COMMUNITY RESPONSE LETTER

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE COUNCIL
HOUSING AND ECONOMIC LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT
FEBRUARY 2026

To Sign This Letter, Please Visit

tinyurl.com/HELAA-Response

Buckinghamshire Council recently published its Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). This identified three sites as "suitable" for residential development in Long Crendon.

- 102 houses land off Chilton Road (the Gladman site)
- 273 houses Madges Farm, Chearsley Road (adjacent to Greenings)
- 42 houses College Farm, Chearsley Road

Taken together, we believe these 417 dwellings are **neither proportionate** (c38% increase on the current Village housing stock), **nor deliverable** (current infrastructure constraints and future needs have not been properly considered), and that the Council's own planning policies have been **inconsistently applied**.

We can and must plan for additional housing in Long Crendon, but this should be done as part of a comprehensive strategy that balances the pros and cons of multiple sites, while embracing the views of all residents. The **Long Crendon Neighbourhood Plan** development process is the best and only **democratic** way forward. However, that process will not be completed until later in the year. The Council, by identifying three large sites as "suitable" for development in the HELAA now, is getting in the way of and **undermining** this process which is against established National Planning Guidelines and practices

The deadline for providing feedback to Bucks is short (March 16th) and the topic is extremely complex. So, we have drafted the attached Community Response Letter, in the hope that we can add your voice to the concerns that we believe will affect all residents of Long Crendon. The letter is written in "planning speak" — because of who it needs to go to — but, put simply, it just makes the three straightforward points we've outlined above. You're very welcome to read it in detail, but you absolutely don't need to. What we really need is your signature, if you agree with what we are saying, so that your support is counted.

This is not about resisting change or shutting the door on new neighbours; it's about ensuring that growth is planned responsibly, with the infrastructure, landscape and heritage that sustain village life properly considered. Long Crendon has always drawn its strength from people who care for it: this is simply another moment to stand together, with the same pride and purpose as those who came before us.

The letter below (hopefully with your digital signature), will be sent to Buckinghamshire Council on 12th March

For and On Behalf of the
Undersigned Residents of Long Crendon

5th March 2026

Councillor Steven Broadbent
Cabinet Leader
Buckinghamshire Council
steve.broadbent@buckinghamshire.gov.uk

Copies
Peter Strachan, Cabinet Member for Planning and Environment, Buckinghamshire Council
Sarah Ashmead, Interim Chief Executive Officer, Buckinghamshire Council
Steve Bambrick, Corporate Director for Planning, Growth and Sustainability, Bucks Council
Eric Owens, Director of Planning and Environment, Buckinghamshire Council
Tom Ansell, Case Officer PL/25/6024/OA and PL/25/5099/OA, Buckinghamshire Council
Councillor Clive Harriss, Buckinghamshire Council
Greg Smith MP

Dear Councillor Broadbent,

Regulation 18 Consultation – Buckinghamshire Local Plan
Community Response For And On Behalf Of The Residents Of Long Crendon HP18

We are writing as residents of Long Crendon to submit our comments under Regulation 18 of the Draft Local Plan for Buckinghamshire, with particular reference to the Draft Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) for residential property around the village.

Our representations are informed by the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan (2013-2033), which adopted the Long Crendon Neighbourhood Plan in 2017, together with the NPPF 2025, and the Council's own evidence base. We have also engaged extensively with the Parsh Council's Steering Committee, which is in the advanced stages of updating the Long Crendon Neighbourhood Plan.

Our overall position is that the 417 dwellings considered "suitable" in the HELAA for the Parish of Long Crendon are **neither proportionate** (c38% increase on the current Village housing stock) **nor deliverable** (infrastructure constraints have not been considered), and that **planning policies have been inconsistently applied.**

We can and must plan for additional housing in Long Crendon, but this should be done as part of a comprehensive strategy that balances the pros and cons of multiple sites, while embracing the views of all residents. The Long Crendon Neighbourhood Plan development process, currently in an advanced stage, is the best and only democratic way forward. Identifying three large sites as

"suitable" for development in the HELAA pre-empts and undermines this process, contrary to p50 of the NPPF.

CUMULATIVE IMPACT OF SITES CONSIDERED "SUITABLE" IN THE PLAN

The Plan identified three sites as "suitable" for residential development in Long Crendon Parish. OPUS 653 (land off Chilton Road), OPUS 377 (land at Madges Farm, Chearsley Road) and OPUS 5000 (land at College Farm). We will refer to them collectively as the "OPUS Sites"

Taken collectively, neither the scale or spatial allocation of new dwellings at the OPUS Sites are suitable, far outweighing the ability of existing infrastructure to support them.

We set out our reasoning below.

1. **Inconsistency in Buckinghamshire Council's Assessment of Site Suitability**

Buckinghamshire Council's published site-assessment methodology sets out a clear framework for determining whether land is suitable for allocation. The criteria include:

- Landscape sensitivity
- Heritage impact
- Access to services
- Transport sustainability
- Flood risk and drainage
- Infrastructure capacity
- Relationship to the existing settlement pattern
- Deliverability and proportionality

When these criteria are applied consistently, the OPUS Sites should be assessed as unsuitable, in line with the Council's treatment of other sites in the village, specifically OPUS 159 (land to the North of Drakes Drive).

However, there is a clear inconsistency in the way the OPUS Sites have been categorised when compared with other Long Crendon sites that you have already deemed unsuitable for allocation.

1.1 Comparison with Other Rejected Long Crendon Sites

In both the current and previous rounds of assessment, you have rejected several sites in Long Crendon on the grounds that they:

- Extend the village into open countryside
- Harm the rural setting of the Conservation Area

- Are poorly connected to services
- Would increase car dependency
- Have landscape or heritage constraints
- Are disproportionate to the scale of the village

These same constraints apply equally — and in some cases more strongly — to the OPUS Sites.

Yet the OPUS Sites have been treated more favourably, despite:

- Larger scale
- Greater cumulative impact
- More severe infrastructure constraints
- Clear evidence from Highways, Thames Water, Heritage, and Environmental Health that they are not sustainable locations for development

1.2 Application of the Council's Own Criteria

(a) Landscape and Settlement Pattern

Other Long Crendon sites have been rejected because they extend the village into open countryside and erode its rural setting. The OPUS Sites do exactly the same — but on a much larger scale.

(b) Heritage Impact

The Heritage Officer's consultation response confirms that development on the northern edge of Long Crendon causes harm to the Conservation Area and fails to comply with statutory duties. Other sites have been rejected for far less heritage impact.

(c) *Transport Sustainability*

The Highways Development Management response confirms that the local road network is already over capacity. Other Long Crendon sites have been rejected on transport grounds, yet the OPUS Sites — which generate far more traffic — have not been treated consistently.

(d) *Infrastructure Capacity*

Thames Water has confirmed that the water network cannot accommodate additional development without major upgrades.

Other sites have been rejected due to infrastructure constraints, yet the OPUS sites face greater constraints.

(e) *Flood Risk and Drainage*

The OPUS Sites have:

- Overland flow paths
- Groundwater emergence

- Limited infiltration
- Surface water pooling

Other sites with similar or lesser constraints have been rejected.

(f) Proportionality

The Council has previously rejected sites in Long Crendon on the basis that they would represent disproportionate growth.

Yet the OPUS sites collectively represent a 38% increase in the size of the village — far beyond any reasonable definition of proportionate development, even against the background of current central government plans.

1.3 Lack of Justification for Differential Treatment

There is no evidence that the OPUS Sites perform better than the rejected Long Crendon sites.

In fact, the technical evidence shows they perform worse.

The inconsistent treatment suggests that:

- The assessment process has not been applied uniformly
- The OPUS Sites have been advanced despite failing the Council's own criteria
- The cumulative impact on Long Crendon has not been properly considered
- The Local Plan's approach to rural settlements lacks coherence and transparency

This inconsistency is a material flaw in the site-selection process and should be addressed before the Local Plan progresses to Regulation 19.

This inconsistency undermines the robustness of the site-selection process.

2. Status of the Long Crendon Neighbourhood Plan ("LCNP")

Even if the argument advanced in section 1 above is rejected, what is inescapable is that the LCNP (2013-2023) remains an adopted and up-to-date part of the VALP until 2033.

The Long Crendon Neighbourhood Plan:

- Defines a settlement boundary.
- Allocates housing that has already been delivered or permitted.
- Protects key green spaces.
- Sets design and character policies.
- Identifies heritage and landscape sensitivities.

Long Crendon is in the process of updating the LCNP through the *Future Crendon* project. Public consultation is due to begin in April 2026. This demonstrates that the community is

proactively planning for its future and is committed to managing growth in a sustainable and locally appropriate way. The emerging work will continue to reinforce the concept of a settlement boundary and identify significant landscape, heritage, and infrastructure constraints around the village.

Long Crendon currently contains approximately 1,100 dwellings. The three promoted sites—OPUS 653 (102 dwellings), OPUS 377 (273 dwellings) and OPUS 5000 (42 dwellings)—would collectively introduce around 417 additional homes, representing a **38% increase** in the size of the village. Even individually, each site would result in a disproportionate level of growth for a rural settlement:

- **OPUS 653** → 9% increase
- **OPUS 377** → 25% increase
- **OPUS 5000** → 4% increase

Such levels of expansion are far beyond what could reasonably be considered proportionate for a rural village and would fundamentally alter its character, setting and infrastructure balance.

3. Spatial Strategy and Rural Settlements

The Regulation 18 Draft confirms that:

- Growth in rural villages should be proportionate.
- Development should be directed to sustainable locations.
- Infrastructure capacity is a key determinant of suitability.

Long Crendon is not identified as a strategic growth location. Directing development to the village would undermine the spatial strategy and disperse growth into less sustainable rural areas.

4. Transport Sustainability

Long Crendon is not a sustainable transport location:

- Bus services are infrequent and unreliable.
- The village is heavily car-dependent.
- Thame Road, Chilton Road, and Chearsley Road are narrow, constrained by residential parking and school traffic, and already under pressure.

The recent Highways Development Management response to application **PL/25/6024/OA** (97 dwellings at Madges Farm – part of OPUS 377) provides clear, technical evidence that the **local road network is already operating at or beyond capacity**. The Council's own modelling shows:

- The Chearsley Road / Bicester Road / The Square mini-roundabout is forecast to operate over capacity in the 2035 PM peak even *without* additional development.

- With development traffic added, the junction reaches RFC 0.97 and delays of around 60 seconds, confirming that the network *cannot absorb further growth*.
- The Highways Authority explicitly states that the development "exacerbates both delays and queuing" and that mitigation is required to bring the junction back within acceptable limits.

The Highway Authority also requires:

- A cumulative impact assessment (this should include all OPUS Sites ,together with strategic developments under consideration like the anaerobic digester at Bicester Road (CM/0022/22).
- Modelling of the Drakes Drive / Thame Road roundabout
- Modelling of the Chearsley Road / Thame Road roundabout
- Cross-boundary assessment with Oxfordshire County Council (e.g. impact on Thame Road / A418 Roundabout

These requirements demonstrate that the local road network is already under severe pressure, and that even modest additional development triggers the need for complex, multi-junction mitigation. The road network, simply, cannot accommodate significant additional traffic without unacceptable impacts on safety and congestion.

The Highways Authority is not yet in a position to support the ninety-seven-dwelling application associated with OPUS 377 on transport grounds. **This is a clear indication that Long Crendon cannot sustainably accommodate further significant allocations, including the OPUS Sites.**

5. Infrastructure Capacity

(a) Water and wastewater

Water and wastewater infrastructure constraints are a significant issue for Long Crendon. The recent Thames Water consultation response for application PL/25/6024/OA concerning only part of the OPUS 377 site confirms that:

- The existing water network cannot accommodate the needs of new development.
- Major network reinforcement works would be required before occupation.
- Without upgrades, development may lead to no or low water pressure in the village.
- Groundwater discharges into the public sewer require a Groundwater Risk Management Permit
- Surface water cannot be discharged into the public network.

This is a clear indication that the water supply network is already operating at or near capacity, and that further development in Long Crendon would require substantial upgrades to strategic infrastructure.

Thames Water's published AMP7 and AMP8 investment programmes list numerous treatment works scheduled for expansion or improvement. Long Crendon WWTW is not included in any planned upgrade programme for 2025–2030.

This means:

- There is no strategic plan to increase treatment capacity.
- Any additional development would require developer-funded upgrades, which are unlikely to be viable or proportionate for rural sites.
- Any such funding would need to come in addition to funding for education, healthcare and highways upgrades

The Local Plan cannot rely on future capacity that is neither planned nor funded.

Drainage and surface water issues are well-documented in several parts of the village (e.g. surface water flooding from Pinners Way onto Chearsley Road and High Street), and the local sewage infrastructure is severely challenged. This is a significant constraint on further development. The Long Crendon Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) is a small rural treatment facility with extremely limited hydraulic and biological capacity, and **there is no published programme for expansion in Thames Water's current or forthcoming investment cycles.**

Environment Agency monitoring data for 2021–2023 shows that Long Crendon WWTW is a minor works operating close to its permitted limits. Although the recorded spill hours are low, this reflects the small scale of the works, not spare capacity. Even modest rainfall events can trigger storm overflow activity, indicating that the system has minimal headroom.

By contrast, the downstream works at Shabbington and Thame — which receive flows from the wider catchment — recorded:

- Shabbington WWTW: 48 spills, 575 hours (2023)
- Thame WWTW: 38 spills, 438.7 hours (2023)

These figures demonstrate that the downstream network is already under severe pressure, meaning it cannot absorb additional flows from new development in Long Crendon.

The OPUS Sites would collectively introduce around 417 new dwellings, representing a 38% increase in the size of Long Crendon. This scale of growth would:

- Significantly increase foul water flows into a capacity-constrained treatment works
- Increase hydraulic load on a fragile sewer network
- Exacerbate downstream pressure at Shabbington and Thame WWTWs
- Require major reinforcement works that are not planned, funded or deliverable within the Local Plan period

Given these constraints, the OPUS Sites cannot be considered deliverable, sustainable, or compliant with the infrastructure requirements of the NPPF.

(b) *Healthcare access*

Healthcare provision in and around Long Crendon is already operating at or near capacity. The scale of development proposed through the OPUS Sites would place additional pressure on services that are not capable of accommodating further growth without significant investment and expansion — none of which is planned or funded.

Long Crendon is served primarily by Unity Health (Thame & Long Crendon), with additional reliance on practices in Haddenham and Brill. These practices already report:

- High patient-to-GP ratios
- Limited appointment availability
- Increasing demand from recent housing growth in Thame, Haddenham and surrounding villages
- Workforce and estate constraints that limit expansion

Unity Health's Long Crendon branch is a small satellite surgery providing dispensary services only, with restricted physical capacity. It cannot absorb the additional patient load generated by 417 new dwellings without:

- Additional consulting rooms
- Increased staffing
- Expanded parking and access
- Investment in digital and clinical infrastructure
- No such expansion is planned or funded.

The NHS Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire West Integrated Care Board (BOB ICB) has consistently highlighted that primary care capacity is under pressure across the region, and **that new development must demonstrate deliverability of healthcare mitigation. None has been provided for the OPUS Sites.**

In their response to PL/25/6024/OA for 97 houses on part of OPUS 377, the ICB stated that an s106 contribution of £91,563 would be required. By extrapolation, £393,626 would be required for 417 dwellings. We should note that the GP Surgery, which was due to be funded with the development of 41 dwellings at Pinners Way in 2019 has not yet been built

(c) Primary and Secondary School Capacity

Long Crendon Primary School is a popular and high-performing primary school with a catchment that already includes significant recent development.

Long Crendon Primary School s already operating close to its capacity as a one Form Entry school (210 places).

Significant growth of the village arising from 417 new dwellings would likely trigger the need to expand this to a two-form entry school, even after considering falling birth rates.

Any meaningful expansion without compromising play space, safeguarding, or operational functionality would be difficult. Even modest increases in pupil numbers would require:

- Additional classrooms
- Age-appropriate modifications to existing facilities
- Expanded hall and dining capacity
- Additional staffing numbers
- Increased staff parking
- Improvements to access and drop-off arrangements

Using Department for Education multipliers (~0.30 primary pupils per dwelling) would require 125 new places at Long Crendon Primary School to serve the Opus Sites

On the reasonable assumption that the education authority would prefer a single expanded school rather than two separate schools within the parish, it follows that growth at this scale will require land capable of accommodating either a physical expansion of the existing school or provision of a new school site that is well integrated with the settlement.

Buckinghamshire Council has not identified any funded programme to expand Long Crendon School. The OPUS Sites would generate a substantial number of primary-age pupils, placing pressure on a school that is already close to capacity.

Long Crendon has no secondary school. The village relies entirely on Lord Williams's School in Thame, which:

- Is already operating at or near capacity
- Serves a wide catchment across South Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire
- Has limited scope for expansion on its existing site
- Is affected by significant housing growth in Thame, Chinnor, Haddenham and other nearby settlements
- Is funded by Oxfordshire County Council

Additional development in Long Crendon would also increase pressure on secondary places and require pupils to travel further afield, increasing car dependency and undermining sustainable transport objectives.

Using Department for Education multipliers (~0.20 secondary pupils per dwelling) would require 83 new places at Lord Williams's School

Buckinghamshire Council has not identified any secondary school expansion programme that would accommodate the additional demand generated by the OPUS Sites.

(d) Cumulative Impact Across Healthcare and Education

Healthcare and education provision in Long Crendon and the surrounding area is already under significant pressure. The OPUS Sites would:

- Overwhelm local GP capacity
- Place unsustainable pressure on Long Crendon School
- Increase demand for secondary places that cannot be met locally
- Require major infrastructure investment that is neither planned nor funded

There is no evidence that these constraints can be mitigated proportionately or sustainably for any of the three OPUS Sites. On this basis, the OPUS Sites should be assessed as unsuitable for allocation due to healthcare and education capacity constraints.

6. Landscape, Heritage and Environmental Sensitivity

Long Crendon contains:

- A large Conservation Area
- Numerous listed buildings
- Important views across the Thame Valley
- A distinctive rural setting
- A well-defined settlement boundary adjoining open countryside in an Area of Attractive Landscape

The Heritage consultation response for application PL/25/6024/OA concludes that development on the northern edge of Long Crendon would:

- Harm the distinctive character of the Conservation Area
- Urbanise the rural setting of the village.
- Erode the agricultural landscape that contributes to the CA's significance.
- Cause less than substantial harm requiring great weight under NPPF paragraphs 195, 201, 203, 205 and 206.
- Fail to comply with the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
- Fail to comply with Local Plan policies BE1 and BE2
- All three sites fall outside the settlement boundary defined in the VALP

These findings apply directly to the OPUS Sites, all of which lie within the rural setting adjoining the Conservation Area and contribute to its historic agricultural landscape.

7. Biodiversity, Habitat Connectivity and Environmental Net Gain

The OPUS Sites lie within a landscape of high ecological value, characterised by species-rich hedgerows, mature trees, farmland habitats and interconnected wildlife corridors that link the village to the wider Thame Valley. Development on these sites would result in the loss,

fragmentation and degradation of these habitats, contrary to national policy and Buckinghamshire Council's biodiversity objectives.

7.1 High-Value Habitats and Protected Features

All three OPUS Sites contain or adjoin:

- Priority habitats, including hedgerows and semi-improved grassland
- Mature hedgerow networks that form key ecological corridors
- Foraging and commuting routes for bats, owls and other protected species
- Farmland bird habitat, including species of conservation concern (red list)
- Connectivity routes between the village and the Thame Valley landscape
- Red-listed species, including Starlings and Skylarks, and Hares and Hedgehogs

These features are integral to the ecological character of Long Crendon and are recognised in both the LCNP and Buckinghamshire Council's Green Infrastructure evidence base.

7.2 *Fragmentation of Ecological Networks*

Development of the OPUS Sites would sever or degrade multiple ecological corridors. This is contrary to:

- NPPF paragraph 186, which requires planning decisions to protect and enhance ecological networks
- Environment Act 2021, which mandates measurable biodiversity net gain
- Local Plan policies on green infrastructure and habitat connectivity

The OPUS Sites, particularly 377 and 653, sit within continuous hedgerow and field-margin networks that support movement of wildlife across the rural landscape. Their development would create hard urban edges, fragmenting these networks and reducing ecological resilience.

7.3 Cumulative Biodiversity Impacts

The Heritage Officer has already highlighted the importance of considering cumulative impacts on the Conservation Area. The same principle applies to biodiversity.

When considered together, the OPUS Sites would:

- Remove large areas of open countryside
- Break up continuous habitat corridors
- Increase lighting, noise and human disturbance
- Reduce the ecological permeability of the village edge

- Create isolated pockets of habitat with limited ecological function

7.4 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Requirements

Under the Environment Act 2021, all major developments must deliver a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain. This must be:

- Measured using the statutory biodiversity metric
- Delivered on-site, unless robust justification is provided
- Secured for at least 30 years

Given the scale of habitat loss across the OPUS Sites, it is highly unlikely that 10% BNG could be delivered on-site without:

- Significant land take
- Extensive habitat creation
- Long-term management commitments

Indeed, the land developer's BNG assessment for part of OPUS 377 (PL25/6024/OA) concludes that there would be a net loss of bio-diversity that cannot be mitigated on-site.

No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that BNG is achievable for any of the OPUS Sites, either individually or collectively.

7.5 Lighting and Disturbance Impacts

Environmental Health has already raised concerns about lighting and noise impacts (PL/25/6025/OA). These are directly relevant to biodiversity, particularly:

- Bats, which rely on dark corridors
- Owls, which hunt along hedgerows
- Farmland birds, which are sensitive to disturbance
- Nocturnal mammals, including badgers and hedgehogs

Development on the OPUS Sites would introduce:

- Street lighting
- Domestic lighting
- Increased vehicle movements
- Noise from construction and operation, including from heat pumps and air conditioning
- Failure to demonstrate deliverable biodiversity net gain
- Cumulative ecological harm across the northern and eastern edges of the village

These impacts would degrade the ecological value of the surrounding countryside irreversibly.

This represents an irreversible loss of to the local ecological environment. Cumulative ecological harm is a material planning consideration and must be assessed under both the NPPF and the Environment Act.

On this basis, the OPUS Sites should be assessed as unsuitable for allocation due to biodiversity and ecological network constraints, consistent with national policy and your own evidence base.

8. Flood Risk and Drainage Constraints

Flood risk and drainage capacity are significant constraints affecting all three OPUS Sites. The Council's evidence base identifies:

- Surface water flood risk
- Overland flow paths
- Groundwater emergence
- Limited infiltration capacity

Thames Water's consultation response (PL//25/6024/OA) reinforces these concerns, requiring:

- Measures to minimise groundwater discharges.
- A Groundwater Risk Management Permit
- Assurance that surface water will not be discharged into the public network.
- Protection of water mains crossing or near the sites

Lived experience confirms that surface water flooding is already caused by the development of 41 houses at Pinners Way in 2019. The SuDS installed at that time is insufficient in heavy rain, with flood water running along Chearlsey Road and into the High Street. Adjoining properties have been flooded, and many have had to install additional mitigation measures at considerable expense (eg The Eight Bells on High Street Long Crendon).

It falls to common sense that if flooding is already experienced from a development of 41 houses, then 375 additional houses (OPUS 377 and OPUS 653) on adjoining up-hill land will create significant additional risk. The 2x attenuation ponds proposed for 97 houses (PL/25/6024/OA) highlights that the developer is aware of the problem. By extrapolation, 375 houses would require **four attenuation ponds**, with no guarantee that they will not over-spill and creating a dominant feature on the landscape immediately outside the current settlement boundary

Given the scale of development proposed across the OPUS Sites, the cumulative impact on surface water management would be substantial. **There is no evidence that the local drainage network has the capacity to accommodate the additional runoff that would be generated.**

9. Environmental Health and Amenity Impacts

Environmental Health raises concerns (PL25/6024/OA) that development could:

- Detrimentally impact the amenity of existing and future residents,
- Create over-bearing development on rising topography, adjacent to existing dwellings, with limited potential to mitigate
- Generate significant construction-phase noise, dust, vibration, and lighting impacts.
- Introduce new operational noise sources (e.g., air-source heat pumps)
- Require a Construction Environmental Controls Plan
- Require detailed noise and lighting assessments.

These concerns are particularly relevant in Long Crendon, where the rural character means noise and lighting impacts are more noticeable and construction access is constrained.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As residents of Long Crendon, we the undersigned respectfully request that you:

1. Classify OPUS Sites 377, 653, and 5000 as **UNSUITABLE** in the draft HELAA
2. Continue to respect the settlement boundary defined in the LCNP.
3. Direct growth to Aylesbury and other strategic locations, consistent with the draft spatial strategy.
4. Recognise the *Future Crendon* work as evidence of proactive community planning and delay any new site allocations in Long Crendon until the village Neighbourhood Plan is complete and adopted.

Long Crendon has already met its planned housing contribution through the Neighbourhood Plan. Further allocations on the scale proposed in the HELAA would be unsustainable, harmful to heritage and landscape, and inconsistent with the Council's own evidence.

First Name	Second Name	Address	Post Code	E-Mail
John	Doe	Main Street	HP18 XXX	John.Doe@gmail.com