

## TERRIERS FARM LIAISON GROUP MEETING

### 08.10.15 Minutes

#### Present:

Matt Knight (Chairman)  
Tony Green (WDC)  
Ian Guy (Widmer End Residents Association)  
Sara Perry (Hazlemere Rights of Way)  
Andrew Cole (High Wycombe Society)  
Debby White (Chiltern Society)  
John Bland  
Paula Day (Kingshill Grange)  
Catherine Oliver (WDC)  
Hugh McCarthy (WDC)  
Anthony Wright (East of Amersham Hill Residents Association)

#### Officers

Charles Power (WDC)  
Sarah Oborn (WDC)  
Chris Schmidt-Reid (WDC)

#### Apologies:

David Wainman (Hazlemere)  
Brian Swain (Hughenden Parish Council)  
Richard Atkinson (Brands Hill Residents Association)  
Phillip Anderson

	Item	Notes	Action
1	Introductions		
2	Minutes of the last meeting	The minutes were agreed.  Email circulation list is not reaching everyone, updated circulation list to be prepared  Richard Atkinson emailed Cllr Green on WDC policy regarding care homes and sought comments from Officers rather than disagreeing with the content of the minutes.	CSR  noted
3	Request for membership from the developers	Clarified that this issue had been discussed at first meeting.	

	Item	Notes	Action
		<p>Proposed to invite to attend part of meeting regularly from the beginning allowing time at the end to discuss items when they are not present.</p> <p>Purpose of their attendance is to receive feedback from group to inform development brief, be aware of discussions and answer points that are raised.</p> <p>Important to ensure there is a confidential minute/record if necessary.</p>	<p>CP to communicate with developers</p>
4	<p>Update on the Development Brief process (including questions on the access points to this development, the impact be on current traffic flow? How many dwellings are proposed? What is the mix? Any facilities for shops etc? Any facilities for recreational building e.g. meeting place?)</p>	<p>Query raised in relation to how much influence the brief will have when a planning application is made</p> <p>CP gave presentation on development briefs</p> <p>SO provided an update on progress of brief</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• skeleton of brief agreed, boundaries agreed,</li> <li>• baseline studies now being provided</li> <li>• list on website,</li> <li>• also supplied to appropriate specialists to assess</li> </ul> <p>WDC assessing to Identify important issues to be considered, any conflicts and mitigation. Based on SWOT analysis by WDC officers.</p> <p>Developer slightly behind on timetable, draft should be available by next meeting.</p> <p>Feedback sought at next meeting on draft brief and technical reports</p> <p>CP flagged up the responsibilities of LG members and not having wider public discussions at this stage, while still looking to feed into the process.</p> <p>Q1. will first brief include housing numbers? A. no – main constraints and opportunities.</p> <p>Q2. will it include access points? A. where it meets public realm connections will be considered. Vehicle access problematic, still awaiting HW transport report, req'd to inform impact of access options on network. Due in November</p>	

	Item	Notes	Action
		<p>Q3. does the report consider peak traffic flows? A. yes.</p> <p>Q4. will Jacobs Report include access options? A. not specifically but looks at the impact of the site on the wider network.</p> <p>CP clarified report is a WDC/BCC report not one produced by developers, delay result of seeking political agreement.</p> <p>Q5. is an access through woodland opposite AXA as this was ruled out in the previous planning application on the site A. not ruled in or out, the brief needs to consider all options for access to the site.</p> <p>CP clarified brief dealing with site, not all land within developer control, so just because the reports cover this area that does not mean the developers are looking to have an access there.</p> <p>Issues and positions from previous planning applications not necessarily being maintained – brief aims to start afresh in considering site and in the context of current planning policy framework</p> <p>Requested that LG members send questions/comments to consider at next mtg.</p>	
5	<p>Discussion about</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the need for housing for older people</li> <li>• land for sports and recreation</li> <li>• schooling</li> <li>• The historical context of the 'three fields'</li> </ul>	<p><b>Need for housing for older people</b></p> <p>Aging population around site triggers consideration of providing opportunities for downsizing</p> <p>Agreed that this should form part of the housing offer on the site</p> <p>CP identified that based on HEDNA figures existing commitments meet forecast need</p> <p>It was suggested that local market research is required to justify housing to meet downsizing requirements</p> <p><b>Three Fields</b></p>	

	Item	Notes	Action
		<p>Three fields report concludes not part of a three field system - see land use report attached to the agenda,</p> <p>CP clarified that developers commissioned report, Martin Andrew generally agrees with findings</p> <p>Concern raised about the role these fields play in preserving a gap between Terriers and Hazlemere. Also the desire to retain these for sports and recreation.</p> <p>CDP pointed out that we cannot pre-judge the development brief, that there is a need for S&amp;R and the Brief will look at where best to put this.</p>	<p>Agreed to discuss at next meeting</p> <p>CP will circulate MA comments – report is on website for members to read.</p>
6	Feedback from representatives on the Infrastructure Round Table	<p>NTR</p> <p>Concern voiced about level of detail fed back to group</p> <p>Suggested to add onto agenda and that a more comprehensive set of notes from the infrastructure meetings be available to all</p>	CP
7	Any other business	Addition to terms of reference, to be circulated for consideration, suggests a clause that there is candid and free discussion, not taken outside the meeting. Mutual respect to be employed.	MK – proposed wording to be circulated
8	Date of next meeting	Tuesday 3/11/15 Committee Room 1, 6pm	
9	Close		