

COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC OPEN DAY ON SWLP PREFERRED CONSULTATION - 22 FEBRUARY 2025

NO	OTHER	COMMENT
✓		The space between the two railway lines currently acts as a buffer. The building proposal would affect this, infrastructure and the amount of floodwater
	✓	Bypass and infrastructure must be put in place first
	✓	Bypass and infrastructure must be put in place first
	✓	Bypass and infrastructure must be put in place first. Support some development but not to the detriment of Henley-in-Arden character and well-being of residents and town
	✓	Agree with some devt. But need infrastructure and sites to be agreed by residents
	✓	Amount of houses planned is excessive. Together with enormous site planned for Beasley, Pathlow, Wilmcote traffic problems would be horrendous
✓		no to proposed large scale devt. Totally inappropriate scale for Henley. Accept need for smaller proportional devt over longer timescale - 20 years to allow town's facilities/infrastructure to grow and accommodate
✓		Road system doesn't allow for planned houses. Schools? Too big for the environment
	✓	Unless there is a bypass and better support for development - new schools, medical centre and a BY-PASS
✓		Agree with development of Henley but not on such a large scale
✓		It's imperative that the JPC working group puts forward a thorough proposal for Henley devt. As a credible, sustainable and deliverable alternative
	✓	Scale for Henley is unrealistically large. Will be detrimental to the character of the area and the access, infrastructure, facilities cannot cope with such a proposal
✓		Land to the west of the railway line in SG23 should not be developed, this would open the floodgates for the future
✓		I do not want the devt to go ahead for the loss of the green belt and the countryside in Henley - this must be stopped
✓		Flooding, pressure on services, traffic
	✓	Open to some houses but not that many and question 50% social
✓		Infrastructure, surface water, HS etc catchment ponds no good
	✓	Consider third of SG23 as a maybe
	✓	Need more detail. Consider using part of site for solar - no clean energy
✓		Flooding, extra schools, dr's, shops - two towns, Historic buildings on High St, Traffic

NO	OTHER	COMMENT
✓		Character of area, infrastructure, environment, loss of green space, traffic, congestion, road access
✓		Character of area, infrastructure, environment, loss of green space, traffic, congestion, road access
✓		Please ensure residents are fully involved and represented
✓		Disproportionate, increased flood risk, no infrastructure, 500 houses perhaps OK
✓		Proposal doubles size of Henley. Need services and infrastructure to support. Completely inappropriate for the area and locations
	✓	Happy for some housing but needs to be affordable
✓		Think of the environment
✓		No housing on green belt - traffic issues
✓		Ridiculous to treble the size of Henley - road, traffic and flood risk
✓		
✓		Infrastructure, roads, flooding numbers
✓		Infrastructure, roads, flooding numbers
	✓	Would change the character of the town
✓		Infrastructure, roads, bottle-neck
	✓	Don't object to the devt. Of more housing, but think the proposed scale is too big. Proposal would swamp the town/village and I can see no provision for increasing other infrastructure to support it. Ie. Schools, medical centre, traffic flows, parking etc
	✓	Housing should be designed for young families - older generation to downsize
	✓	The devt. Should be fair to Henley and also more focus on all the infrastructures.

DOTS ON BOARDS

2

106

30