


Response ID	Do you support development on Iver Heath Fields or do you want to see this land retained as public open space within the Green Belt? Please explain the reasons for your answer	Final Result				412
		Blanks	Yes	No	Other	
		37	23	318	34	100.00%
1	Depends on what it is and how it contributes to the community	8.98%	5.58%	77.18%	8.25%	
2	The open space allows dumping and rubbish and encourages bad social behaviour					
6	No - it is great for wildlife and dog walking.					
7	This should be retained. The fields contain wildlife that shouldn't be disturbed and the area is an area used extensively by the local community.					
8	No. Due to the fact the village is already overcrowded.					
9	No support. Valuable community resource in already built up area.					
10	No. Too much development already					
11	Retained as open space for public enjoyment and benefit. Once gone such places are gone forever.					
12	Land to be retained as public, open space within the green belt.					
13	No, Iver Heath fields acts as a green corridor for wildlife and a buffer against the motorway network.					
14	Retain as public open space. Local amenity for nature, walking and wildlife.					
15	No. It is important to retain as much green belt and open spaces as possible.					
16	No to development on Iver Heath Fields.					
17	Retain as public space - already too much pollution, too many flats, housing etc					
18	I don't like housing alongside motorways because of pollution and noise. But would think a large care home would be ok as residents stay indoors and plenty of car space for carers and residents families					
19	Public open space. As essential for health well being of community.					
20	I need convincing - if development means traffic away from Iver Village then I would agree.					
21	Green Belt land was designated so that no building would take place and should remain so					
22	Leave as is. The infrastructure necessary to support development doesn't exist.					
23	I wish to see Iver Heath fields retained as a public open space for the benefit of the present community, which is easily accessible.					
24	Retain as open space. So much land is being lost in the area to the likes of big business like pinewood					



25	Public open space within the green belt.
26	Green Belt land needs to be retained. Otherwise we will face a slow degradation of the land as it is taken piecemeal. Where do you draw the line?
27	No. Retain the field as an open space, because it brings people together.
28	Leave the fields. To much greenery taken away. To much concrete and not enough green.
29	Minimal only. It is best within the green belt.
30	Must be retained as public open space.
31	Don't know much about the area so can't comment
32	Retained as public open space development means more families more vehicles on the road and we don't have schools for our children.
33	Public open space
34	I do not support development. This is an area used regularly by local people.
35	Want to retain as public open space as there's too much built up area already.
36	We do not support development on Iver Heath fields. Roads are congested. Schools are full. Health Centres are full, have to wait a week for appointments
37	no I do not support the developement. Green Belt must be protected for future generations
38	Yes my grandchildren need work and housing
39	LEAVE WELL ALONE, we don't need any more buildings, the developers are rich enough
41	Retain as public open space.
42	No we do not support any development on Iver Heath Fields as we feel there isnt enough open space in Iver Heath
43	See the land retained. Roads will not take anymore traffic.
44	No to development only green space between the M25 and Iver Heath.
45	No. Any development will contribute to urban sprawl.
46	We strongly feel that the land of Iver Heath Fields should not be developed on at all and should remain public open space to be used by local residents for recreational purposes and to stay as nature sites for wildlife. The land became green belt to prevent urban sprawl and we have already lost chunks of it to Pinewood Studios because money talks!!!
47	Retained as green belt.
48	NO, there is enough traffic already in this area
50	Retain as public open space
51	Not many trees, I support development

52	retain as Greenbelt - Iver Heath does not have supporting facilities to support more housing
53	No. The Ivers are in a gridlock situation. We are unable to drive around this area now.
54	Retained as public open space, to keep the semi-rural existence of the area
55	Possibly some of it if other facilities are available eg transport, doctors/schools.
56	Not familiar with the area.
57	No, between 1963-65 Iver Parish purchased the fields which was paid for by our rates. The reason for the purchase was to protect the area and to be used for recreational purposes. Nothing has changed.
58	No, keep open space.
59	Perhaps very limited.
60	Leave Iver Heath Fields. We need public open spaces. If we start building on our open spaces it will set a precedent and never stop.
61	No. Retain as public open space
63	No to development. Keep Iver a village.
65	Only very limited development for residential purposes if offers 'affordable homes'.
66	To be retained and maintained. I agree strongly. Unlike Gams' field which is within the developed village area, Iver Heath Fields are marginal and an essential part of the Green Belt "ring".
67	Retained as public open space
68	Retained.
69	No. I live in a "VILLAGE" not a town. There's not the facilities to cope now.
70	Retained due to proximity of M25
71	It would depend on whether the road system was improved.
72	I am against Iver Heath Fields being developed because A) further pressure on the local schools, hospitals, doctors and traffic. B) Increased traffic will cause poorer air quality.
73	No. This is a green space that is in daily use - people walking/dog walking and is a barrier between us and the M40.
74	With Brexit we are now back to control of populations so development can be put on hold till we're sorted.
75	I do not support any development. It should stay as public open space. It is used regularly by dog walkers, schools, scouts and children - 24 hours
76	NO Keep in green belt
77	I do not support any development for Iver Heath Fields. Due to Pinewood expansion their value is even more important. They are an exceptional community asset.

78	Would like to see some released for housing. Not businesses.
80	Wants land to be retained as public open space, reason may be overdeveloped
82	If it involves more new housing, this will mean more cars and therefore more congestion in the area and schools
83	we don't have much space in Iver. This land should remain. The children and the youth need this facility
84	Retained as open space to maintain a local facility and continue to act as 'a border'.
85	I would prefer that the fields stay as they are.
86	Yes. Though there is considerable from Pinewood there is still much land towards the M40 which could be utilised for both
87	Keep as green belt. There is not enough open space for kids anyway.
88	I would prefer it to be open space as I visit it regularly with my disabled daughter, who prefers quiet, less congested areas to walk around in.
89	Remain as is.
90	Yes, this would keep the impact of new housing from the centre of The Ivers.
91	No. Only for a car park for St Margarets Church. Nowhere to park for weddings etc
93	Keep fields. If you are going to build do it near the station to get better access to crossrail or whats the point?
96	No I do not support. Retained as public open space . Because its greenbelt and used by a lot of locals
97	No. Too much congestion on roads in and around Iver already.
98	To remain the same. There are enough built up areas.
99	I do not support development on Iver Heath Fields. Building so close to the motorway (noise and pollutants) is condemning people to a lifetime of medical problems. What happens when the M25 is widened as it probably will be.
100	No. IVER HEATH FIELDS SHOULD STAY AS THEY ARE
101	There is the wildlife to consider and also the quiet that the land can be utilised in other ways that don't harm it.
102	I don't support development on Iver Heath Fields. It degrades quality of life (pollution, traffic)
103	I don't support development. We have illttle countryside as it is - these fields need to remain as they are. Its busy enough here already!

<b>104</b>	I DO NOT SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT ON IVER HEATH FIELDS. SHOULD BE RETAINED AS PUBLIC OPEN SPACE. PROVIDES VALUABLE RECREATION AREA/EASILY ACCESSIBLE
<b>105</b>	Retained as public open space limited green belt in this area. Walkers, dog walkers, extensively use the fields.
<b>107</b>	Popular area. For Residents. To walk. Development leads to traffic increases we already have enough.
<b>108</b>	No, because the immediate area is congested. Parking is not provided with the majority of houses are doctors/schools are at capacity.
<b>109</b>	I discovered this area for dog walking during the foot & mouth crisis. It fell below the usual local amenities and if something must go for residential development this may be first choice.
<b>110</b>	LAND RETAINED AS PUBLIC OPEN SPACE WITHIN THE GREEN BELT.
<b>111</b>	IVE HEATH FIELDS WAS BOUGHT WITH MONEY LEVIED ON THE RESIDENTS IN THE EARLY 90s TO STOP IT BEING BUILT ON, WE WANT OUR MONEY BACK IF BUILDING GOES AHEAD
<b>113</b>	I like to walk my dog there, so no. However it is a vast area of land that is never busy, so maybe.
<b>115</b>	If anywhere this is a good space to utilise
<b>116</b>	Absolutely No Commercial or Industrial development. No need for it will only cause more noise and air pollution in the area and damage the village green scenery
<b>117</b>	increased traffic on Pinewood Rd due to the expansion of Pinewood Studios makes I H F a necessary Public open space for peace and quiet
<b>118</b>	DO NOT SUPPORT
<b>119</b>	No. The infrastructure around the locality cannot support another development. The main A 412 which runs by the fields is already overcrowded with traffic. Schools, GPs and other local amenities could not cope. The Green Belt area is used for leisure purposes - leave it as it is!
<b>121</b>	The y should remain as a public open space as this keeps Iver Heath a village
<b>122</b>	RETAIN
<b>123</b>	This land to be preserved as Green Belt to maintain open Country spaces.
<b>124</b>	NO DEVELOPMENT "FIELDS" SHOULD BE THE OPERATIVE WORD.

<b>125</b>	NO. I do not support any development of Iver Heath Fields. They must be retained as a major recreational open space for the use by the people of IVER and NOT LOSE THEIR GREEN BELT STATUS . See my additional page and 7 Photos illustrating the work done by Friends of Iver Heath Fields.
<b>126</b>	I DO NOT SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT . WE NEED AN IVER RELIEF ROAD BEFORE MORE HOUSING IS BUILT.
<b>128</b>	Public open space. IVER HEATH is being spoilt by so much road traffic - we cannot cope with more development.
<b>129</b>	Retained as public open space - protect the land & environment we chose to move to.f
<b>131</b>	KEPT AS PUBLIC SPACE WE DO NOT HAVE ENOUGH SPACE
<b>134</b>	WE DO NOT SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT. WE DO NOT WANT NOISE POLLUTION OR Pollution FROM homes OR ROADS. ALSO OUR hospitALS CANNOT MANAGE EXTRA PATIENTS OR Schools.
<b>135</b>	THIS LAND MUST BE RETAINED FOR THE PEOPLE OF IVER HEATH THERE IS NOT MUCH GREEN AREA'S FOR PEOPLE TO WALK & TAKE THEIR DOGS !!
<b>136</b>	RETAIN IVER HEATH FIELDS AS A PUBLIC SPACE. ANY DEVELOPMENT WILL INCREASE TRAFFIC IN WEHAT IS ALREADY OVER CROWDED WITH TRAFFIC MOVEMENT
<b>137</b>	No I don't. Due to the bottle neck effect it will dramatically have on local traffic.
<b>139</b>	NO ! It's the only place left in Iver Heath within walking distance of the village for pleasurewalking, picnics & dog walking etc - also contains may species of Butterfly
<b>140</b>	REMAIN PUBLIC OPEN SPACE
<b>141</b>	Retained land for Public open space to Protect history + prevent congestion in a lovely area.
<b>142</b>	I wan't to retain open spaces for everyone to enjoy.
<b>143</b>	PUBLIC OPEN SPACE THERE IS LITTLE AVAILABLE - THE PARKS ARE GOOD, BUT NOT ALWAYS EASILY ACCESSIBLE.
<b>144</b>	NO OBJECTIONS TO BETTER PUBLIC USE, I DO NOT KNOW WHERE THE FIELDS ARE AND NEVER LICKELY TO USE THEM.
<b>145</b>	Difficult access onto A412 onto Pinewood Road & onto Seven Hills Road. Adding to congestion at Crooked Billet.
<b>146</b>	IVER HEATH FIELDS SHOULD BE RETAINED FOR THE MANY PEOPLE HOW USE THEM.

<b>147</b>	Iver Heath Fields should remain as public open space. It acts as a lung between housing in Iver Heath and the M25. Developing more housing or industry there will intensify the traffic problems that already exist in Iver Heath with the A412 and in the Parish of Iver generally. More residents will create more traffic as they commute to Hillingdon, Slough, Heathrow etc.
<b>148</b>	No. This is important public open space preventing the further encroachment of industrial activity into Iver and is part of the swathe of GB separating Iver from London. It is preventing further fragmentation caused by the M25 and Pinewood development. Development would isolate The Clump and the wildlife present there and on the fields whereas now there is potential for improvements to the wildlife corridors. The fields are well used by local residents and fulfil the important role of 'local green space'
<b>149</b>	RETAINED AS PUBLIC OPEN SPACE. AREA NOT SUITED TO HOUSING DUE MOTORWAY POLLUTION AND ACCESS PROBLEMS. IDEAL SITE FOR MORE & BETTER RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.
<b>151</b>	Land to be retained as public open spaces
<b>152</b>	A3. Iver Heath Fields currently provides a useful recreational area for walkers and dog owners.
<b>153</b>	WE DO NEED MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING & THE IVER HEATH FIELDS WOULD SEEM THE IDEAL AREA
<b>154</b>	The Iver Heath Fields should remain as openspace. If it were to be developed we would just have an urban sprawl.
<b>155</b>	No view either way
<b>156</b>	NO. AS IT IS USED ALL YEAR ROUND BY THE COMMUNITY FOR LEISURE. WE ARE ALL TOLD TO GET OUTSIDE AND WALK MORE
<b>157</b>	YES BOTH BUT, SOME GREEN BELT, SHOULD BE RELEASED.
<b>158</b>	No I don't support development on Iver Heath Fields as I want to see this land retained as a public open space as this land does a great public service at the moment to local residents in an area in which to exercise not only themselves but also their dogs and so encouraging activity and a sense of community.
<b>159</b>	Under no circumstances should there be development on Iver Heath Fields, they should be retained in tact.

<b>161</b>	The land should be retained as public open space. That's what makes Iver such an appealing place to live. It's not too late to preserve the essence of Iver as a village full of green space to spend with the family but I'm worried that if we start releasing land in little slices, before we know it, Iver will have lost its charm as what still feels like a traditional and historic village.
<b>165</b>	Retain as open space
<b>173</b>	3. I live in Iver Village and potentially does not impact me directly. However with 800-1000 housing units planned at Thorney Lane Business Park, surely the Ivers as a whole, would be bearing more than their fair share of the Bucks housing target. Consequently is further development, traffic, pressure on schools, healthcare, infrastructure necessary? I would imagine not. Consequently, though this doesn't impact me directly, I would not be supportive of further development if the Thorney Lane Business Park development (in the construct I have described above), gets the go ahead.
<b>178</b>	Currently don't use it as live in Iver but all green open spaces are precious if they are accessible and can be used by all for recreation not just dog walkers. I feel open spaces such as recreation grounds should be dogs on leads as have had bad experience with dogs and this puts many people off using open spaces. Plus the mess they often (owners) leave behind carries diseases. Who would want children playing football falling into that! (Iver Recreation ground is a prime example)
<b>186</b>	as a last option . Could some of the land nearest pinewood green be kept . I except we may have to give up some land
<b>189</b>	No I do not support development on Iver Heath Fields. This should be retained as an open space for the Public to use. Most of our fields are being used for non agricultural purposes - eg Airport parking or as in the case of the 'Car Wash' come illegal caravan site in Langley Park Road.
<b>191</b>	No, I absolutely do not support development of Iver Heath Fields regardless of the outcome of the greenbelt consultation. This land is the 'Heath' in Iver Heath and should be retained for public enjoyment. It is highly likely that if released it will be snapped up by Pinewood and it will be commercial premises in no time at all. This must be very strongly resisted.
<b>194</b>	Public Open Space. I think there are brownfield sites that could be used up first.

<b>200</b>	If you build on Public Spaces, this is the precursor to the Green Belt and the downfall for everyone's enjoyment, especially the children.
<b>202</b>	Remain as public open space as it can then be used for many reasons by all members of the community.
<b>204</b>	Retained as a public space. It is already used by many residents for walking and other outdoor, healthy pursuits. We need to retain this as the area is further encroached by both Heathrow and Crossrail.
<b>206</b>	Without a more specific location description I can't really comment on development of this area.
<b>210</b>	Some degree of the Iver Heath Fields should remain, but given the needs for housing in the area, this is possibly the best option. However more than just housing there needs to be additional infrastructure in terms of schools, medical centres, and shops
<b>212</b>	Retain it as open space. It's Green Belt.
<b>214</b>	I think this land should be retained, it is a very much used local facility
<b>218</b>	This is an area to be retained as it is for the benefit of future generations. The area has a greater diversity of plant and animal life than the area described above and should be protected while the land between Iver and the railwayline is more suited to development.
<b>219</b>	No because of difficulties of entrance/ exit either from and onto A412 and Seven Hills Road and Pinewood Road. All vehicles from this site will impact on the congestion of traffic at Crooked Billet roundabout. This is a very busy road over which many people cross, to local shops, medical centres and schools.
<b>222</b>	RETAINED AS AN OPEN SPACE
<b>225</b>	There is already shortage of community facilities, it should be retained with the Green Belt
<b>229</b>	No I do not support development. It is community space and is used by many people for leisure and dog walkers.
<b>231</b>	I think it should remain as green belt
<b>235</b>	Retained as open public space

<b>238</b>	I strongly believe the Iver heath Fields should be retained as public open space since the area is used and enjoyed by members of the local community and a reason why people choose to reside in the area. To eradicate such areas would impact greatly on wildlife and the communities sense of wellbeing in residing near natural areas of land. If our green belt land is sold (always for monetary gain) eventually we will have little left in the way of natural land, consequently impacting on wildlife, pollution, natural drainage etc.
<b>239</b>	It is recognised that Iver Heath Fields is an area of land defined by strong, defensible boundaries. However, the land's value as a recreational resource should be taken into account. It is not in the most sustainable location for development compared to other land such as that south of Richings Way. Land within walking distance of Iver Station should be prioritized for release from the Green Belt for development.
<b>241</b>	Keep the land retained as public open space
<b>242</b>	This precious open space in Iver Heath which can be visited on foot by most residents offers a place to walk and a place that children can play. It is a wonderful habitat for birds, wild flowers, deer, and particularly for butterflies which are under threat in so many areas.
<b>244</b>	No development, please leave this as public open space. This is used all the time by family and friends and development will change this area drastically. It is one area that makes living here a pleasure.
<b>247</b>	Public open space - such areas are perpetually under attack for development.
<b>250</b>	Retain as public open space
<b>251</b>	Some sympathetic development should be instigated in the Iver Heath Fields. This development must however be linked to improvements in all aspects of the local infrastructure - doctors, schools, roads, power, water etc. Keeping large spaces which are used by only a few people for a few hours per day is not sustainable when we require jobs and housing. These must however be targeted at the younger families in the area who have children seeking work and wish to start their own families.
<b>252</b>	I have no view on this.

<b>254</b>	No - this land represents a buffer not just between settlements but with the M25. It is a valued and much used public open space. Its removal from the greenbelt destroys the green belt between Denham, Uxbridge and Iver Heath Also, with the existing PSDF Phase 1 delivered and proposed Phase 2 PSDF development due within 2 years its importance as a wildlife corridor and habitat is increasing in significance. It may contain vestiges of ancient woodland.
<b>256</b>	This area has already been destroyed by Pinewood and the M25, We must protect the Heath in Iver Heath. Its an area used by locals for walks, jogging etc
<b>257</b>	To be retained as a public space.
<b>259</b>	No - these fields are all that are in place to stop the sprawl of Pinewood Studios meeting the M25 spreading over the entire area, These fields are open to all, and personally I walk in these fields most days, along with many other dog owners, these fields offer a place of peace and quiet, and once that goes it can never be replaced.
<b>260</b>	Do not support - there is very little open space here
<b>262</b>	As long as the developments were aimed towards more affluent people, it wouldn't affect the feel of the area. We already have Langley Park and Black Park nearby.
<b>265</b>	Retain as public open space as the existence of such places enhances residents' quality of life and is one of the main reasons why many people live here.
<b>266</b>	We moved to this area because of the Green belt and the pleasant walks and wildlife not more buildings
<b>267</b>	We do not really use the Fields.
<b>268</b>	My preliminary answer is that the land should be retained as a public open space within the Green Belt. However, that is my default position - I currently lack sufficient data to have a more informed view.

<b>270</b>	<p>No. Monies should be provided by South Bucks Council to potect and provide facilities to support the use of Iver Fields. It needs to be better maintained to ensure it is fully accessible i.e. better pedestrian access from Church Road Iver Heath. If the Council allow it's release from the Green Belt then it must ensure that enough monies can be obtained to solve the existing issues in Iver Heath which would be exasperated by any further development. As set out above; that is (inter alia): 1) Highways and Transport - the number so cars / HGV's on the road are (what it is perceived as a pedestrian/cyclist) at dangerous levels most of the roads in Iver and Iver Health are severely congested and (outside the rush hours when vehicles are at a standstill) used as rat runs with vehicles clearly exceeding the speed limits in force to get to the M25/M40. 2) Public Transport - e.g. a regular bus service to take local residents from Iver Heath / Iver to Iver station? As well as improving links to Uxbridge with a service that is more regular and does not stop at 8PM in the evening (e.g. the number 3 from Uxbridge to Iver Heath) making almost impossible to commute into London without a car. Extension of the shuttle bus from Pinewood Studios to include an additional bus stop / pick up point at the Co-op at Iver Health</p>
<b>274</b>	<p>I wish to see this Iver Heath Fields retained as public open space as I and others use it frequently.</p>
<b>275</b>	<p>No. It should be kept as open open spave because its greenbelt.</p>

<b>276</b>	I vehemently oppose the development of Iver Heath Fields. This is a place where my children have explored far more natural wildlife, vegetation than anywhere can offer - even with Black Park and Langley Park close by it is the easiest way to get out and exercise and ensure we continue to stay fit and not obese and a drain on the health service. If the only place I could exercise my dog was the Recreation Ground then I think I'd have to shoot it, or me, or both of us, populated as it is by youngsters taking drugs and littering the ground, or on occasion by loud mouthed, swearing amateur football players (and boy, are they amateur). In addition, the development of Iver Heath Fields would strain (as already stated) the local services and utilities and highways beyond their capacity to cope. If anyone took time to try and drive along Church Road, even outside rush hour, it would be clear that soon it will become gridlocked, adding to the already intolerable level of pollution, which of course Iver Heath Fields helps to combat.
<b>278</b>	I do not support development on Iver Heath Fields; this land should be retained as a public open space within the Green Belt. The local area will not be able support an increase of this kind. We simply do not have the infrastructure.
<b>280</b>	Depends on the development, I am against any new commercial or industrial use in and around Iver.
<b>281</b>	I think it should remain public open space because it is used and a valuable asset.
<b>285</b>	No. It is the best example of what Green Belt is for. It is the last piece of original heathland and the amount of Green Belt given up to Pinewood in this particular area is sufficient. It is a well used green space which should be retained for the pleasure & well being of local residents.
<b>287</b>	If this area is to be developed this should take the form of an access road from the A412 leading to Pinewood Studios so as to take pressure off Church Road
<b>288</b>	I would like to see this land retained, mainly because of the pints highlighted earlier - More litter being dropped in streets via passing traffic - More traffic using pinewood green as a rat run - More traffic in general in Iver heath. Five points is main congestion point - Noise pollution generated by additional traffic and also carbon emission increase - By allowing more development on green belt land, this will effectively increase the sprawl of greater London into the home counties

<b>289</b>	Yes I never see that many people over there and other sites are more used.
<b>291</b>	Retained as a public open space, for the reasons I have said, we do not need urban sprawl! The 'Ivers' are a group of villages and should remain so! Filling up large greenbelt spaces with houses will change the aesthetics/ appearance of the area. Furthermore there is no secondary school in Iver and so why increase the population when the infrastructure cannot cope as it is.
<b>292</b>	We are already a heavily populated neighbourhood. We need green space. Otherwise we will become urban, part of greater London. This is a change of nature of the area, which I do not believe people who chose to live here want. The local facilities are already stretched, whether the railway (parking especially), the dentist, clinic, the roads. Any increase in planned population needs to have concurrent improvement for the environment and facilities fully budgeted.
<b>293</b>	I have no preference, as long as total infrastructure is taken into account.
<b>300</b>	Keep as public open space so we can enjoy some countryside - walking dogs, showing our children wild plants etc
<b>301</b>	Do not support development but would like to see it retained as public open space. There is already a lot of construction work been going on in the area by Pinewood Studios. This area is 'free' for the public to use. The area is being used more by people with dogs, football, flying model aircraft. Some of these things aren't possible in areas like Black Park or Langley Park. A lot of wildlife use Iver Heath Fields. These are more 'natural' areas than the other surrounding parks.
<b>306</b>	No I do not support development on this site, this is a lovely open space for people to walk their dogs or take their family out for some healthy exercise.
<b>307</b>	No I think it should remain green belt
<b>308</b>	NO. the land should be retained as public open space. Strong protection for the Green Belt is important as it promotes urban regeneration and keeps housing and business close to services and transport links. In addition, large numbers of people use the Green Belt every day, often for activities as simple as enjoying an open view or walking the dog. Greenbelt needs to be protected.
<b>311</b>	should be kept for recreational purposes for iver residents . I do NOT support building on this land for any reason

<b>316</b>	No I do not want to see development in iver Heath fields as such a large amount of green belt land in iver Heath was given over to Pinewood and the vast development of new studios there has not seemed to be the right use of green belt land.
<b>317</b>	No I do not support development on Iver Heath. We need green spaces. As mentioned in my early answer. Development will not help with already congested roads. In Iver we have a major challenge with HGV. New homes will compound traffic and HGV coming into the area.
<b>318</b>	No, I do not support development on Iver Heath Fields. This land must remain undeveloped green public space for the benefit of this community, its residents and visitors.
<b>319</b>	Retain as open land, the integrity of the green belt should not be destroyed by a thousand cuts.
<b>320</b>	Iver Heath Fields should be retained as public open space to ensure the health of the residents in the local area.
<b>323</b>	I do want to see this land retained as a public open space within the Green Belt.
<b>324</b>	This land should be retained as open spaces as it contributes to the well being of the community. The trees and vegetation clean the air and the space encourages people to exercise.
<b>326</b>	No, there are few community facilities in the area, it should be retained within the Green Belt
<b>328</b>	Only if secondary school not residential
<b>329</b>	No development on Iver Heath Fields. Iver Heath Fields is an unspoilt beauty spot where adults and children can get the exercise they need by enjoying nature and the countryside without risk of being mown down by cycles or segways.
<b>330</b>	I would like it to remain green belt. The roads and services can't support more people
<b>331</b>	I DO NOT SUPPORT THIS DEVELOPMENT. RESIDENTS IN THIS AREA BOUGHT THEIR HOMES BECAUSE OF THE GREEN BELT.
<b>333</b>	No development. This land should be kept as it is. Developed would result in an increase of private vehicles. The present amount of vehicles in the Iver Heath area is more than enough.
<b>334</b>	This land should be retained as public open space. The Ivers open spaces should be kept for the people of the Parish to use, where will locals go if these spaces are reduced by development.

<b>337</b>	No This will increase traffic locally which seems to be on an increase at present coming from a resident . Its land is ideal for dog walkers and leisure usage for the community.
<b>338</b>	No as this land is used for various activities for the Iver Heath community.
<b>340</b>	No as this is used for various things including walking dogs and is used by the surrounding local community
<b>343</b>	The land at the Iver Heath fields should only be considered for development after the land West of Iver Heath between the A4007 and Pinewood Road. The land West of Iver Heath is best placed to help meet housing need and represents a logical extension to Iver Heath.
<b>344</b>	NO, the village has already been blighted by the Pinewood development. We must keep the Iver Heath fields as public open spaces for recreational use. Many people use the fields for walks, and children and animals and there are many people who are not Iver Heath residents that come and enjoy the fields.
<b>347</b>	See above
<b>351</b>	No. The fields are well used by locals and also people from surrounding areas. There is a thriving dog club using the cut area which is maintained by the Friends of Iver Heath together with cutting the pathways. There are also goalposts to allow children to play football. (These I believe have been provided by a local resident). Although many people walk their dogs many also love walking the cut paths just for their own pleasure. In the summer months, weather permitting barbaque's are sometimes held. Black Berry's and Slows are also harvested when in season which would be a great loss. The habitat is great for wild life, walking my dog I have seen deer, rabbits, sky larks, kestrels, red kites, buzzards, green woodpeckers, swallows, nut hatches, blackbirds, thrushes, herons, blue tits, great tits and many others. It would be a sad loss to loose this area to development.
<b>353</b>	It should remain as public open space. There is too much development causing overcrowding of public services including roads.
<b>355</b>	We need to retain as much of the green belt as possible for the health and general wellbeing of the local community
<b>356</b>	NO. This land is already an amenity space and is valuble to flora and forna,there are other options to use green belt that do not have such value.

357	Retain as a public open space. I campaigned for its purchase years back to protect from development. And have in the past planted trees and helped maintain them.
358	Leave this as a public open space. the infrastructure in and around the area would not be able to accommodate the increased number of households.
361	I find this option hyprictical - local authroities objected to Pinewood development on a scrubby field of low athestic value, yet the South Bucks Council owned land that is far more use to the community as an pleasant and green open space, and is far more athesticly pleasing - it now wants to develop it? Plus, if this was proposed it should ahve been done at the same time as Pinewood, so the whole infrustructure and roads could have been dealt with at the the same planning stage - but we know why not - as it was objecting to Pinewood expansion. Shame on you all. Developing this land will cause additional traffic and conjection. Not exceptable. There are better areas of green belt that could be released of lower value and if used could benefit the whole community. What ebenfit will this have - more traffic - but anything else, releif road, doctors, school - what? But, money in SBDC pocket - still shame on you again.
366	No retain for public open space
367	I do not support the development of Iver Heath Fields. It must remain as public open space. It is well used locally and offers a more natural leisure area than the manicured green public areas such as the 'rec' in Iver Heath. One of the issues with modern living is that there is little 'space' accessible to the public; in Iver Heath Fields, although well used, there is opportunity for walking safely, away from the traffic, the space provides a home for wildlife, areas where children can be children and gain some life skills from experience e.g. setting up camp and climbing trees (although this is limited) in a relatively safe environment
368	No. Retained as public open space. A local open space reached within walking distance. Not having to drive to Black or Langley Parks.nDevelopment will ruin the area, the natural habitats and increase the traffic and noise.
369	No. - traffic is already bad enough with insufficient local amenities

<b>370</b>	Absolutely not! This area is used extensively as an open space for local residents, it has an important range of wildlife, it is part of a wildlife corridor along the M25 and the site of ancient woodland. Development would exacerbate the serious traffic problems experienced in Iver Heath and, in any event, the air quality issues associated with the adjacent M25 make it inappropriate for development.
<b>372</b>	This should be left as land for public open space as there isn't much around and do know of people who use this field. Leave the fields, countryside and wildlife alone. These fields are more used and needed than you think.
<b>373</b>	Retained as green belt land. But we've already lost three fields to developments. And turned into brown space land with the view to develop houses. You sell outs must think we're stupid. Wildlife is being effected. Fields are badly neglected for years. Unless complaints are made.
<b>374</b>	No, because it's too far away from the railway station, therefore along with the proposed closure of hollow hill lane, traffic through Iver would be too great pushing pollution into illegal levels.
<b>375</b>	I feel the land should be retained for public open space, this is our preference.
<b>376</b>	This land should be retained as green belt and open public place. I also think that more can be done to bring locals to this great open space. Iver
<b>378</b>	Not in Iver Heath so don't know
<b>385</b>	Leave it alone
<b>387</b>	I do not support this. Iver Heath wouldn't be Iver Heath then.
<b>388</b>	Remain a public green belt space We moved to Iver due to the natural landscape and the small close-knit communities. Adding further development would begin crowding the area thus increasing crime and need for policing.
<b>389</b>	No development
<b>392</b>	I would want public open space as you have pinewood studios that can use that space for filming. Also the locals use to take their children if any development use to make park for families.
<b>393</b>	NO, I DO NOT SUPPORT ANY DEVELOPMENT OF IVER HEATH FIELDS, I WOULD RATHER SEE DEVELOPMENT OF PALMERS MOOR FARM AREA, BUT ACCESS WOULD BE A PROBLEM.

<b>396</b>	I would like to see it retained unless it supports anyone of the following: 1. Commuter parking in Richings Park 2. A relief road for HGVs 3. Avoid SBC ingressing on our community i.e. if we don't develop there, they will.
<b>398</b>	No I do not support any development on Iver Heath Fields. This is the last remaining "original " land which is generally open to the public (no fees). It is all of the heath areas that the area is named after. Further, it would be a significant eroding of the green belt at a critical geographic location - this area provides an air filter from the M25 and m 40. Finally the immediate area could not accommodate further traffic
<b>400</b>	No firm opinion but green belt land should be maintained unless there is benefit to the existing community.
<b>402</b>	Iver Heath Fields is greenbelt and an area used by the residents as an area to walk and relax. See answer to question 1
<b>407</b>	I am not very familiar with this part of the Parish and defer to residents who live closer.
<b>415</b>	Retained as public space
<b>416</b>	Although I am unfamiliar with Iver Heath Fields, as a public open space, many local residents would probably not wish to see it disappear. Hence, the suggestion that in some circumstances, it may be viable to lift green belt restrictions and encourage private development.
<b>429</b>	Open space - there is enough traffic and congestion in Iver already
<b>431</b>	I do not support development of on Iver Heath Fields. I use Iver Heath Fields regularly for walking the dogs and general exercise. Knowing the fields well, the only way I would ever consider any development acceptable is if it was on the one field nearest the A412 and a Section 106 agreement ensured additional trees and shrubs were planted in the area, with the remaining Iver Heath Fields properly maintained in a natural and litter-free state.
<b>433</b>	Oppose development Need green space
<b>434</b>	I don't support
<b>435</b>	This land should be retained as public open space. Allowing development will be the tip of the iceberg and before you know it the Ivers will be a concrete jungle with no soul and a thoroughly depressing place to live.

<b>436</b>	I do not mind building on already built on areas as we will get new development. But unbuilt on land specifically green belt needs to be protected. We are already seeing a lot of new development happening around Iver and it's drastically increased congestion and noise pollution.
<b>438</b>	Retained as public open space
<b>440</b>	I want it retained as public open space as it allows the local people to enjoy it. It is good for their wellbeing and health
<b>443</b>	I suppose a little area could be developed but needs to keep plenty of space for community
<b>446</b>	Q3 No I do not support any development in ALL the Iver Heath Fields. (see later questions) doing so would leave a lot of residents and their children with nowhere to walk / play / study north of the A412. Some noise from the M25 is obvious to existing residents even the ones buffered by the fields. To build and live in developments even closer to the M25 would be VERY noisy and stressful and residents would be subject to vehicle pollution. I am amazed by the number of people who use the fields and especially YOUNG people this must contribute to their health and be less of a burden on the NHS (Government evidence exists that supports this) <a href="http://www.nhs.uk/Livewell/getting-started-guides/Pages/getting-started-walking.aspx">http://www.nhs.uk/Livewell/getting-started-guides/Pages/getting-started-walking.aspx</a>
<b>448</b>	I do not support development on Iver Heath Fields because the open area is essential for the local community for dog walks, play area and as an open space, general wellbeing. The other options would be Black Park, Langley Park which are a car drive away. Many of the other open spaces in the area are not open to the public.
<b>451</b>	I want to see this land retained as public space within the green belt for the enjoyment of future generations. This is one of the outstanding features of this area and is what makes it special.
<b>453</b>	Public open space as this is what is special, appealing and attractive about Iver.
<b>455</b>	My preference would be for it to be retained as it adds to the area's natural beauty. Slough, Uxbridge and Hayes are either side of the area and they are very built up. If we don't preserve the Iver area, we will end up with no areas of natural beauty left.
<b>457</b>	As we would lose our open spaces one by one if we allow this to be developed.

<b>458</b>	Would like land retained as open space. The beauty of the area is the open space by developing on it and building ...will ruin area. Any developments that are made should definately be in line with current surroundings.. No multi tenanted accomodation.
<b>459</b>	This should be retained as public open space since these are few and far between.
<b>460</b>	No. I would like to see Iver Heath Fields retained as public open space. There are too few green areas in our local area as it is without another one being developed.
<b>463</b>	No preference
<b>464</b>	In theory I support development of this site however I do not feel the current road infrastructure, A412, could handle the extra traffic from such a development. Already traffic regularly backs up on this road.
<b>465</b>	I don't know the area well enough to comment on this
<b>466</b>	No, because this area is already developed enough
<b>467</b>	Public open place
<b>468</b>	Iver Heath Fields must remain in the green belt to offer it protection against future development.
<b>469</b>	Kids need a place to play that is within walking distance – I'm sure as grown adults you recall the importance of this from when you were young... it is the same today, even more so with communities becoming more dis-engaged... the long-term social effects of which we will live to regret.
<b>471</b>	This land should be retained as public open space. See points made in question 1 above.
<b>472</b>	If the land has very little public use at present it could be a potential development site.
<b>477</b>	No. It should be retained as open space.
<b>478</b>	It would be nice to retain this space.
<b>479</b>	yes
<b>480</b>	Don't mind
<b>482</b>	As before
<b>483</b>	Open space
<b>485</b>	It's important to have public green space for all the families to use and given the diverse nature of the community it's a place where residents can mix
<b>486</b>	Only if there will be benefit to the community and residents I.e a park or a school.

<b>488</b>	This is a heavily weighted question ! It should not be an either or question but rather what type of development could be acceptable i.e. some affordable housing at the south end; some mixed use north end but with 75% of land area retained as Public Open Space. As Q2 process should Development Brief lead
<b>489</b>	Retained as public open space as this is the nice thing about Iver that there is open space and it feels like the countryside.
<b>490</b>	No, this is Green belt land
<b>491</b>	Whilst, the Iver Heath Fields isn't in close proximity to Richings Park Village - there needs to be serious consideration of what the fields provide for the residents and families.. Therefore, the land should be retained as public open space within the green belt. Some rationale, listed below: It offers pet owners a place to exercise their pets It provides the elder community a place to exercise, walk and network It provides children with a safe place to play Its in close proximity to residents, so they can walk, rather than drive to their destination
<b>498</b>	I do not support development on ant Green Belt. I do not understand the rationale when there are large areas within Buckinghamshire and the surrounding areas that are crying out for regeneration. It feels like the easy/cheap option rather than the best option for the long term benefit of the community and environment.
<b>500</b>	Retain as open space we have to draw the line somewhere
<b>503</b>	No Iver Heath Fields should remain open space the village cannot cope with more people and traffic
<b>504</b>	do not support. Keep it for the children
<b>506</b>	Retained as open space - area regularly used by local residents
<b>508</b>	Remain greenbelt, wildlife, open space to enjoy, traffic
<b>510</b>	No - the roads around simply could not support the extra traffic they are already congested as result of Pinewoods expansion
<b>511</b>	Retained as public open space
<b>512</b>	No - it provides a green space between Iver Heath and the M25 and Greater London - why we live here
<b>513</b>	This area should remain Green Belt - more building will contribute towards a more congested area traffic wise
<b>514</b>	Yes to be retained Nice area for walks
<b>515</b>	no keep as open space Green Belt
<b>516</b>	No Iver heath Fields should be kept as an open space and kept within the green belt

<b>517</b>	Absolutely no - this is an important local authority to Iver Heath resident
<b>518</b>	No leave it as Green Belt
<b>520</b>	This is a good open space people to walk and exercise their dogs. People of Iver Heath can access it on foot.
<b>521</b>	No. If it were possible to keep development under control, however once it has taken a foothold, I believe to retain our green would be increasingly impossible.
<b>523</b>	Yes - currently non-utilised land.
<b>524</b>	Public open space
<b>525</b>	Retain as 'green belt' land as it is Iver Heath land heritage.
<b>526</b>	No, retain as we moved here for the green areas like Iver Heath Fields.
<b>527</b>	Retain as public open space. Should use brownfield sites only. Green belt should be protected to keep a good level of natural green space for locals.
<b>530</b>	To stay Green Belt - we use it daily to walk our dog and enjoy the open space and woodland and see the deer
<b>531</b>	No. I do not support development on Iver Heath Fields, It needs to be retained as public open space. My reasons are that: 1. We already live in a highly trafficked area and the pollution from these vehicles is reduced by absorption from grasses and trees and it also provides a vital area for recreation and a sense of wellbeing. 2. This is the last 'vestige' of 'heath' in Iver Heath that has been unsullied since Edward III's day when he used to use it for hawking and hunting purposes when he stayed in the nearby village of Iver. I have personally inspected these areas of the 'heath' and I have found many, many species of grasses, wild flowers, fungi and trees that have lived undisturbed for at least 400 years.
<b>533</b>	No development. Retain green belt. Protection of wildlife and leisure walks and dog walking. Traffic on A412 too congested now. Any development would mean more traffic chaos and surrounding roads congestion. Roads would not cope.
<b>534</b>	RETAINED WE NEED TO PROTECT THE OPEN SPACES FOR WILDLIFE, SUSTAINABILITY, FLOODING ETC ETC
<b>535</b>	I do not support the development of IHF. If we start chipping away at the Green Belt there will be none left in 50 years time
<b>536</b>	Retained as public open space to protect flora, fauna and benefit the local environment for Iver residents to enjoy
<b>537</b>	Do not support development on any Green belt land as it is important to have green space between built-up areas

538	to remain as is. Development will seriously alter the character of the village
539	Absolutely not. I personally use the fields so do my children each week. Many others use the fields, its the reason I moved to Iver Heath
540	No development, retain as public open space within the green belt. The Ivers must keep the village, rural community
541	My reason for moving to Iver was its green spaces and parks
543	No do not support development Green belt should be just that, there for a reason.
544	Retained Insufficient free open walking space in the parish Green belt is at its narrowest in this area already.
545	Retained as Green Belt. Not enough "green" area in Iver Heath for Children & wild life to enjoy.
547	NO Not at any cost. Loss of 100 ACRES for Pinewood Studios Development has impacted very badly for the Area with increase of traffic.
548	Kept as public open space
553	Answer Iver Heath Fields should remain as a public open space. The local community needs somewhere to walk, meet, exercise and for dogs
554	A small amount so as to keep a happy balance
556	Retained. It is a more natural and wilder open space, special for wildlife, butterfly species etc
557	The areas must be retained as open space. It is well used. Building on Green Belt will set a precedent
559	No see Q!
560	Answer No, land retained as public space within the green belt. CLIMATE CHANGE!
561	Answer No. Iver Heath Fields should be retained as public open space and kept within the green belt
562	Answer Public open space retained. Too many residents oppose this proposal
563	Answer Keep fields as it is Green Belt
564	Answer Retained as public open space
567	Answer Green Belt means Green Belt, leave alone
568	Answer Please retain as open space
569	Answer Left as public spaces as kids need somewhere to play
570	Answer Must be retained as a public open space within Green Belt
572	Answer No. I use the fields 2 - 3 times a week for walking and running
573	Answer No. The Iver Heath Fields should be sacrosanct. Because it is likely to be a corrupt and non socially sensitive development

<b>574</b>	Answer Remain Green Belt. Iver/Iver Heath has an acute traffic problem. More houses will bring more traffic
<b>575</b>	Answer Retained. Area is already congested
<b>576</b>	Answer No. Retain Iver Heath Fields as public open space within green belt to deliniate Iver and Iver Heath as separate communities
<b>577</b>	Answer Should be retained as public open space within Green Belt
<b>579</b>	Answer No, as I feel there is still some need for recreational areas
<b>580</b>	Land retained as public open space. Building should only take place on brown field sites for the long term protection of the environment and a healthy life.
<b>584</b>	No. Keep as open space. Too many houses
<b>585</b>	Both. Play area for public and some housing, secondary school