - no change</i>
C55	Improve barrier between park and site with mounding	9	<i>Mounding would affect roots of existing trees - no change</i>
C56	Support enhancement of Riley Park for shoppers and visitors	20	<i>The brief supports this subject to ensuring the character of the park is maintained; this would be a matter for the Trustees of Riley Park Trust to consider and approve, however - no change</i>
C57	Suggest new residential edge to park to screen development and provide suitable urban context to the park	31	<i>The brief does show this as an option on page 15 – no change</i>
C58	Conflict of desire lines with playing pitches	32	<i>The lines shown represent existing informal routes through the park and do not conflict with the current areas used as pitches in the park. It is not intended that these should become more than they are at present – any such change would be a matter for the trustees of Riley Park Trust - no change</i>
	<b>Quoitings Square</b>		
C59	Return Quoitings Square to the Town rather than current use as a car park	13; 28; 31	<i>Noted but this is outside the M4 site area so cannot be included as a specific proposal within this brief – no change</i>

## Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

### Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
	<b>Conservation aspects</b>		
C60	Ensure Old Farmhouse is not affected by proposals as with the current toilets	35	<i>Agree that the setting of listed buildings will need to be considered and opportunities taken to improve, and this principle is included in the brief and reflected for example in the first redevelopment objective on page 11.– no change</i>
C61	Support height restriction to 2-3 storeys	19	<i>Noted – no change</i>
C62	Support conservation of Historic West Street frontage – new development to take account of scale and height	23	<i>Noted. The brief includes guidance to ensure this is the case– no change</i>
C63	Qualify height guidelines to include metres as well as storey numbers	32	<b>Will amend the document to include height ranges in metres and feet</b>
	<b>Pedestrian/ cycle provision</b>		
C64	Support for better walking routes into town centre/ signage	7; 11; 27: 35	<i>Noted, the brief advocates an improvement to pedestrian routes - no change</i>
C65	Support pedestrian only access to Town Lane and Crown Lane	20	<i>Noted, but there will be need for retention of some vehicle access to service the buildings located on these streets – <b>will clarify the brief.</b></i>
C66	Current footpath links between north west of town and town centre are adequate	32	<i>As explained in the brief the quality of these routes need improvement and opportunities to make routes better should be taken - no change</i>
C67	Call for review of pedestrian crossings	28	<b>Noted, will pass onto relevant departments</b>
C68	Clarification & support for cycle routes and cycle parking	2; 7	<b>Amend brief to include information on cycle routes and parking</b>
	<b>Public transport</b>		
C69	More buses instead of parking	7; 19	<i>Additional public transport would be welcome but is outside the remit of the brief. The spread of trip origins means that many car trips/parking acts could not practically be replaced by viable bus services. - no Change</i>

## Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

### Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
	<b>Traffic/ highways</b>		
C70	Concern over any increase in traffic levels in town centre and around the park	14;18; 25; 31	<i>This aspect was covered in detail when the policy M4 was included in the Local Plan; further detailed studies will be carried out as part of any specific proposal for the site through the usual planning application process – no change</i>
C71	Concerns regarding junction with West Street and Oxford Road – congestion and buses	5: 18; 28; 29; 31; 32	<i>The brief does state on page 9 that options to improve this junction will need to be explored and implemented as part of the redevelopment– no change</i>
C72	Historic nature and character of West street not to be compromised by highway improvements	32; 36	<i>Agreed – this principle is included on page 9 of the brief – “roads and accesses should be scaled appropriately for this historic town” – no change</i>
C73	Concern about increased traffic along Crown Road or close vehicular access from Crown Road	5; 18	<i>The current role of Crown Road will remain unchanged in the brief as a secondary access only for businesses and properties on the eastern end of the site as described on page 13 – no change</i>
C74	Support alternative car park access via Crown Road-	31	<i>See comment above – no change</i>
C75	Concern regarding accidents at current junction of Riley Road/ Crown Road	22	<b><i>Agree and the illustrative plan on page 16 will be amended to show how this junction could be made safer for pedestrians</i></b>
C76	Questions regarding scope of highways advice inputted into the brief; need for independent study	26: 32	<i>The brief is underpinned by detailed studies which took place when the M4 policy itself was adopted; further detailed studies will be carried out as part of any specific proposal for the site through the usual planning application process. – no change</i>
C77	Brief proposals should include a transport solution for the town centre as a whole	26	<i>This is outside the scope of the brief which relates specifically to the M4 policy in the Local Plan which considered the wider transport implications. These will be examined again as part of the preparation of the Delivery and Site Allocations document for the LDF later this year. – no change</i>
C78	Support reduction in scale of Riley Road/ Oxford Road junction	36	<i>The brief includes this as an aspiration – no change</i>
C79	Questions regarding provisions for servicing	2; 15	<i>Specifics will be dealt with through planning applications stage but for principles see pages 11; 13 &amp; 16 in the brief- no change</i>

## Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

### Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
C80	Questions regarding HGV routes to avoid Chapel and West Street	2	<i>It is difficult to envisage an alternative route e.g. Oxford Road that would not cause adverse effects elsewhere in the town– no change</i>
C81	Impose 10 tonne weight limit on good vehicles to allow area to be planned without large turning circles	36	<i>This type of restriction would be too severe and likely result in a number of shops not being able to receive deliveries; even the current layout demonstrates that turning circles can be quite compact and still accommodate goods vehicles. no change</i>
	<b>Car parking:</b>		
C82	Additional parking not needed	7	<i>Policy M4 states that provision of public parking should reflect present facilities and increased use of the site. Any new proposal would need to accord with the parking standards in the Local Plan, the brief reflects this approach - no change</i>
C83	Support provision of more parking	8; 9: 17; 26; 29	<i>Noted, see above comment C82</i>
C84	Residential or retail should not reduce capacity for additional parking	8	<i>Any proposal would need to meet the requirements set out on page 17 to accommodate current and anticipated parking demand– no change</i>
C85	Advocate underground parking with part possibly under Riley Park	9: 31; 35	<i>The brief does include this as an option if extra parking capacity is deemed necessary but within the current M4 site boundary only e.g. see page 11– no change</i>
C86	Support for decked parking	29; 32	<i>See comment C85 above – no change</i>
C87	Object to 1 level parking/ multi storey parking	18; 23; 25	<i>Any specific proposal will need to meet the objective that parking should not dominate the character of the place and reflect the historic character of Marlow, and would be fully assessed as part of any planning application – no change</i>
C88	Suggest provision of additional parking on Industrial estates	18; 19	<i>This would only meet demand at specific times when the industrial areas are not utilising their own parking – no change</i>

## Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

### Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
C89	State car parking requirements rather than refer to appendix in local plan	32	<i>For the sake of brevity briefs do not repeat the detail of information that is contained in other policy documents – no change</i>
	<b>Wildlife Conservation; trees &amp; maintenance</b>		
C90	Include provision for nest boxes and native wildflowers	10	<i>These aspects may be best provided within the park area although opportunities for wildlife conservation will be explored through the detail of landscape proposals for any specific site.– no change</i>
C91	Improved tree maintenance	10	<i>Details of tree maintenance would be secured through a landscape condition as part of any planning permission– no change</i>
C92	Object to removal of any trees along park boundary	11	<i>The brief recognises the importance of these existing trees and they are protected, being part of the conservation area – no change</i>
C93	Concern regarding adequate maintenance / rubbish clearance	21	<i>See comment C91 above – no change</i>
	<b>Infrastructure</b>		
C94	Area suffers from a drop in voltage in electrical power supply	15	<i>Noted, if there is an existing recognised supply issue in the area infrastructure providers would be consulted as part of any specific planning application. – no change</i>
	<b>Phasing of development</b>		
C95	Multiple ownerships and competing interests will mean brief cannot be delivered quickly and is over optimistic	3; 26; 32; 36	<i>The illustrative plan has taken account of land ownership and allows redevelopment of the site in phases – see page 18 of the brief. Issue raised when the M4 policy was examined and considered not to be a problem by the Local Plan Inquiry inspector. – no change</i>
C96	Support to incremental phasing approach advocated in the brief	30	<i>Noted – no change</i>
C97	Plan needed to show landownership	32	<i>Landownership may change and in any event this information can be obtained from the land registry. – no change</i>

## Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

### Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
C98	Support comprehensive approach to redevelopment	36	<i>The brief and M4 policy advocate this approach – no change</i>
	<b>Construction Impacts</b>		
C99	Concern expressed regarding delivery of construction materials	15; 32	<i>This would be covered through consideration of any specific planning application which could use planning conditions to limit any impact – no change</i>
CI00	Concern expressed regarding impact on parking levels during construction	15: 32	<i>See comment above – no change</i>
	<b>Detailed corrections</b>		
CI01	Correct name for Riley Park to Riley Park Trust	1	<b>Amend brief</b>
CI02	Change Crown Road to Crown Lane	1	<i>Have checked OS plan and road names shown on brief plans are correct – no change</i>
CI03	Number each paragraph	32	<i>Not normally required for this sort of document – section numbers and page numbers are sufficient – no change</i>
CI04	Include full planning history of the site in an appendix	32	<i>Planning history is available through the Council's website – no change</i>
CI05	Add words “in the” before adopted local plan on page 2	32	<b>Amend brief</b>
CI06	Change wording regarding sharp change in level on page 6	32	<b>Amend brief to clarify</b>
CI07	Burgage plot zone unclear on page 7	32	<b>Diagram will be amended distinguish the burgage plot zone more clearly from listed buildings</b>
	<b>Terminology</b>		
CI08	Clarify what primary and secondary frontage means	18	<b>This will be clarified in the text on page 12 of the brief</b>

Riley Road (M4 Site) Marlow Development Brief - Appendix 2

Comments received during the Public Consultation Period (Nov- Dec 2008)

No	Comment	Comment from	Response
C109	The brief should distinguish between large and medium footprint buildings	32	<i>The brief does provide guidance on the footprint sizes on page 15 - no change</i>
	<b>Other comments</b>		
	Support for Little Marlow Gravel Pits as a Country Park	34	<i>Noted, but this is not the subject of this brief – no change</i>

**Riley Road (M4 Site)  
Development Brief**

**Appendices**

Approved version

April 2009

*Produced by Spatial Planning Division  
Planning & Sustainability  
Wycombe District Council*

*Copies available from:  
Wycombe District Council Offices  
Queen Victoria Road  
High Wycombe  
Bucks  
HP11 1BB*

*Price £6:00*

*and available online at:*

*[www.wycombe.gov.uk](http://www.wycombe.gov.uk)*

**© Copyright 2009  
Wycombe District Council**

The maps included in this document are based upon from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of the Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. 100023306. 2009.

Aerial Photography Cities Revealed © copyright by the GeoInformation Group  
Height data © Intermap Technologies Inc. All rights reserved. DWYCI50. 2009.