**Appendix 4**

The Chiltern and South Bucks Settlement Infrastructure Capacity Study assessed Beaconsfield “for accommodating the potential for new growth.” Para.1, “it is important to look at potential critical infrastructure issues at the early stages of plan preparation and evidence gathering because this could have a fundamental impact on whether the policies and proposals in the new Local Plan are realistic, deliverable and can be implemented…” The Study focussed on 6 categories of infrastructure: education, health, transport, utilities, flood defences and social care. TWO THIRDS of these categories have been labelled red: “insufficient information currently available.” So, Option 9 is not suitable and not shown to be realistic and deliverable.

Beaconsfield receives a “red” (“insufficient information”) category for:

* Primary education – “very limited scope” - Para.44 confirms that “Bucks CC has very little capital funding available to provide additional school places and there is no guarantee that this funding will be available in future years.”
* Secondary education – “very limited scope” - Para. 49 states that Bucks CC have stated in the Study that 700 homes would generate an additional form of entry of primary pupils and 1200 homes would generate an additional secondary school, form of entry.
* Acute health (hospital) – “to be confirmed”
* Primary Health (GP) – “very limited scope”
* Transport – main roads – any possible improvements would only be “directly related to the development”
* Transport – motorways – “implications to be tested”
* Utilities – waste water – “need Ofwat approval” and “potential cost to consumers via water bills” –trunk sewer “close to capacity” - Gerrards Cross Waste Water Treatment Works requires site wide upgrades.
* Social care – “data difficult to disaggregate in relation to the current information” and “provision could be by private or public sector for some types of accommodation.” The Study highlights the need for further evidence into the issue of affordable care beds and this is a key concern in relation to accommodation for the elderly.

Beaconsfield received an “amber” designation (“capacity dependent on planned measures and improvements” – but no details given) for:

* Transport – rail: “implications to be tested”
* Utilities – drinking water – suggested measures include: “demand management, water efficiency measures and transfer of supply from outside catchment”
* Utilities – electricity and gas: “a site specific matter”
* Household waste collection and recycling

Para.38 confirms that one of the most severely affected roads is the A355 between Amersham and Beaconsfield and the A355 south of Beaconsfield. The proposed relief road would be hopelessly swamped by the proposed population growth.

Para.45 confirms “the scope for accommodating future potential growth in population or housing…seems very limited.” Put simply “more engagement is needed.”

Para.58 states that Beaconsfield and Gerrards Cross are already “referred to by Chiltern Railways as being two of the busiest stations in the area with their carparks frequently at full capacity.”

The Study states that “there are several elements to this Study which will need to be the subject of further work.” This includes “commissioning work on viability.”

The Study concludes that it is not known how the required infrastructure would be funded and warns against what CIL could deliver.

The Responses from the Infrastructure Providers/Other Organisations to the Questionnaires submitted as part of the Study have revealed:

* High level assessment needed for M40 between jct.1 and 3 – already an accident blackspot.
* No accessibility to bus services has been considered in distinguishing which settlements to include in the Study and Beaconsfield bus services are very poor and incapable of supporting an extra 4,000 residents.
* No account has been taken of sufficiency of walking and cycling infrastructure. The A355 which would separate the Option land from the rest of the town is a highly dangerous road for cyclists and pedestrians – impossible to cross safely at peak times.
* There is a need for AFFORDABLE care bed provision for the elderly.
* Historic England state “ in considering potential growth locations need to consider the positive contribution made by the historic environment and ensure that harmful pressures are avoided…” Irrevocable harm would be caused to the character and setting of the historic core of Beaconsfield Old Town.

In conclusion, the infrastructure and facilities need is not shown to be viable and deliverable for release of this Green Belt land and the resultant growth in population of the town. Therefore, Option 9 is not suitable and should not be taken further.