**Appendix 2**

The HEDNA is fundamentally flawed in its methodology allocating 5ha of employment space to this Green Belt land in Beaconsfield. It has not established the exceptional circumstances required. This land is unsuitable for Green Belt release and development. The need for employment land is not defined; there is no substantive need assessment. Without this, employment land need in Beaconsfield has not been proven.

The HEDNA does not ask nor answer the pertinent questions surrounding employment land need in Beaconsfield. The following has not been defined and demonstrated and, without such, no case has been proven for release of this Green Belt land:

1. Type of employment use to be created; use class; number of employees in each unit and at each pay grade.
2. Location and number of units.
3. Floor area and type of each unit (e.g. office unit, office block, freehold, leasehold, retail unit, business park, warehouse, light industrial unit).
4. The demographic to work in each unit.
5. Where the demographic defined at point 4 above would live and where do they live now?
6. How many parking spaces to be allocated to each unit defined at point 3 above.
7. How the demographic described at point 4 would travel to and from work.
8. How many extra journeys would be generated daily to account for the journeys made by the demographic at point 4.
9. What impact would the journeys described in point 8 have on local infrastructure and traffic congestion.
10. What impact would the employment use specified at point 1 have on the existing business users of the town? How would the business impact the existing traders in the town? Negative impact?
11. The cost of the land required for the construction of the units specified at point 3 above.
12. The construction cost of the units specified above at point 3 above.
13. The prospective sale prices and rental of the units mentioned at point 3 above.
14. Compare the cost in points 11, 12 and 13 with similar units in nearby Loudwater and High Wycombe.
15. How the requirement for 5ha of employment land in Beaconsfield has been calculated.
16. How this can be justified in light of entire high rise office buildings in High Wycombe and also Maidenhead currently being converted to residential use.
17. Why Beaconsfield allocated a full 50% of the entire 10ha employment need of the whole district when by the Hedna’s own admission Beaconsfield is not an important commercial property location.
18. Employment space will not assimilate with the Conservation Area, Beaconsfield Historic Core, the nearby Area of Outstanding Natural beauty, ancient woodland, hedgerows, ponds, agricultural and habitats. Impact entirely negative.
19. What proportion of Beaconsfield residents out-commute?
20. What employment the current residents of Beaconsfield are engaged in and where.
21. What salaries the current residents of Beaconsfield enjoy.
22. Why this is needed in Beaconsfield and not elsewhere.

 It has not been shown that employment space is viable or pertinent to the Beaconsfield Green Belt or Conservation Area; employment space cannot be satisfied here; this land is not suitable for employment space. Exceptional circumstances have not been proven for release of this Green Belt land in Beaconsfield.

It must also be shown that this employment space cannot be located elsewhere in the locality – but just along the A40 an entire high rise office block is being converted to residential dwellings and there is vacant brown field land nearby in Loudwater. Therefore, there is no need for this type of development here. The present consultation should not and must not trigger release as no viability has been shown or even assessed; no need has been demonstrated and Option 9 Beaconsfield East must be withdrawn from further consideration.