

MINUTES

Daws Hill Reference Group

Thursday 5 July 2012

Gill Gowing (Chairman)
Richard White WDC
Chris Steuart WDC
Chris Colbourn BCC Place
Jerry Unsworth WDC

Cllr David Johncock
Cllr Trevor Snaith
Cllr Jean Teesdale

Ken Tyson SCRAL
Angus Laidlaw DHRA
Stuart Armstrong DHRA
Simon Peacock DHRA
John Moore SFFRA
Alan Van Der Pant DHRA
Carolyn Leonard
Tony Fooks HWS

Taylor Wimpey Team

Geoff Armstrong DPP
Andrew Sturla
David Pycke

Apologies: Councillor John Savage, Liz Johncock, Arthur Winning, Paula Lee, Barbara Wallis

1. Matters arising from minutes

- (a) In matters arising from the last meeting there was a reference to "Need to re check discount basis for existing development with respect to education (see section 4 of last meetings minutes)." RW circulated a paper addressing the point for consideration outside the meeting.
- (b) Catherine Wooley stated at the last meeting that she would respond on a number of points. CJS to chase for a response.
- (c) CJS reported that planning applications had been received in respect of the sports centre redevelopment and the all weather pitch relocation to John Hampden School. Although the neighbour letters provide a deadline for comment, comments can still be made up to the point the application is determined (but it helps to see comments sooner rather than later).
- (d) The tree survey has been resubmitted and is on our web site.

2. Consultation

CJS presented a brief summary of the exhibition (attended by 114 people) and the comments so far received (14 responses). It was anticipated that many more residents will respond before the closing date for comments on 20th July.

A number of points were raised and responded to in the discussion.

- Will the Council give different weight to comments from residents associations and other organisation to those just from individual residents?
No. We intend to give equal weight to all comments received and have due regard to them.

- The SQTS contained misinformation in stating that the Daws Hill bus link has general support. This has harmed the trust that residents have of their representatives on the Reference Group by giving a false impression that the link is supported.

Page 11 of the SQTS considers schemes that are not included in the strategy and identifies schemes the Highway Authority is not proposing due to lack of support. The SQTS states that “A series of workshops and reference groups have taken place to inform the SQTS and only schemes that showed general support have been included in the strategy.”

This statement was made therefore in the context of schemes that were not supported. It doesn't specifically state that the Daws Lea bus link is supported but this can be implied.

It is incorrect to suggest that the Daws Hill bus link has general support from the workshops or the Reference Group. The phrase appears in the highway authority's document and it should be noted that neither the planning or highway authority set out to deliberately produce statements that are incorrect.

No decision was made at the Reference Group meeting regarding this statement which will be reviewed by the County Council.

- A female member of staff at one of the Councils stated in a telephone conversation that the owner of the house in Daws Lea would be happy to sell their property. This is not the case.

The County Council does not know where this statement originated. The County Council acknowledges that the owner has not had any detailed discussions with the County Council regarding this matter nor has agreed to the sale of the property. The County Councils officers are speaking to the house owner to discuss the emerging strategy further.

- There was concern that the County Council's representative did not attend the exhibition, which started at 2.00pm, until 4.00pm.

The County Council apologises for this although a Senior Manager was in attendance from 4pm. It was stated that this was due to resource issues on the day.

- Taylor Wimpey stated that they are currently considering the brief and will provide a detailed response.

Noted.

TW circulated drawing 031101-WIM-WL-SEP-01 for the site entrance proposals. This identified an elongated roundabout on Daws Hill lane and within the site to provide access to the site and the bus drop off/local centre. TW explained the objectives of the proposal – tree retention, school drop off etc. TW set out their position that they do not consider that the Daws Lea bus link is needed for their development and that if it did proceed the drop off within their site could still be retained.

- Some of the reference group found the proposals interesting and worth further consideration.
- There was a concern that the business units added to the problems and should be deleted from the brief. The need for such units was questioned given the amount of vacancy in the town. The traffic impact of the business development was a concern. The officers were accused of changing the ideas that had been emerging from the reference group.
- TW said they were not keen on the business development proposal and could show that such a development would not be deliverable at this site.
- *The officers considered the debate about the business units to be healthy. We do need to better understand the reasons for opposing the idea. The proposals for business development at the site are found in the Councils Position Statement Policy PS8 which has been in front of the reference group since last September – the proposal is not new. The benefits of having job growth were outlined. Councillor Teesdale stated why she considered Policy PS8 to be soundly based.*
- The date of the intended planning application was questioned. The reference group had been told September but were now being told November.
It is up to TW when they submit their application but they have stated it is likely to be in November.
- There was a concern that the infrastructure strategy behind the brief was flawed and that the land uses/amount of development should be limited to the type and amount that can be supported by highway capacity. There was a request to change the strategy.
The infrastructure as proposed would support the proposed development. There is an event planned for the evening of 16th July where the point can be examined in more detail.
- There was a question whether local government was well placed to zone land for business development (including the sports centre site proposals as well).
The Council has an evidence base for promoting employment development and has market intelligence as well.
- There was a concern that information is not available to the reference group/residents to demonstrate that the transport measures will work. Do not need vast amounts of data, simply need information on one sheet of paper to spell out how the transport solution will work so this can be examined and commented upon. It was stated that the residents are employing their own experts to look at transport matters.
ACTION: The County Officer agreed to provide more information.

3. Density

CJS presented information on residential densities to help inform discussions for the planning of the Daws Hill development. Examples of net densities of 30, 40, 60 and 75 dwellings per hectare were illustrated.

- The John North Hall site redevelopment had a density of 75 dwellings per hectare and there was a concern that this would be the model for the density of development at Daws Hill rather than the examples of lower density that were given.
The John North Hall development is of little relevance. The high density reflects the high proportion of apartments within this development and its gateway position on an entrance road into the town. At the time it was considered that there were no significant trees within the site that would constrain the development.
- Clarification was sought regarding the amount of car parking that would be sought for the residential element of the Daws Hill development.
The car parking standards are set out in the brief. They are proposed to be at a much higher level than the standard that was used for some of the examples in the density paper.
- A question was raised about how many car movements had been assumed at the site.
The highway authority has made assumptions about this. The figures were not available at the meeting. This is an issue for the 16th July meeting.

4. Stakeholder event 16th July

RW presented a paper outlining different options for the stakeholder event. Only 5 people have so far confirmed they can attend and RW asked if any one else can attend. There may be an option to book the room to later if the event overruns.

- There was a question about how the residents could influence the outcome of the consultation process.
The consultation is an opportunity for the community to express views. The 16th July event is intended to be an opportunity where some issues can be explored in greater detail. It was explained that the consultation period will end on the 20th July and that this date cannot be altered.
- The reference group felt that the first option set out for the event was the best way to proceed.

5. Neighbourhood Forum update (Daws Hill residents)

The matter is with the Council who will decide what to do at the Cabinet meeting on 31 July.

Next Meeting: This is being considered for Tuesday 7th August. The meeting date will be circulated once determined.