QUESTION:

Does Thame have to deliver 339 homes through the revised TNP?

ANSWER:

339 is the number given to Thame by the District Council. Since those 339 were passed on to us, some more housing has come forward and we can take that off that total.

This includes homes that have received planning permission, like those on the old DAF Headquarters site. It also includes some on sites that do not yet have planning permission, but that it is reasonable to count. For example, an application for 57 homes has been made on Reserve Site C, south of Wenman Road.

Due to these new sites coming forward, we now think that we will have to find room for fewer than 200 out of the original 339 homes.

Thame also has to work out how many homes it must plan for to help its residents who have special needs. Some of these might be able to be provided instead of the District's homes, but others might need to be provided in addition to them. We are currently working towards finding out what these special needs are.

QUESTION:

What is meant by 'specialist housing'?

ANSWER:

We have a duty to provide specialist housing under the District's planning policy. We currently have multiple sites across Thame where developers want to build care homes for the elderly. These commercial schemes have focused on the most lucrative provision. Thame believes that all of our elderly housing needs should be investigated and, where possible, provided for.

Thame also has major issues concerning housing affordability and we believe we should try and help local families stay in the Thame area.



Will all the new homes will be delivered in one location?

ANSWER:

There are several sites around the town that will count to the homes we have to build, including some that already have planning permission. Any remaining homes will need to go on one or more of the 4 major sites. With the numbers remaining being relatively low, it is preferable that the homes go on one site, rather than having several 'half-filled' sites which may attract further, uncontrolled development in the future.



Why have the CEG and Diagnostic Reagents, and the Cattle Market sites been removed from this consultation?

ANSWER:

The use of these sites for housing was well supported during the last consultation and they are very likely to be included within the draft Thame Neighbourhood Plan. The CEG site was an allocated Reserve Site for the last Thame Neighbourhood Plan, and already has a planning application on it for 57 homes.



Were the Highfields and East of Thame housing sites rejected in the first consultation? If so, why have they been included in this consultation?

ANSWER:

For the first consultation, both the Highfields and East of Thame housing sites were examined, but not initially highlighted for growth as there were concerns with how they performed against the Vision and Objectives of the Thame Neighbourhood Plan. There were also landscape concerns over both of these sites. Some members of the public were, however, not happy to have had them discounted as an option at the earliest stage and felt they wanted to know more about them.



Will TNP2 deliver a new school?

ANSWER:

We hope to have the answer from the County Council's School Planning Team very soon. Although new homes will bring more children, natural variation in birth rates in and around Thame means that it might not be necessary to provide a new primary school.

Lord Williams's School is likely to expand to 12-form entry under its current growth plans. From that point onwards, it may cater for future growth by shrinking or expanding its catchment area as necessary.



Will TNP2 deliver a new health hub (near the Rugby Club)?

ANSWER:

There is already a live planning application for a new facility for Thame GPs on this site. The wider site does not have to be used to help with the delivery of new health services.

QUESTION:

Would the High Fields or South of Moreton Lane developments result in Thame losing the road-free footpath connecting Thame and Moreton?

ANSWER:

Neither site would harm the current footpaths serving Moreton, and neither proposal suggests sending vehicle traffic along Moreton Lane itself.

QUESTION:

Can the Cuttle Brook Nature Reserve be extended?

ANSWER:

Extending the CBNR is being offered by the promotors of land at High Fields and South of Moreton Lane. The land has been identified as unsuitable for development, being mostly flood plain.

Although the public would benefit from an extension to the CBNR, it is possible that any extension in this area would have to remain closed to the public. This is because the current CBNR is suffering from over-use and the plants, wildlife and water quality of the Cuttlebrook are being harmed. A closed extension would provide a buffer area where plants and animals could live without disturbance which should help with the continual repopulation of depleted areas.

"The High Fields site will deliver a 30-acre expansion to the Cuttlebrook Nature Reserve"

FACT CHECK:

Potentially true.

Areas within the flood plain are of very little value in development terms and may not be of great value to the farmer. Three of the four sites have areas prone to flooding and if carefully managed could provide areas for leisure, increasing habitats and reducing flood risk.

The possibility exists that public access to any future extension area, anywhere along the Cuttlebrook may have to be restricted or prohibited to help our natural assets flourish.

"The High Fields site is the only site that can deliver an extension to the Phoenix Trail."

FACT CHECK:

False.

The Phoenix Trail already connects to National Cycle Route 57, which serves Rycote Lane and provides an onward cycle route through to Gloucestershire. More direct access to Rycote Lane could be provided without development; parts of the Phoenix Trail immediately adjacent, next to the South of Moreton Lane site has for many years been leased by the owner to Sustrans, the cycle charity.

"The High Fields site would have its own access off Rycote Lane."

FACT CHECK:

Not known.

The access off Rycote Lane is in the ownership of a local family trust. It is not known if or when access could be agreed across this land.

"The High Fields site will provide 120 affordable homes (rent / shared ownership / first homes)"

FACT CHECK:

False.

This would be the level of provision if 300 homes were required, which is highly unlikely to be the case. Whatever site gets chosen, the owner / developer would have to provide 40% of the homes on their sites as affordable homes.

"The High Fields site will provide 8 acres of land next to Lord Williams for additional school and community use."

FACT CHECK:

The Town Council does not believe Lord Williams's needs any additional land.

Thame may not need a new primary school. Any general community use should be accessible by public transport, but it is not known if commercial operators could run a viable service to this site, even if housing expanded in numbers