

RESERVE SITES INFRASTRUCTURE ROUNDTABLE

Meeting Notes

Meeting Title:	Infrastructure Roundtable		
Date:	7 July 2015, 7.00pm		
Location	Committee Room 3, WDC		
Chaired By	Cllr David Johncock		
Present:	<p>See Membership List as modified by apologies</p> <p>John Rippon head of Growth & Development Bucks County Council (JR)</p> <p>Richard Smith, Technical Director Jacobs (RS)</p> <p>Cllr David Johncock – WDC Cabinet Member for Planning</p> <p>John Callaghan, WDC Acting Deputy</p> <p>Robert Harrison, WDC Acting Deputy.</p> <p>Charles Power, WDC Acting Deputy</p> <p>John O'Brien Pimms Action</p>		
Apologies	<p>Tony Garner (Gomm Valley and Ashwells Liaison Group)</p> <p>Sue Wagner (Slate Meadow Liaison Group)</p> <p>Simon Kearey (Terriers Farm Liaison Group)</p> <p>Cllr Katrina Wood</p> <p>Cllr Val Letheren</p> <p>Cllr Julia Wassell</p>		
Points of Agreement/Actions	Notes	Action	Completed
1. Introduction	Cllr Johncock opened the meeting and explained that he would be chairing as Cllr Marshall was on holiday	None	
2. Minutes of the Last Meeting	The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed	None	
3. Actions from the Last Meeting.	<p>Re the response from the BCC Education team:</p> <p>The number of children at schools, does not include St Michael's and number from out of area, was not part of the question but can be added.</p> <p>There appears to be a disconnect</p>	<p>Request figures from BCC.</p> <p>Noted by JR</p>	

	<p>between education and highways with regard to pick up and drop off for schools (Q9)</p> <p>The question regarding consultation about footpath access to St Michael's School was to be taken up outside the meeting.</p>		
<p>4. Presentation by Richard Smith, Jacobs on emerging High Wycombe Transport Package</p>	<p>Richard Smith provided the presentation which was followed by a Q&A session.</p> <p>It was agreed that the presentation would be e-mailed to the infrastructure group members. However, because this is just initial thinking and does not constitute firm proposals, circulation would be restricted to Liaison Groups members only. This was not made clear in the meeting and so an additional explanatory slide has been inserted which summarises the verbal introduction given to the group.</p> <p>Members are asked to respect that this is not a public document and is only for comment and feedback by the Liaison Groups.</p> <p>The following questions arose:</p> <p>Q. Why is there not more detailed information about the particular reserve sites eg traffic impact studies?</p> <p>A. Because this is a strategic review of the network into which the reserve sites have been factored. It is the developers job to undertake local impact studies for the development they propose on the individual sites.</p> <p>Q. Why does this not include the</p>	<p>CP/JC</p> <p>All</p>	

	<p>M40 Junctions ?</p> <p>A. Because that is the responsibility of Highways England (HE). However, there is momentum behind a road improvement strategy and studies are liable to lead to changes. The LEP are involved in discussions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HE brief to assess M40 J6 to 2 and connectivity to the wider network. - A404 access to HC hub and Westhorpe interchange and Bisham roundabout - SW strategic assessment and Heathrow third runway implications. <p>Q. Is there a way of stopping development if access to sites is through a serious constraint?</p> <p>A. There have been discussions with highways and Development Management at WDC to consider access points, but Jacobs only present pros and cons of these, it is up to the developer to prove that the access points work.</p> <p>Q. If works are proposed to improve the flow of the London Road and changes are proposed to bus lanes, why does the Council not consider the use of Flow Lanes rather than the current bus lane?</p> <p>A. This has not been considered but could be.</p> <p>Q. Where were the proposed housing numbers taken from as ABS numbers are likely to be higher than shown?</p> <p>A. The numbers were taken from the initial work done by WDC on the release of the sites. However, there are no fixed numbers for any site as yet.</p> <p>Q. What is the position regarding</p>	<p>RS/JR</p>	
--	--	--------------	--

	<p>the possible link from the school to the Hub ? Is that on hold ? A BCC have decided that the current preferred option is the route adjacent to the motorway. Feasibility work is required from BCC to test this option.</p> <p>Abbey Barn</p> <p>Q. Why does the presentation not mention the traffic numbers on Heath End Road and Daws Hill Lane, or Flackwell Heath, Sheepridge Lane? A. These have been modelled and BCC do have the numbers but the thrust of the high level strategy is to ease congestion on the primary network so as to lessen the need/desire to use the secondary routes.</p> <p>Q. Will ABS become a rat run ? A. ABS will not be a through route (except possibly for public transport)</p> <p>Q. What do you propose to do about Winchbottom Lane? A Keep it as a Lane and don't tie it into any junction improvements to Abbey Barn Lane. No proposals to improve or widen it.</p> <p>Q. Why do we not consider the widening of Winchbottom Lane and model the effects ? A. This could be done.</p> <p>Gomm Valley</p> <p>There was a general discussion based around the possibility of turning Cock Lane into a two way road.</p> <p>Q. Will the bridge at the bottom of Cock Lane be widened if the lane is two way? A. Possibly but it would not</p>	<p>RS</p>	
--	--	-----------	--

	<p>necessarily be done at the same time.</p> <p>Q. Would that not just move the queue to the bridge? A. Possibly but this can be assessed as part of any transport package.</p> <p>Q..There is a path next to Cock Lane that could be used by pedestrians and cyclists, has this been considered? A. No detailed consideration of how the lane might be widened has taken place.</p> <p>Q Is it likely that people living in the development will actually work in Wycombe and be more likely that they will have to commute ? So should WDC and BCC look to revive the Bourne End Rail Link ? A. WDC have done everything they can to protect the link unfortunately we have not managed to win all the appeals against our refusal of development on the route and it is therefore uncertain that the route will ever be developed as a public transport link.</p> <p>Q. Why can we not have a rail stop at loudwater? A. That would be a matter for the service provider</p> <p>Ashwells</p> <p>Q why has Ashwells been suggested as the preferable access point to the Ashwells development area, How has Jacobs assessed the points. A. No detailed assessment has been undertaken that would be the job of the developer. However, Ashwells road looks like the easiest from a highways</p>	RS	
--	--	----	--

	<p>perspective as the other potential accesses are restricted.</p> <p>Terriers</p> <p>Discussion about the provision of a crossing/traffic calming on Amersham Road, this was to be continued outside the meeting.</p> <p>Slate Meadow</p> <p>Concern that SM was not considered in the earlier infrastructure workshop and therefore TFB did not have feedback from the local community to feed into their work.</p> <p>Concern that design features on Cores End road would not do anything to assist in vehicles exiting Frank Lunnon Close</p> <p>Q. Has modelling and traffic analysis been done for the Bourne End/Wooburn Area? A. Yes the Technical Report will include traffic analysis for that area.</p> <p>Q. Bourne End is used as a cut through to get to the Bisham roundabout, The works proposed there will not in the opinion of people in BE help to resolve congestion at that roundabout. Can TFB please lobby to have these 'improvements' reconsidered? A. TFB are in discussions with HE about this and a number of other strategic matters.</p> <p>Q. Can TFB please come to a Slate Meadow Liaison Group Meeting to discuss the work they have done with regard to Cores End Road and the Wooburn Bourne End area in general?</p>	<p>JR/BS</p> <p>CDP to look into the extent of this.</p> <p>JR</p> <p>CDP to</p>	
--	---	--	--

	<p>A. Yes this can be arranged</p> <p>General questions</p> <p>Q. Can the traffic light sequencing be looked at on Kingsmead park to prevent the queues backing up into the retail park at weekends. A. Yes this can be looked at</p> <p>Q. What is the difference between SCOOT and MOVER types of traffic control? A. SCOOT links junctions to work in sequence while MOVER only deals with traffic at a single junction</p> <p>Q. Has the potential for HS2 waste lorries coming from Handycross and through Cressex been taken into consideration when working out these traffic numbers. A. No but WDC are challenging the route and it is not therefore currently part of the plan</p>	<p>organise – potentially attending 7/9 SM Liaison Group tbc</p> <p>JC/RS/JR</p>	
<p>5. Any Other Business and date of next meeting</p>	<p>Next meeting – Health, Open Spaces– TBA.</p>		

Agreed Membership List	
Cllr Katrina Wood	Bucks County Council
Cllr Julia Wassell	Bucks County Council
Cllr Val Letheren	Bucks County Council
Cllr Lesley Clarke	Bucks County Council
Cllr Mike Appleyard	Bucks County Council
Cllr David Shakespeare	Bucks County Council
Nigel Phillips	High Wycombe Society
Mike Chadwick	Chiltern Society
Phil Hooper	Gomm Valley & Ashwells Liaison Group
Tony Garner	Gomm Valley & Ashwells Liaison Group
Liz Johncock	Abbey Barn Liaison Group
Stuart Armstrong	Abbey Barn Liaison Group
Brian Swain	Terriers Farm Liaison Group
Simon Kearey	Terriers Farm Liaison Group
Simon Fowke	Slate Meadow Liaison Group
Sue Wagner	Slate Meadow Liaison Group