

**RAF Daws Hill Development Brief
Detailed Summary of Comments made during the
Consultation 15 June-20 July 2012**

This detailed summary is arranged under the consultation questions that were included in the development brief: The numbers in brackets included after the comment indicate where more than one consultee identified the same issue.

4 – Site Analysis and Context

4.1 - Do you think the right issues have been identified for the site and that these are appropriate responses?			
Yes	37	No	24
If no, please give your reasons below:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whilst the environmental impact of the M40 is included as a main issue, there is no mention of the traffic congestion in the area. We think this is a major issue that should be included here. (12) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No references made to the traffic impacts, likelihood of congestion at M40 junction 4. 2. As well as responses on traffic congestion and the existing infrastructure, we would want to see some adjustments to the response in relation to the existing landscape: A requirement that the treeline from all sides should be maintained and that the height of buildings should be <u>strictly limited</u> in any development response to ensure that the buildings are not detrimental to the landscape and to external views of it. (12)/ <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Issue #1: Tree cover does not belie the built-up nature of the site. The site is not heavily build up at present. Tree cover is a defining characteristic and should remain one. Response #1: Trees should be accommodated not “where appropriate” but “as a most important priority”. (2) 2) Do you believe that we can achieve our policies in terms of housing density without widespread felling of good trees or do we have to accept that we will not achieve our desired density with this development ? 3) Adapt development form & intensity to accommodate the trees where appropriate – TW proposal only retains 30% of the existing trees. This is due to the very high building density of over 30 dph. 3. We agree that many of the right issues have been identified, but are surprised that retention of the existing, recently renovated, housing has been ruled out. Surely sustainability requirements should at least allow for retention of existing infrastructure to be considered? (10)/ Retaining existing houses/bungalows (3) 4. Main issues:- Proximity of site to established residential area impacts on the Site in terms of character and density of development - Response: - Development to respond to existing character and density of the Daws Hill area. (2) 5. Fences and Walls <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Not convinced about the need to remove fences along Daws Hill Lane which would in itself alter the character of the area for no good reason. 			

- 2) The entire north side of Daws Hill Lane consists of fences and walls. It is inappropriate, therefore, to remove the existing fence along the RAF Daws Hill site, as proposed. Why not leave the site “inward –looking” as before, thereby minimising its impact on the existing environment?
6. Realism in achieving cycling and walking journeys to/from the site given the hilly terrain.
 7. Parking provision is inadequate and will cause problems seen elsewhere in Wycombe District. All house having two or more bedrooms need at least two off street parking spaces.
 8. According to our records, the very top north-east corner of the site (north-east of Sixth Street) is included within the Grade II registered Wycombe Abbey historic parkland. This may be an error in the drawing of the boundary of the site, but even if so, the site would adjoin the registered parkland and forms part of its setting. There should, therefore, be a reference to this designated heritage asset and to the need to conserve or enhance it and its setting within the issues identified for the site.
 9. The proximity to the Chilterns AONB has not been fully considered. Your authority has a duty to conserve and enhance the AONB, and this must be part of the planning process. Views in and out of the site from/to the AONB should be a key part of the decisions made about the design of the site. The Chilterns AONB design guide, and document on the setting of the AONB should also be taken into account when this development is designed.
 10. The main site issues have been identified correctly, however in terms of responses, opening the public boundaries visually and physically will cause the character of Daws Hill Lane to change, from basically rural in nature with residences set back from the road, to becoming far more urbanised with full view of the designated housing and business area etc.
 11. Back new development onto residential boundary to protect existing rear boundaries & enhance the existing tree belt through longer gardens – the proposed buffer zone at the back of Sandford Gardens is too short.
 12. Fig 4.1.4 noise profile is unrealistic as it does not reflect the intolerable M40 noise levels experienced in Sandford Gardens during adverse weather conditions. Acoustic barriers and a low noise level surface are required.
 13. Taylor Wimpey believe that the right issues have been identified for the site, however, they consider that some clarification on a couple these is required in relation to the character of the site and its relationship with the surrounding area and would refer you to the comments made in the marked up copy of the development brief produced by DHA Architecture.

4.2 - Do you think the right issues have been identified regarding context / townscape setting and that these are appropriate responses?

Yes	9	No	53
-----	---	----	----

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. Evidence suggests inability of local infrastructure to support large public centre development within the area **(31)**
2. Development brief does not identify the negative impacts on the local residents. **(30)**
3. The existing residents have not sought a “centre” for their area. Why is this being imposed? It is neither wanted nor needed. The natural “centre” is surely High Wycombe centre. **(12)**
 - 1) From a wider perspective, creating a centre for Daws Hill may well detract from the wider community of High Wycombe, including the town centre where attempts to re-generate already hang by a thread partly due to the economic downturn. Development of the Handy Cross/ Daws Hill area to the scale anticipated will generate a community accessing the area from the motorway and totally separate from the rest of the town.
4. Housing density is not outlined in the main issues or response. The majority of the surrounding neighbourhoods have a significantly lower density of housing and given the nature of the environment, mature trees and existing congested road infrastructure, it would be more beneficial to see a less dense development that was more in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhoods and less likely to put pressure on the already congested road and town infrastructure of Wycombe. **(10)**
 - 1) Should be possible to retain some of the existing houses and other buildings on the site, in order to help establish character and historic continuity. However I query the diagram showing the “surrounding residential area” which has been cleverly constructed to include some high density developments which have no relation to Daws Hill, in particular Area 5.
 - 2) I agree with many of the principles; however the location of high density in the Open Technical Area brings these properties very close to the boundary with existing low density housing. The style of designs should exclude any buildings over two stories. Again the very high overall 30 dph density aggravates this issue. The proposal for 550 dwellings does not respect the existing environment. About half this number would be more realistic.
5. ‘Private realm’ environment is significant factor for the character of the area and why many residents choose to live here. Any ‘public realm’ and centre should be modest and situated so as not to impact on the character of the area or be detrimental to the existing already inadequate infrastructure.(11)
 - 1) The correct issues have been identified, i.e. largely a private realm and not functionally part of a wider community. However in terms of response, many of the existing community have chosen to live in this area precisely because of these characteristics and their views have not been taken into account.
 - 2) The sitting of the proposed ‘public realm and centre for the Daws Hill area’ is critical if it is to benefit existing residents and other users as well as new residents. It should therefore be sited towards the front of the development. It should however be sited far enough back to keep the existing vegetation along Daws Hill Lane, enhanced as necessary by further landscaping to retain the current ‘Arcadian’ feel of the lane. The infrastructure to allow for the increased traffic movement should be in place before the public realm and centre is developed. Retail provision in

this centre is likely to have peaks of usage during the early morning and also during the morning and afternoon school runs so sufficient parking should be provided to allow for this. It will also be necessary to take account of the nature of the other public provision in the centre and its likely peak of usage in fully determining the final parking provision as we would not wish to see overflow parking from the centre, elsewhere in the area.

6. Transport Issues

- 1) A satisfactory solution to the transport issues has not yet been devised.
 - 2) I believe the area cannot currently cope with the traffic volume in the area caused by the number of schools in the area, number of houses and through route to M40 and M4, I do not believe the new proposals will ease this situation but make an already overstretched area less safe and desirable to live in. This does not appear to have explicitly been noted in the Development Brief.
 - 3) Consider how to minimise traffic impacts on M40 junction 4.
7. According to our records, the very top north-east corner of the site (north-east of Sixth Street) is included within the Grade II registered Wycombe Abbey historic parkland. This may be an error in the drawing of the boundary of the site, but even if so, the site would adjoin the registered parkland and forms part of its setting. There should, therefore, be a reference to this designated heritage asset and to the need to conserve or enhance it and its setting within the issues identified for the site's context/townscape setting.
8. The proximity of the AONB should be considered. However, we are pleased to see that landscape elements have been considered. The proximity of locally designated wildlife sites and how these are to be protected should be part of any final solution.
9. Much of the future needs that would arise out of the proposed development have not been taken into consideration and the negative impact on the existing residents in the Daws Hill community. Much of these issues have been obscure and a sense of clarity between the council and the residents has not been present.
10. Taylor Wimpey agrees that the issues and responses identified are correct. However, the inclusion of density figures in Figure 4.2.1 for each of the character areas is unnecessary as its purpose is only to set the local character context. To achieve a minimum of 30dph consistent with Local Plan Policy H8 the developer will need flexibility to interpret these character areas in an up-to-date manner.

4.3 - Do you think the right issues have been identified regarding connections and that these are appropriate responses?

Yes	30	No	32
-----	----	----	----

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. School bus problem overstated (only 5 or 6 buses serving Daws Hill Lane (schools) A significant factor will be the on-site generated schools traffic accessing the off-site schools. Given that schools traffic is such a congestion issue, schools cannot abdicate their responsibility but should be mandated to

provide on-site facilities for all bus and car drop-off & pick-up activities; they should “consume their own smoke”. **(15)**

- 1) The contention that congestion on Daws Hill Lane is due to school bus “drop offs” does not stack up with the evidence that local drivers regularly queue to turn right at the junction of Daws Hill Lane and Marlow Hill. The key point is that this occurs before or around 8.00 am when traffic moving towards Handy Cross is already backed down to the Daws Hill Lane junction; this is prior to schools being open for delivery of students
 - 2) Agree with points but would stress it’s not the school buses that are the problem, it’s the hundreds of parents dropping one child. Schools themselves should be forced to provide adequate drop-off areas such that cars do not back up into public roads.
 - 3) A major shift in behaviour will be required to change parents habits in dropping off children at or close to their schools – how will this be enforced?
 - 4) The proposal to make school-children walk over 1000 yards to and from coach drop-off/pick-up points along a busy and potentially dangerous road will lead inevitably to more parents using their cars for their children’s’ school journeys, further exacerbating an already unsatisfactory situation
2. Whilst the issues are agreed the responses are not.
- 1) It should be made clear that fixing the heavily congested infrastructure that exists surrounding the development the M40, A404 and A40 is necessary before significant numbers of dwellings are completed. **(12)**
 - 2) The first two bullet points should be qualified in that any new or improved connections should not be at the expense of the environment and ecology, nor lead to reduced security or privacy for both the development’s new residents and those in surrounding areas. **(12)**
3. No satisfactory transport infrastructure solution has yet been devised to cope with the additional traffic created by the development. **(3)**
4. While the issues and responses may be correctly identified, the current draft Southern Quadrant Transport Strategy relied upon in response 5 is considered inadequate – please see High Wycombe Society response(s) to the SQTS.**(2)**
5. No mention of congestion at M40 junction 4 – any appropriate transport strategy needs to be set within the wider context including impacts on M40, Junction 4.
6. There is a big issue with the deteriorating condition of roads and pavements Daws Hill in all the roads. Buses are repeatedly using roads which were not designed for this loading. It is suggested that School buses are a major source of congestion.
7. Care should be taken to ensure that connections into the Chilterns AONB are an asset, and are not detrimental to the purposes of the AONB.
8. The key “Connections” issue is the lack of any access other than Daws Hill Lane, already seriously congested in the morning and afternoon peaks. The Southern Quadrant Transport Strategy (SQTS) fails to deal with this problem, which it greatly understates (see later). The proposed development will make this problem much worse, and seriously impact on the health, safety and wellbeing of existing residents and road users – contrary to the Local Authorities vision statements of intent.
9. Adoption of an agreed “Southern Quadrant Transport Strategy” especially

“Strategy for Daws Hill Lane” is pre-requisite to this.

10. However the existing footpath network works well
11. The problems with congestion are being moved round the corner
12. There should be a comprehensive approach to developing Daws Hill and Abbey Barn South which would result in significant additional benefits (infrastructure delivery, optimise integration/connectivity, co-ordinated design and place-making, avoiding piecemeal development). Specific transport improvements that can be delivered by comprehensive development identified.
13. Taylor Wimpey considers that the 6th bullet point under Main Issues should be amended to read that ‘*Congestion along Daws Hill Lane is a result of the combination of school drop off traffic, a high proportion of ‘through’ traffic, high car ownership and high car use in Daws Hill and the poor take up of bus services*’. Other than this Taylor Wimpey believe the right issues and responses have been identified regarding connections.

4.4 - Do you think the right issues have been identified regarding land use and that these are appropriate responses?

Yes	8	No	54
-----	---	----	----

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. Failure to ensure the infrastructure of the site to support the goals is a significant omission. Transport a major concern but need to account for other infrastructure. **(32)**
2. We agree with the issues but think the reference to density in the 4th bullet point in the responses should be removed: Residential development *should* reflect and respond to the character of the area. **(11)**
3. The on-site school needs to be developed early to provide facilities for the initial new residents and also to avoid generating further traffic congestion arising from on-site traffic travelling to off-site schools, pending the on-site schools build. **(11)**
4. The site should include scope for extra care / elderly person housing. Rather than this being optional, I consider it should be prescriptive. Such homes will have the effect of reducing the number of vehicle movements which arise from the site. **(13)**
5. Need more detail on how future connections to Abbey Barn South whilst ensuring this development has its own integrity can be achieved. **(3)**
6. I appreciate that Policies call for high density development but the existing infrastructure and that proposed, particularly for transport cannot support a high density development. The position of the ‘local centre’ ‘off Daws Hill Lane (from figure 4.4.2) appears to mean fronting the Lane in the ‘zone of best visibility for passing traffic’? This is hardly in keeping with the context ‘continuing the tree lined avenue...and ‘maintaining the ‘arcadian’ feel along Daws Hill Lane’, see 4.2 Key responses and the whole essence and character of Daws Hill Lane. In the original Taylor Wimpey survey only 25% of residents thought this a good place, over half preferring a more central position which would be nearer the proposed school and Abbey Barn South. Surely encouraging passing traffic to stop here will only increase the need for more parking here and the movement of traffic on and off the site. **(2)**
7. The land use section takes insufficient account of existing congestion on Daws Hill road and Marlow Hill, and the additional burden that the Daws Hill

development will impose. **(2)**

8. A mixed-use development is not wanted by local residents or by the developer. Aside from the “community centre”, it would be impossible to adequately constrain the type of commercial use that might ensue, with unpredictable effects on additional traffic generation.**(2)**
9. To reflect and respond to the character of the area, residential development should follow the existing housing density as closely as possible. A rough density calculation for the existing Daws Hill residential area (using numbers from the map in section 4.2, not including the RAF base, which held mainly technical facilities) gives a figure of approximately 17 dwellings per hectare. It is most important that a similar figure—not more than 20 dph—is imposed as a maximum overall density, both to preserve the character of the area and to avoid overloading the road infrastructure. This would set an upper limit of 300 dwellings for the site overall—a figure that should also be specified in the development brief.**(2)**
 - 1) The building density of 500 homes is too high to be in keeping with the area as it currently exists
 - 2) Correct issues have been identified however there is no evidence that the transport infrastructure will support an increase in density over the existing level. Constant reference to the development of Abbey Barn South is a reason for disquiet; additional future development in 2026 with an already inadequate infrastructure borders on irresponsibility by the planners.
 - 3) Residential development should reflect and respond to the character of the area but does not have to follow the existing density – this is a conflicting statement especially if the overall density is three times the current density in the area. A medium density of 15 dph would allow the statement to be respected.
10. Agree with a mixed use development site. Helps keep a level of containment and therefore reduces the need of private car travel and its possible impacts on M40 junction 4.
11. Concerns re scale and nature of business development
12. Misleading to describe location of drop off point as being in the north east corner – possible alternative wording is “at the northern boundary with Daws Hill Lane”.
13. There should be a reference to the need to conserve or enhance the Grade II registered Wycombe Abbey historic parkland and its setting under Land Use: Main Issues and Land Use: Key Responses.
14. Not convinced that there is evidence to show what a “balanced community” is, how it might be designed or why it is necessary. I disagree with the School site being adjacent to Abbey Barn as I do not support the development of that site, and believe it should logically be adjacent to the drop off point. I think that making connections to Abbey Barn South will encourage its future development, which would be contrary to policy and unnecessary. Finally I see no evidence for the suggestion that new development “does not have to follow existing density”. I would prefer that it did.
15. It is good that open space provision is being considered at an early stage. This is an opportunity to provide spaces for people and for biodiversity enhancement.
16. To maintain the character of the local area, preserve the integrity of views from the town centre and elsewhere, and minimise the density of car ownership per unit area, all buildings on the site should be restricted to a maximum of two

storeys.

17. Vary the intensity of the development to respond to site constraints such as existing trees and sensitive residential boundaries as shown in Fig 4.4.2 – The number of trees to be removed and the depth of the Sandford Gardens buffer zone do not respect this statement. The M40 noise effected band does not reflect the intolerable noise levels experienced frequently in Sandford Gardens during adverse weather conditions of wet road surfaces and a Southern wind direction. A large area of the new development will experience these intolerable noise levels if a low noise surface is not applied to the M40 and acoustic barriers are not installed.
18. I disagree with what is being proposed for the entrance to the site. This should be maintained as it is at the moment with a drop off zone behind the screen of trees. The current entrance should remain as the main entrance with a further access point close to the drop off point. Any retail buildings and centre should be at the centre of the development adjacent to the area proposed for the school. It is questionable whether a community centre and retail outlets are actually require there is no/little requirement for this in the existing community. The schools' in the area have the facilities to provide for any community meetings etc. I am also totally opposed to any business units.
19. Please refer to the marked up comments/suggested amendments made by DHA Architecture.

5 – Redevelopment Objectives

5 - Do you agree with these redevelopment objectives, are there any others you would like to add?

Yes	5	No	55
-----	---	----	----

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. The goal to “create a high quality scheme that is sustainable and a great place to live” is valid. However, this should not be at the cost of a significant negative impact on different groups of the existing community, since this can in no way be described as “sustainable”. This objective should be added and clearly articulated. **(27)**
 - 1) The objective about creating a high quality scheme that is sustainable and a great place to live is too inward looking and should be widened to also ensure there is no negative impact on neighbouring areas and the wider Wycombe community. **(16)**
 - 2) We believe the goal to “To create a high quality scheme that is sustainable and a great place to live” is correct in its ideal. However (a) it should not be at a significant cost to the existing Daws Hill community; (b) the term ‘sustainable’ needs further clarification; (c) environmental/green issues need to be spelt-out; (d) density of dwellings need to be clearly and precisely defined, and (e) in our view, car parking provision needs to be rethought in light of the ‘2 cars per dwelling’ statistic for the Daws Hill area.
2. The objective in relation to congestion should be expended to deal with the wider issue of congestion in the area, not just dealing with the school drop off issue.

(11)

3. Need to mention the mitigation measures in place to reduce the potential traffic impacts of development on M40 Junction 4. Include/mention the Southern Quadrant Transport Strategy.
4. Brief should be strengthened to ensure the resolution of traffic congestion on Daws Hill Lane is a requirement of the development – specifically require RAF Daws Hill to provide the necessary infrastructure to resolve this issue including both the eastern and western school drop off points.
5. We would want to see a further objective about minimising the impact on the ecology and environment by building sustainably and to positively join up green areas with ‘green corridors’, ‘green roofs’, to encourage biodiversity across the Chilterns and Wycombe woodlands. **(11)**
6. Concern about taking Abbey Barn South into account and the effect it has on looking for solutions that integrate road infrastructure between the two sites. **(3)**
 - 1) Concern about taking Abbey Barn South into account (conflicts with the statement regarding the character of Daws Hill – “the site is situated at the point where town turns into countryside”) and how this has affected the approach to ...?
 - 2) I do not agree with the first objective. There is no need for this; very few people living in the area want this. Abbey South Barn should not be developed it should become a recreational area, integration therefore would be minimal.
7. Objective #3: Strongly agree! Objective #5: Agree with the principle, but disagree with the designation of the site as “urban”, due to the locality’s significant “arcadian” character and the extensive wooded barrier between it and the town centre. Issue #6: The possibility of Abbey Barn South being developed in the future should not be a constraint on achieving the highest possible quality for the Daws Hill development. This objective should be removed.**(3)**
8. Much of the Daws Hill area is very conveniently close to High Wycombe Town Centre, Handy Cross, local schools and the Marlow Road shops. It is questionable whether a further local centre is needed.**(2)**
 - 1) There is no demand from existing residents for “a heart for the Daws Hill area”, a point that is repeatedly ignored by the planners.
9. I do not agree to any new connections that affect the privacy or security of existing residents or land owners or that have a negative impact on their health or use of their own private space.**(2)**
10. The redevelopment objectives to be truly sustainable must be mutually dependent. No mention is made of improvement in quality of travel to work or every day business. The problem comes back to the lack of infrastructure and failure to fully mitigate plans in other parts of the town which will have an impact, i.e. Handy Cross. **(2)**
11. More parking spaces
12. Although English Heritage does not disagree with the objective to reconnect the site with its surroundings and historic past, there should be a mention here of conserving or enhancing the Grade II registered Wycombe Abbey historic parkland and its setting.
13. I agree that the schools traffic situation needs to be resolved, but the need to improve access more widely for local business, for traffic using Daws Hill Lane, is

equally crucial. I strongly disagree that the development should seek to facilitate access to and connections with Abbey Barn South, which should not be developed.

14. There must be the objective to make the construction of the development sustainable, ie. Reuse materials and also not cause nuisance to the neighbourhood and be well planned and communicated. No road closures which would cause chaos!
15. To reinforce and protect the arcadian character of Daws Hill Lane – this is difficult to respect if the commercial areas are clearly visible from Daws Hill Lane.
16. The proposals for children attending the existing Catholic Schools are misguided, and better solutions exist.
17. Please refer to the marked up comments/suggested amendments made by DHA Architecture and the comments on page 4 of this letter regarding redevelopment objectives 2, 3 and 6. In relation to objective 4 Taylor Wimpey would like to see it clearly stated that the Daws Hill development is responsible for dealing only with its own impact on the highway network and thus acting as a catalyst for the delivery of the comprehensive solution.

6 – The Brief for Redevelopment

6.1 - Do you agree with the locations of uses shown on the RAF Daws Hill Development Brief Framework Plan; is there anything you would want to locate elsewhere?

Yes	5	No	55
-----	---	----	----

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. Objection to the public transport route through Daws Lea/ Concerns regarding increased air pollution, safety for pedestrians - children and residents of the nursing home/The road is narrow, not designed for buses, and in the winter time can be impassable due to ice on the gradient. It would encourage other road users to explore this side of Daws Hill Lane in an attempt to avoid traffic **(21)**
2. The planned public transport route though Daws Lea would severely impact on the residents' quality of life on Health and Safety grounds in terms of increasing already excessive noise and air pollution, as well as the safety of a growing community with children. Point 6.2.1 refers to the importance for the new development of, "How safe it is". This needs to apply also to existing members of the community. Daws Lea should not be considered a Public Transport Route. The cost in terms of the creation of the route, the automatic bollard control system against the saving in journey time will need to be justified, as well. **(14)**
3. I do not agree with the locations of uses shown, especially a public transport route through Daws Lea as it would have major health and safety consequences on the existing community who are already victims of the excessive noise and air pollution generated from the M40 motorway behind Daws Lea. Furthermore, families with young children send their children off to school by foot, and this proposed route will severely question the safety of these children during their commute to school. It is therefore suggested that the construction of an alternative roundabout on Heath End Road straight after the bridge with a road running parallel to the M40. which would be an ideal solution to support any future developments. Moreover, we are highly concerned that this will destroy the unique character of the Daws Hill Area and it is our best interest to preserve this

natured gift as responsible citizens of this community.

4. Not only do I have to face up to 2000 cars entering and leaving the new sports centre development, but now I understand that the developers of RAF Daws Hill propose a school drop off point in or around the current Highways Agency depot, using the current access road to the sports centre. Any additional traffic from RAF Daws Hill should not impact on our area of Fair Ridge and The Spinney. If they cannot solve the problem of extra traffic from their development, then their planning application should be refused.
5. In the diagrams on page 20 and 21 we note a proposed public transport link through Daws Lea to which we can find no other reference in this brief or in the Draft Southern Quadrant Transport Strategy. Daws Lea is a residential road which already suffers from considerable noise and air pollution from the M40. We feel we cannot comment on this aspect of the brief until we have seen evidence from a study of the impact of such a route upon the residents. As we have not been able to locate such a study we would appreciate details to enable us to consider the appropriateness of this proposal. We would however comment that should buses be re-routed through Daws Lea, some residents of Daws Hill Lane who currently have a bus service will be deprived of this service. This can hardly be said to encourage the use of public transport. We would also appreciate costing for this proposed rerouting as our understanding is there would need to be road improvements and the compulsory purchase of property so clearly the cost should be considered and balanced against the number of bus movements that would be diverted.
6. No business units should be developed on the site unless a real need can be proven. There are empty units at the Cressex commercial estate and in the centre of Wycombe empty shops/offices. There is no consideration of the increase in traffic flow the sizeable proposal would create, adding to the existing major problems. Where they are proposed to be sited is right on the boundary of an AONB, which is to be avoided. There is no business case stated for such units, other than a conceptual policy to invest in jobs. The adjacent site of Handy Cross, with dedicated business units proposed, is much more appropriate. **(13)**
 - 1) We agree with the locations of uses. We question the need for any significant business use on the site, given the likely negative impact it will have on traffic congestion and the wide availability of empty business units in the Wycombe area. **(13)**
 - 2) Although given the apparent over supply of current business units in Wycombe, it is questionable whether more units are required at all. **(3)**
 - 3) There appears to be little support outside WDC for the idea of business use—other than for small-scale community facilities such as a convenience shop—on this site. The logical place for such small-scale use is in the local centre near the main entrance. The area currently designated for business use (blue on the maps), being too close to the motorway for residential use, should be redesignated as open space.**(2)**
 - 4) Locate any commercial areas nearer the centre of the site not fronting Daws Hill Lane**(2)**
 - 5) The predominance of business development at Handy Cross must, to be truly sustainable, be balanced with primarily housing development at RAF Daws Hill.
 - 6) We believe that the inclusion of commercial and retail units is not concomitant with ‘a high quality scheme ... a great place to live’. Inclusion

of retail units would detract from already struggling retail in the town centre; commercial units sited at the entrance to the development—with attendant delivery vans, parking lots etc—would not in our view enhance the site's attractiveness as '... a great place to live'.

7. We believe the references to potential future footpath links to the north and west of the site should be removed from the Brief. This proposal is at odds with the design principles set out later in the brief about security of rear gardens and the sensitive boundary shown on the western edge of the site. New footpaths would have to pass along the rear boundaries of properties in Wallingford Gardens and those on the Warren Wood estate. They would provide escape routes for criminals in both directions, potentially increasing crime and the fear of crime for both the development's new residents and those in surrounding areas. If a new footpath to the north of the site were routed to avoid compromising security at Wycombe Abbey school, it would have to join Warren Wood Drive to the east of our estate, thereby rendering it unnecessary as it would be no shorter than existing pedestrian routes to the town centre. **(11)**
 - 1) The footpath indicated to the rear of Wallingford Gardens is not acceptable either from a security aspect and is contrary to the 'Active fronts and backs' policy 6.2.2 outlined for RAF Daws Hill and existing residents expect this to apply to their security too. 'Discount routes that are not overlooked', i.e. those to the rear of dwellings **(2)**
 - 2) The potential footpath links shown on map 6.1.2 appear to transverse private land outside the confines of RAF Daws Hill.
8. Again, it appears that the possibility of Abbey Barn South being developed in the future is being put forward as a constraint on the Daws Hill development. In section 6.1, the result seems to be that one end of the main access route will lead, for the time being at least, into the middle of a field. Assuming that this will in fact be a dead end, it appears to conflict with the guidance in 6.2.1 that "Dead ends that are not obvious should be avoided." The maps in section 6.1 should be amended to allow greater flexibility of site access design without the requirement for a main access route to ABS, but without physically preventing future access to ABS.**(2)**
 - 1) Conflict between figure 6.2.1 and page 38 regarding bus penetration into RAF Daws Hill site (figure does not show this whereas text refers). Emphasise the advantage of a bus route linking into Abbey Barn South which would provide more viable/sustainable service. Welcome the reference in 7.7.3 to the need for a direct public transport link with bus priority and high quality cycling/walking routes to the planned Handy Cross Hub. The link will only be materially beneficial if at the same time provision is made for improved school drop-off and parking facilities to the rear of the schools in the vicinity of the depot. The new link and measures to improve the school drop-off and parking arrangements should therefore be a requirement of the development.
9. Make sure the layout and access to the neighbourhood centre does not tempt people to park or wait on Daws Hill Lane.
10. In terms of the Grade II registered Wycombe Abbey historic parkland to the north of the site and its setting, English Heritage welcomes the indicated open space/retained woodland along the northern boundary of the site.
11. It would appear that the proposed density of development is much higher than in the locality, which is unacceptable and will adversely affect the existing character

of the area. I have commented above on the location of the primary school and the need to retain trees on the site. While I have no objection to small businesses (of B1 character) being established on the site, I am not convinced that this is a good or logical location.

12. Natural England views the incorporation of Green Infrastructure, at a local and sub-regional level, as a '*multifunctional resource capable of delivering those ecological services and quality of life benefits required by the communities it serves and needed to underpin sustainability. Its design and management should also respect and enhance the character and distinctiveness of an area with regard to habitats and landscape types*'. Green Infrastructure should further '*thread through and surround the built environment and connect the urban area to its wider rural hinterland*'.
13. The expansion into Abbey Barn South makes a mockery of the objective to be gateway to the Chiltern AONB.
14. The Sandford Gardens buffer zone comprising lower density housing is not deep enough to meet the requirement to respect the sensitive boundary with existing residences.
15. No area for allotments has been allocated as previously proposed.
16. The current plan is far too dense to reflect the current environment and locates higher density dwelling close to the existing low density residential properties.
17. A third entry/exit point for the site is shown on page 20. 3 such points will further impede traffic flow along Daws Hill Lane.
18. As stated earlier the local centre should be located more towards the centre of the site, if required? There should be no business area this should be a residential development. Business units in themselves do not guarantee business will be attracted to this site and there is very little national evidence that this idea would succeed, there are plenty of other business sites within the Wycombe area
19. Please refer to the 'alternative' Framework Plan produced by DHA Architecture which indicates what Taylor Wimpey considers are appropriate uses and where certain uses would be better located.

6.2 - Do you agree with the design principles contained in section 6.2? Is there anything else that should be added?

Yes	7	No	52
-----	---	----	----

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. Considers there will be an excess of cars to parking spaces resulting in problems **(28)**
 - 1) The SQTS acknowledges an existing car ownership of 2 cars per household – simply because this is necessary to live in this area! Adequate parking spaces (at least 2 per household (average) plus visitors) are essential, if necessary reducing the number of homes. **(12)**
 - 2) Fully understand the need for housing on the RAF Daws Hill site but the density of housing is critical and the intended design for parking is

inadequate. Most homes nowadays require at least two parking spaces per dwelling, not allowing for visitors. **(2)**

- 3) Can not tell how many car park spaces are being provided by dwelling, this will indicate if there will be enough parking spaces in the site and the potential use of existing parking in the local residence which will result in negative impacts **(2)**
 - 4) The existing Abbey Park development had adequate car parking spaces on 2003, when I moved there, however in recent years, with the propensity of adult off-spring returning home to live after university or due to the high cost of rental or house purchase, has led to increasing street car parking. Car parking spaces as indicated for the new site would be inadequate. Two cars per household is now the minimum, and of course with the increase in cars there will be more journeys undertaken. It is simply unrealistic to expect an increase in the provision of public transport to cater for this; residents living on a new development at Daws Hill will be predominantly commuters travelling in all directions outside of High Wycombe with no access to a regular service other than buses calling at the proposed parkway for M40 journeys.
 - 5) There must be sufficient parking.
 - 6) The provision of parking will need very careful thought and landscaping otherwise areas of the site will look unattractive like Kingshill Grange where parts of the site appear to be littered with cars.
 - 7) I believe that catering in an under-generous fashion to parking demands, will only result in double-parking, pavement parking & other unsightly and dangerous parking. I definitely believe more than currently adequate parking should be efficiently provided.
 - 8) Underground car parking should be considered.
 - 9) With a known car ownership density of 2 cars per dwelling in the Daws Hill area set to be repeated into the Daws Hill site, the design brief as it is laid out will not suitably deal with issues like car parking provision. Again, we believe on-street parking, parking in 'lots' behind or in front of houses will detract from the 'great place to live' ideal.
 - 10) Agree the site should include sustainable transport infrastructure such as cycle routes and footpaths to connect to other areas of High Wycombe. Agree with cycle storage.
 - 11) Parking standards should be adopted using Council Parking Standards. The brief makes little or no mention of what role parking supply may have in reducing or managing travel by car.
2. Buildings should be restricted to 2 storeys maximum. **(12)**
 3. We don't think sufficient attention is paid to the potential effects of significantly increasing the amount of land that is hard surfaced. With the extreme monsoon-like weather conditions seen recently in other parts of the country, this development ought to take into account the likelihood of such conditions occurring here and ensure water run-off does not impact on those properties built on the lower parts of the site and on lower areas surrounding the site. **(9)**
 4. 6.2.3 – Garages (page 26): A garage 3m wide internally is sufficiently narrow to deter some drivers of medium to large family cars from using it for parking. A minimum garage size of 7m x 3.5m would perhaps be more appropriate. **(2)**

5. Prefer to see the site, if developed at all, growing organically over very many years. The principles in the Brief are laudable but will create a sense of sameness throughout the development.
6. Distance views into the development from the Chilterns AONB should be considered in the design of the whole development.
7. The depth of the buffer zones with sensitive boundaries are not clearly defined.
8. There appears to be no provision for waste and recycling storage, clearly this should be provided in an unobtrusive manner.
9. On no-account should Daws Lea be designated a bus route.
10. High density housing, where buildings are virtually on-top of one another, should be avoided at all costs.
11. Taken together there will be a **significant increase in traffic flows onto the Handy Cross site**. The proposal is that almost all of this traffic (other than public transport) will be **funnelled** through the existing road which provides access to the residential area. Exiting and accessing our homes is going to become extremely problematic. It is unacceptable that local residents should have to be drawn into all this additional traffic. Plans should be put in place **to separate** the business and school traffic from the residential traffic so that residents are not disproportionately affected by these proposals.
12. There are bound to be a proportion of the people using facilities at Handy Cross who will consider it acceptable to leave their cars on our estate. What plans will be put in place to manage this? Parking is already a problem from users of the sports centre, the new estate recently built at the John North Hall site and the school run. We really do not need to add to the problem.
13. Taylor Wimpey considers that the design principles proposed are appropriate but believe that it should be made clear within the brief that these represent a guide only and should be applied flexibly where appropriate.

6.2.5 - From workshops held prior to the production of the Development Brief there was a preference expressed to disperse the affordable housing throughout the site. Do you agree with this approach?

Yes	54	No	4
-----	----	----	---

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. Affordable Housing should be peppered/distributed throughout the site. **(11)**
2. Some dispersal is acceptable provided it is not to the detriment of the higher cost housing.
3. Poor location for affordable housing, but I agree that if provided, it should be dispersed.
4. The need for a 30% allocation should be based on need and the take up on other Wycombe housing developments
5. Consideration should also be given to retirement homes as part of the 30% figure. Where affordable housing is scattered throughout the site and is not well looked after this could cause considerable problems. However, this would be better for social cohesion than grouping all of the affordable housing in one area.
6. Whilst we agree that affordable housing should not be 'clustered' but dispersed

through the development, we also believe that affordable housing should be grouped in smaller numbers, and further believe that affordable housing should—as far as possible—be indistinguishable from the remaining dwellings.

7. Taylor Wimpey will aim to disperse the affordable housing as far as practicably possible. However, for management purposes Registered Providers prefer to avoid pepper potting preferring small groups of 20-30 dwellings.

6.3 - Do you agree that we should adopt local car parking standards for RAF Daws Hill and do you agree with the standards proposed?

Yes	3	No	54
-----	---	----	----

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. Inadequate parking provision leading to overspill parking and tensions amongst residents **(21)**
2. Need to provision adequate parking of at least 2 per household, plus visitor parking. **(15)**
 - 1) All house having two or more bedrooms need at least two off street parking spaces
 - 2) A sensible attitude towards car parking should be adopted. There should be sufficient space to allow for cars to be parked away from streets and without concreting over front gardens, and there is sufficient space on the site to enable this to be done.
 - 3) There is no point of having parking restrictions.
 - 4) Parking spaces should not be over provided. We note the Council's reference to NPPF para 39 in relation to parking. We also note the Council's acceptance of the site as one which is difficult to access by foot, cycle or public transport because of its topography. This makes it all the more important that the potential traffic impacts of the site on M40 Junction 4 be a key point in the brief to ensure protects this element of the SRN.
3. We agree local car parking standards should be adopted for the site but think they are set too low in this brief, judging from our experience on Warren Wood estate. The Daws Hill area has above average car ownership and usage. The topography does not lend itself to convenient and unstrenuous access into and out of town; given the hill-climb to return. Public transport will not be relied on - anymore than it is now – hence the development needs to ensure that adequate off street parking is provided per dwelling. **(11)**
4. Car parking standards proposed are inadequate for this site. **(3)**
5. General principles are accepted but care needs to be taken that the school drop off area and the commercial area does not become overcrowded and spill over to neighbouring roads in existing residential areas.
6. Taylor Wimpey considers that the current maximum standards set out at Appendix 9 of the Local Plan are acceptable. The application of minimum standards will only lead to confusion and misunderstanding, which they do not believe is conducive to achieving a high quality development. They would like to express concern regarding the statement that parking courts should only be a last resort. To avoid a car dominated environment parking should be provided via a variety of means, and this should include parking courts as part of a balance.

--

6.4 - Do you agree with the approach taken to trees and green infrastructure?			
Yes	52	No	8
If no, please give your reasons below:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Existing trees and green infrastructure is very important so the reinforcement of principles is of paramount importance and should not be abused by any developer (14)2. Tree Preservation is important and should be emphasised. There should be no compromise & TPOs should neither be abused by, nor negotiated with, any developer. The ideal should be to retain ALL trees, ie minimise any loss. (14)3. I agree with the Policy G11 (1) of the adopted WDC local plan to 2011 as quoted but without the qualification of ‘Ultimately any proposed loss of trees will be balanced against the benefits of the scheme....’ I question, the benefits of the scheme to whom?(2)4. 6.4.1 – Trees: The character of the site is dependent on the large number of trees that are now present. To avoid damaging the sylvan ambience, greater emphasis should be placed on protecting them. For example, paragraph 3 “Detailed site design stage will be balanced with constraints posed by existing trees...” should be reworded as “Detailed site design will be constrained by existing trees...” and para 6 “...retain existing trees where appropriate...” by “...retain existing trees as a matter of priority...”.(2)5. Approach to density and its impact on the trees on the site (density too high?)6. Need to protect trees including American species which form part of the history of the site.7. Current TW proposals does not conform to the objectives to maintain the trees and green infrastructure.8. Policy G10 should be applied rigorously – the statement “Ultimately any proposed loss of trees will be balanced against the benefits of the scheme...” opens the door to weakening the policy on (unjustified, in our view) grounds of scheme viability, boosting housing delivery, and so on, and should be deleted. As the very first bullet of Section 4.1 records “the tree cover is a defining characteristic” of the site, and must be respected and retained.9. Queries re ecological surveys and available information.10. This is particularly important given the exposed position of the site, where reduction of the existing screen will endanger those trees left standing (please remember the damage sustained in this area in 1987 and 1990). Furthermore trees are extremely useful in reducing traffic noise and improving air quality (poor air quality is already a source of concern in parts of High Wycombe near motorways and major roads).11. This should include off site areas including existing trees on Daws Hill Lane, (whether on public or privately owned properties) & Keep Hill Wood, both of whose character & number of trees must not be spoilt or changed to solve traffic infrastructure issues.			

12. Commented above about the desirability of retaining trees. Although the wildlife in this area may not contain rare species, it is abundant, and the development should encourage the proliferation of insects and garden and woodland birds.
13. Potential recreational damage of woodlands from local residents needs to be considered in the design of the development, and any protection planned for the woodlands. Landscape has been considered, however, the adjoining Chilterns AONB and views in and out should be considered more than is evident at present. Biodiversity gains could be a key element of the planned Green Infrastructure, as could recreational enjoyment by local residents.
14. A garden suburb approach should be taken.
15. Taylor Wimpey acknowledges the importance for the proposals to be located in a strong landscaped setting, which seeks to identify and retain the key existing landscape features and ensure that a high quality, appropriate development is achieved. However, it should be noted that this is a permitted development site and as such a balance must be struck between the proposed retention and removal of trees. The retention of low quality trees can dilute the quality of the development and also be counter-productive, preventing the establishment of an enhanced landscape context through a comprehensive, proposed landscape scheme which complements both the existing and proposed elements associated with the site and its immediate setting. As is acknowledged within section 6.4.1, it will not be possible to retain every tree within the site, and furthermore, misplaced retention can present demands on the existing treescape through pruning and removal works post-completion. The proposed development will therefore be informed by key trees (as identified within the arboricultural assessment to BS5837:2012) and landscape features, acknowledging the existing character of the site, without compromising the site's ability to accommodate a high quality, legible scheme which is appropriate from both an urban design and landscape perspective. Taylor Wimpey therefore consider that whilst the principle of creating a development within a strong green infrastructure is acceptable, a balance must be struck ensuring that the treescape that is to be retained will make a positive and long term contribution to the site and its immediate setting. Where trees are removed a detailed justification would be provided alongside a detailed scheme of replacement planting.

6.5 - Are the principles expressed in section 6.5 the correct principles for the local centre?

Yes	21	No	38
-----	----	----	----

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. Commercial use should not include shop fronts with bold, aggressive appearances that are out of keeping with the character of the area. No fast food outlets! **(24)**
2. Combined commercial, with residences above should NOT exceed two stories in height. **(23)**
 - 1) Page 31 says the 'design and layout of the local centre should: be visible to passing traffic. The design and landscaping of this will need very careful thought and design to blend in with the 'Arcadian' character of Daws Hill Lane and although we would support residential use above ground floor commercial use, the centre should not exceed 2 storeys in

total.

3. 4.4 'need for local centre – to provide focus for current and planned community' Why would it need to be visible to passing traffic therefore? The Council has assumed the current community need this. I do not agree with them.(2)
4. Agree that it should be accessible by all modes of transport
5. Disagree with locating close to Daws Hill Lane due to visual impact
 - 1) Since the stated purpose of the centre is to serve local residents, who know the centre is there, it is totally unnecessary for it to be visible to passing traffic. Rather it should be sited discretely within the site where it will NOT detract from the existing appearance of the area.
 - 2) The local centre being visible for passing traffic by implication would endanger the semi rural nature of the area.
6. Office uses above ground floor commercial uses may be preferable to residential.
7. The existing services in Flackwell Heath and Cressex are sufficient for purpose.
8. Existing trees and green infrastructure is very important so the reinforcement of principles is of paramount importance and should not be abused by any developer. Current TW proposals does not conform to the objectives to maintain the trees and green infrastructure.
9. Adhering to the '... great place to live' ideal, and as stated before, placing retail units on the site could negatively impact already depressed retail in the town centre. If retail units are to be built, they should be sited sympathetically, have adequate car parking facilities, should not be a fast food outlet, betting shop or a pub.
10. Commercial use should include supermarket chain
11. Taylor Wimpey do not consider that the local centre is necessarily the correct place to site an equipped children's play space. The locations of the play areas should be dictated by the emerging schemes when matters can be considered in the round.

6.6 - Of the options given in section 6.6, which is your preferred option for the site access?

Option 1 – 4

NB – note erroneous reference to position of the drop off point raised also under Q4.4

Option 2 - 30

Option 3 – 14

NB – further 3 stated needed more info, 1 said none of the options, 1 stated “no view” and 3 made other comments regarding options (see comments below)

1. Option 2 - primarily because it ensures the school drop-off is on the safest side of the main road.(9)
2. Insufficient information but a scheme which means children do not have to cross the road should be considered. Any realignment of Daws Hill Lane should continue to reflect the 'arcadian feel' and the 'tree lined avenue' should be

continued. **(2)**

3. Option 3, assuming that the former section of Daws Hill Lane will still be accessible from both ends.**(2)**
4. Option 2/3 guiding principle should be the provision of very safe walking routes to the Schools.
5. Option 3. There is another option to reroute Dawes hill Lane through the site, making the existing road buses only, helping the drop off and speeding buses up by having a control system, instead of the Dawes Lea option
6. Option 1, except that the school drop-off point should be sited away from existing dwellings on account of the noise generated; this will seriously detract from the existing residents' enjoyment of their properties.
7. I do not agree with any of these options further work is required but should be linked to how the school drop off points are located and how traffic is directed in an out of the site which is under consideration.
8. A routing of DHL within the RAF Daws Hill area (parallel and close to present road) would allow the present road to drop off school children on the 'school' side of the road thus avoiding crossing.
9. Site access should be onto Abbey Barn/ Daws Hill lane. If it was sufficient for the base, why not continue?!
10. Site access should be assessed within Design and Access Statements and TA. Traffic modelling will help test each option and will aid in the decision process.
11. Taylor Wimpey do not support any of the options identified but would support a variation of Option 3 – please see attached drawing.

6.7/8 - Do you agree with the requirements for sustainability measures and noise and air quality outlined?

Yes	55	No	4
-----	----	----	---

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. Agree with comments but believe the same issues should be considered for the existing members of the community (i.e. other residents of the community should not be made worsened noise and air quality as a result of the plan or transport strategy (refers to comments on SQTs)
2. Agree with carbon reduction target (albeit believe a higher figure is desirable and achievable); but CHP should be just one of the menu of options to achieve this, rather than a non-negotiable requirement. Solar (PV/thermal) should also be included in the options.
3. The following comments apply to M40 noise and that from Daws Hill Lane. The document refers to noise exposure categories but of course these no longer exist as PPG 24 was deleted. Our requirements are quite simple in that we require a sound insulation scheme and mechanical ventilation for any façade containing habitable rooms that is above 63 dB LAeq 16 hour daytime, 57 dB LAeq 8 hour night-time. (This is the old PPG24 NEC B/C boundary and based on the same theory that at these levels that the Noise Insulation Regulations are triggered). Of course barriers (probably buildings) may reduce façade levels at facades that would otherwise need protection in an unprotected situation)
4. The following comments apply to M40 noise and that from Daws Hill Lane. Any private gardens or space provided for amenity needs to meet the WHO minimum

outdoor living area standard of 55 dB LAeq 16 hour daytime and we would expect this to be met by providing these areas in the shadow of building in the areas subject to higher noise levels.

5. You refer to the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) and it would be helpful if you could refer to the emerging policy to extend this area (see Modelling Assessment of Air Quality along the M40 for Wycombe District Council, December 2010 at <http://www.wycombe.gov.uk/council-services/environment/pollution/air-pollution/air-quality-management.aspx>) which refers to an area up to 60 metres from the carriageway. With regard to the above I do have some concerns about a CHP system in this area and I think this needs to make reference to the AQMA and recommend a full assessment of the air quality implications of any system is carried out and that this should have no detrimental effect on the objectives of the AQMA in achieving the governments air quality objectives.
6. Green roofs can be good for promoting biodiversity. We are pleased to see SUDS and grey water and rainwater harvesting are all part of the planned sustainability measures.
7. Also this is an opportunity for solar panels to be built into housing roofs as standard.
8. No business units should be developed on the site unless a real need can be proven. There are empty units at the Cressex commercial estate and in the centre of Wycombe empty shops/offices. There is no consideration of the noise and increase in traffic flow the sizeable proposal would create, adding to the existing major problems
9. As already commented the M40 noise levels stated do not reflect reality as adverse weather conditions frequently generate intolerable noise levels in the garden and at night when it is necessary to close windows as far away as Sandford Gardens. Noise mitigation actions need to be taken.
10. Not if you include business units under sustainability.
11. Sustainability: Taylor Wimpey raises no objection to the requirement to deliver a minimum of 15% reduction in carbon emissions on site via the use of renewable or low carbon sources. However, they do not consider Combined Heat and Power or grey water recycling to be appropriate here. In respect of CHP the scheme would be too low density to support it and it would require the installation of a very large chimney with visual intrusion consequences, while grey water recycling brings with it significant maintenance issues. These elements should be removed from the requirements.
12. Noise: The day and night noise exposure categories indicated on Figure 4.1.4 are based upon measurements carried out in 2008. Taylor Wimpey's acoustic consultants, AIRO, have very recently undertaken new surveys and produced updated drawings showing the Day and Night Noise Exposure Categories across the site. Compared to the ones that are presently shown in Figures 4.1.4 the updated versions show the NEC C boundary closer to the roads i.e. less of the site falls within the area affected by noise. The previous drawings were based on measurements carried out in 2008 which would also have been affected by a lot more activity on the site itself rather than just the motorway and Daws Hill Lane. These up-dated drawings are enclosed and Taylor Wimpey request that Figure 4.1.4 is updated to show the new noise exposure zones.
13. Air Quality: Based upon the background assessments undertaken on behalf of Taylor Wimpey there are no air quality constraints to the development of the site.

7 – Activity and land uses

7.1 - Do you agree with this approach to the residential element of the site?

Yes	6	No	53
-----	---	----	----

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. Density Issues

- 1) The site density should mirror that of the existing residential area of Daws Hill, so as to blend in with the surrounding area and context. **(15)**
- 2) Potential housing numbers/density too high and will not relate well to existing development pattern/density that exists in Daws Hill **(13)**
- 3) A density of 30 dwellings per hectare leads to 450 homes. There is no compelling evidence that the traffic infrastructure and the utility infrastructure can support this. Until such evidence is provided, either planning permission should be delayed, or refused, or the number of homes should be restricted pro rata to avoid worsening traffic congestion. **(12)**
- 4) It is a significant concern that the council has not put an upper limit on density of the dwellings to ensure that the site is not over-developed. **(11)**
- 5) The majority of the surrounding Daws Hill neighbourhoods have a significantly lower density of housing and given the nature of the environment, mature trees, existing congested road infrastructure it would be more beneficial to see a less dense development that was more in keeping with the surrounding neighbourhoods and less likely to put pressure on the already congested road and town infrastructure of Wycombe. **(11)**
- 6) Housing density should be no more than 30 dwellings per hectare to maintain the character of the area. **(5)**
- 7) It will prove very difficult to achieve the councils broad aims and retain the character of the area with a density above 30 dph. A figure of 15 dph is more realistic.**(2)**
- 8) The statement in Local Plan Policy H8 "...a net density of less than 30 dwellings per hectare is unacceptable" is based on a policy of the previous government that is not being enforced by the current government. It should therefore be given little weight, and what little it does carry should be balanced by the caveat "...except where site specific circumstances will not allow the general development and housing policies in this plan to be satisfied." Daws Hill is indeed a unique site whose character would be irrevocably damaged and infrastructure problems exacerbated by intensive development. As stated in our response to 4.1 response #4 above, the minimum requirement for 30 dph should be removed as a requirement of the Development Brief and replaced by a maximum of 20 dph. Consequently 7.1 para 2 should be removed or reworded and para 3

amended. In para 5, "... scope for the provision of extra care elderly person's accommodation" should be replaced by "...requirement for the provision of...".(2)

- 9) Because of site specific circumstances (trees and other constraints), an overall average minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare should not be mandatory, and indeed such a scenario is allowed for in the wording of Policy H8. What emerges should flow from appropriate high quality design making efficient use of land whilst respecting constraints – might be more or less than 30.
- 10) I am not convinced that the aims of this brief can be fulfilled if the density of housing is anything like that proposed eg Tree retention, sufficient parking, traffic solutions, character etc.
- 11) We are opposed to the density of construction, proposed for the site. The aim of building in keeping with the local area and within the constraints of the local and overall road infrastructure, should be adhered to. The development cannot be viewed in isolation, but must be seen in the wider context of Wycombe as a whole. The road infrastructure is a limiting factor, that must not be ignored, irrespective of the partial solutions being offered by the SQTs.
- 12) The objective of 30 dwellings per hectare is simply not sustainable infrastructure wise particularly in the light of needing an integrated plan for the whole town.
- 13) The aims of this brief cannot be fulfilled if the density of housing is anything like that proposed eg Tree retention, sufficient parking, traffic solutions, character etc.
- 14) Although we agree broadly to the aims in Section 7.1 we would qualify this. Should it not prove possible to achieve the required density without the removal of good quality, mature trees, hence destroying the character of the area for ever we would urge our officers to reconsider the minimum density requirement.
- 15) I disagree with the local Plan Policy H8 – *a net density of less than 30 dwellings per hectare is unacceptable*. This depends on the site and the ability to get people on and off the site and the characteristics of the area in which it is positioned. A ruling of this nature has led to some horrendous developments. On this site there should be no flats.
- 16) I believe it will prove very difficult to achieve WDC's broad aims and retain the character of the area by developing the site with a density of 30 dwellings or more per hectare. A development similar to Kingshill Gate (by Taylor Wimpey), scaled to fit RAF Daws Hill, and including affordable/retirement accommodation. These options were presented, discussed and received majority recommendations in workshop 2. Why have they not been carried forward into the design brief?
- 17) This high density of dwellings also presents a high risk of blighting the beautiful views from below and across the valley. The Rye and its back drop of mature woodland which rises steeply to the Daws Hill site is a unique asset to town and one that must be protected. It is difficult to see from the concept proposals if the top tree line will be affected particularly the northern boundary. We would hope that the final plans will therefore ensure that boundary trees are retained and the height of buildings cannot be seen when viewed from below and across the valley.

18) Merit in the brief including an anticipated dwelling range (suggest 450 to 550) which will strike the correct balance between making efficient use of the site and ensuring compliance with national and strategic policy and meeting the objectives of the brief.

2. What proof does the council have that the available utility infrastructure can support the site? **(11)**
3. We also have concerns regarding the provision of utilities for the site, especially in view of the comments in section 7.10 Waste, where deficiencies are identified and also in section 7.12 where it is stated the waste water network is close to capacity and localised upgrades of the water supply network will be required
4. Given the treelines and beauty of the surrounding area, restrictions should be included on the height of buildings to 2-3 stories and below the mature tree lines, to ensure they are not visible from the surrounding area and hillside, to maintain the beauty of the natural woodland surroundings/treeline. **(11)**
5. Given the large number of flats recently built in the High Wycombe area, flats should not be built on this site as there are none in the surrounding area.
6. Retain existing dwellings on the site **(5)**
7. Querying the mix of affordable housing (specifically need for 15% to be 4 or more bedroom houses)
8. It is difficult to retain the character of the area.
9. Clause included that agrees to no further development of the Abbey Barn area in future.
10. Support the provision of elderly persons' and retirement accommodation on the site bearing in mind the ageing population of the country. I cannot see why 100% of the houses cannot be built to Lifetime Homes standards rather than 30%. As stated above, I am not convinced of the need for a "mixed community" on this site, whilst I would support there being a suitable range of house types in High Wycombe as a whole.
11. In the introduction to section 7, the reference to business use should be removed.
12. Need to include provision for viability testing as per the Planning Policy Agreement.

7.2 - Do you agree with this approach? Have you alternative proposals which are realistic, deliverable and of substantial benefit to the local economy?

Yes	32	No	26
-----	----	----	----

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. We question the need for this size of business area adjacent to the residential development, given the extent of unoccupied business units in the area. We would have thought that businesses on the site would generate a net increase in traffic, because the reduction in traffic from local residents employed in the business area will be minimal. **(11)**
2. Bearing in mind the existing empty commercial space locally and the residential nature of this area, together with the proposals at Handy Cross and Abbey Barn South, this is not the right location for a business centre. Incentives to use

existing facilities would be better, eg grants to alter upgrade? **(2)**

3. No business units should be developed on the site. Where they are proposed to be sited is right on the boundary of an AONB, which is to be avoided. There is no business case stated for such units, other than a conceptual policy to invest in jobs. The adjacent site of Handy Cross, with dedicated business units proposed, is much more appropriate.**(2)**
4. Questioning the quantum of business development (is it appropriate for the site).
5. No need for business units on the site
6. This site should have no business units, it should be restricted to residential use.
7. Highlights vacancies at Cressex Business Park
8. The tone and wording of 7.2 seem to indicate a more active push for business development than the modest linked element contained in PS8 – see no justification for such a change in emphasis. Access constraints, not a good location for business which attracts in-commuters or HGVs so a cautious and organic approach seeking to match new jobs and businesses to new homes is required.
9. Low key business use will be acceptable, but not uses which create / attract significant traffic flows or heavy / large vehicles.
10. Commercial units have been proposed on a quality housing development, which is supposed to reflect and be in keeping with the surrounding Daws Hill area. Discounting the number proposed and classification, such additions will not enhance the site. The additional traffic generated and dumbing down of the development would not be acceptable.
11. The LSH survey, commissioned by WDC, states that for the purposes of the survey they have combined the Daws Hill development with the greenfield site Abbey Barn South and recommend a combined allocation of 10000 sq. mts between both sites. Abbey Barn South is the larger site but as it is designated green field site and not going to be released for building in the near future it would appear that a disproportional allocation of commercial units has been put forward for the Daws Hill site. The LSH also states and I quote: “Access to the sites is limited by the residential approach. Ideally any new development will have direct access from the M40 motorway; however, we understand that this is not feasible. Therefore, any new development will require an upgrade in the existing access route”. The DHB only states B1 class units. B1 classification also includes B1(c) Light Industrial, if units of this nature were included on the site they would generate yet more traffic, including large courier lorries, which the Daws Hill area would be unable to accommodate without the significant upgrades mentioned in the LSH survey. Therefore no commercial units should be considered on the site without an acceptable upgrade in the road system.
12. Business use of this site (aside from limited small-scale retail use) appears not to be supported by local residents or by the developer. It would be impossible to adequately constrain the type of commercial use that might ensue, with unpredictable effects on additional traffic generation. For example, if part of the site is designated for B1 use, it can be changed without planning permission to B8 use, which includes distribution centres that would be massive traffic generators. WDC’s survey of employment development sites by Lambert Smith Hampton makes explicit why further additional business premises are not required in Wycombe at this time: “In comparison a slight improvement in office take up was seen during 2008 following lettings at the Artisan Building in High Wycombe and Sutherland House in Bourne End totalling 5,575 square metres. Whilst an uplift in

office take up was seen in 2008, this was not continued in 2009, which has seen very little office demand due to the “credit crunch”. There is currently 46,265 square metres of available office space within the Wycombe District. Availability did not grow significantly during 2009, compared to an 11% increase during 2008. At current levels, the availability rate in Wycombe stands at an estimated 14.7%, a level at which the market can be said to be currently over-supplied. When the availability rate exceeds 8% a market is generally said to be well supplied and rental levels tend to stagnate or even can decline as this rate increases.” Section 7.2 should be removed from the Development Brief. **(2)**

13. Whilst having no objection to business units in principle, I believe creating up to 500 jobs in Daws Hill will have a detrimental impact upon the centre of the town which core strategy indicates should be a priority. Added to this there will be increased transport pressure on Daws Hill Lane and Marlow Hill etc, which is normally outside of school hours.
14. There is not a local demand to increase the number of commercial properties and especially located them within a residential area. It will also increase the traffic volumes and aggravate the grid lock that is likely to occur during rush hours.
15. Daws Hill Lane is a residential area. I do not understand, therefore, why the larger part of the business units are to be built on the RAF Daws Hill site rather than on the larger Abbey Barn site.
16. If built the units must be restricted to office use and not light industrial or other uses. My preference is to limit RAF Daws Hill to residential development, given the current over-supply of commercial premises in High Wycombe.
17. If retirement or sheltered housing formed a large part of the development this would help solve both the traffic problems as well as providing employment opportunities. I point out that EMI units are desperately needed in this area, again providing significant employment opportunities.
18. We have reservations with the proposed business use as stated in this section stemming from the classes of BI use not being specified. Whilst we fully appreciate officers would protect the community at large from B1(c) light industrial uses generating excess noise, fumes etc. it is not clear whether the possibility of B1 use of all classes for units of less than 235m² being changed to B8 use by permitted development has been considered. Should B1 use be allowed we feel that planning conditions preventing the change of use to B8 particularly Distribution Centres should be imposed due to the increased traffic movements such use would generate.
19. Agree that businesses should be included within the site. Aids in the reduction of private car use and impacts on M40 Junction 4 by creating a level of containment.
20. Question the rationale for including business development in the brief and request that the employment section is removed (detailed critique provided by consultants to Taylor Wimpey included in response). Note the overwhelming negative views from local residents, councillors and interest groups.

7.3 - Do you agree with the approach to the provision of education facilities?

Yes	7	No	53
-----	---	----	----

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. Insufficient secondary places in the area (29)

- 1) Additional 550 dwellings plus the future Abbey Barn development are far too many for the area and generate excessive extra demand for secondary places
- 2) There is no provision for development money to be given to the closest local secondary schools, including John Hampden, Wycombe High and The Royal Grammar School, all of which are likely to see increased demand for places.
- 3) How has it been established that there will be a need for primary school but not a secondary school? This does not make sense. At the very least the primary children will eventually reach eleven and need secondary education. Will funding to existing schools really work? Provision should be made to include primary children from Daws Hill families too or is the new school to be exclusive? **(2)**

2. Timing of Primary School Development

- 1) Not having sufficient school places in Daws Hill early in the development will lead to increased congestion to school drop offs across Wycombe, given the limited number of places available. **(14)**
- 2) The plans to building a primary school halfway through the development timeframe seem to be far too late. Education infrastructure should precede residential development especially as existing capacity (school places) is extremely constrained in Wycombe. School building/development late in the development timeframe will result in additional strain on existing resources (which are already operating at capacity with very limited places) and will lower the quality of life for existing and new residents and will ultimately impact on the quality of the education and futures of children. **(12)**
- 3) The on-site school needs to be built early to ensure that the first homes do not “export” children to surrounding schools, thereby adding to traffic congestion. **(11)**
- 4) We believe that the primary school should be built in the initial stages of the development and places should be allocated to local residents first.

3. Impact on Existing Primary Schools

- 1) Before a school is built on site, logically St Augustine’s should be the preferred school being the nearest and within walking distance, however this is a denominational school and as such will not be the first choice of school for many parents. Also the availability of places for non-Catholic children which might be available to residents of the RAF Daws Hill site in the admissions process is not indicated here.
- 2) In our opinion Marsh, Hannah Ball and Beechview primary schools cannot be considered to be nearby to the RAF Daws Hill site. By public transport two buses are required, one into High Wycombe and another out again or by private transport a journey through congested areas. In fact probably the easiest journeys are through Abbey Barn Lane or Spring Lane in Flackwell Heath. Parents from the RAF Daws Hill site will look carefully at the popular schools and the ease of transporting their child to and from school. It is therefore highly likely that the two primary schools in Flackwell Heath will be chosen. In consequence these very popular

schools may become heavily oversubscribed and due to the rigorous school admissions policy, children from Flackwell Heath may not receive their first choice of village school and could even be allocated a place outside the village with the knock on effect of even more traffic movement.

4. Also cause additional traffic movements as older children move to existing secondary schools or further afield in Wycombe if existing secondary schools which are at capacity, cannot admit additional children. **(2)**
5. Any new primary school should be located near the drop off point (and community facilities) and not adjacent to Abbey Barn South.
6. Once settled into a school, parents are unlikely to move a child until the natural age break; hence we would expect any school on site to take time to build up its numbers operating at less than optimum capacity for some time. To operate in this manner extra funding will be required, this should be carefully calculated and be taken into account in the Developer Contributions.
7. At secondary level parental choice will determine where students study and hence vehicular movements as many of these will be by private transport. This will be exacerbated as St Bernard's, Wycombe High School and John Hampden Grammar School have rigorous admissions policies / standards which many students will not meet despite these schools being their nearest and within walking distance.
8. Agree with provision of educational facilities as it helps to create a level of containment and help reduce impacts on M40 Junction 4.
9. The approach proposed towards the provision of education facilities is considered appropriate subject to the contributions sought being justified.

7.4 - What facilities in particular do you think should be provided at the local centre?

1. Doctor's surgery, pharmacy, newsagent/small shop **(33)**
2. No fast food, off licence or betting shops (pharmacy and convenience store preferred) **(23)**
3. Friendly quality public house serving food. / restaurant **(11)**
4. A corner shop with long opening hours.**(8)**
5. Costa coffee outlet. **(6)**
6. A coffee shop **(4)**
7. Fast food / restaurants /pubs will again deprive Wycombe's existing local businesses of trade; so these should not be provided. **(7)**
8. There are adequate facilities in Flackwell Heath which will have two small supermarkets, PO, pharmacy newsagents etc which would no doubt welcome extra trade. **(3)**
9. Disagree with locating close to Daws Hill Lane due to visual impact
10. Welcome proposed provision of a police facility
11. A 'Tesco Express' type concept selling newspapers, groceries, post office and pharmaceutical items with dispensary would be welcome.
12. Need to prevent risk of parking/waiting on Daws Hill Lane

13. Range suggested is good and hopefully the Council will bind the developer by legal agreement to providing and retaining these.
14. All other necessary amenities would be in Wycombe Town Centre anyway-which will produce additional daily traffic movements.
15. Well-equipped youth club
16. Cash point, internet café
17. A major store would be inappropriate on this site due to the proximity of others in the area and the large volumes of vehicular movements it would generate to and from the site.
18. Possibly businesses such as a restaurant and hairdressers, although the suggested external area of 60m² would be rather small for a restaurant.
19. A post office, although this may not be viable, unless combined with another business. Again size may be prohibitive.
20. A multiuse community centre which could house a nursery school and youth facilities for example.
21. Supermarket chains are most welcome
22. Make sure there are suitable sustainable transport facilities to help enhance the level of sustainable travel proposed at the site.
23. Taylor Wimpey considers the uses suggested for the local centre to be appropriate subject to market testing and viability. Taylor Wimpey have no objection to the inclusion of a retail unit within the centre subject to compliance with relevant retail policy tests.

7.5 - What community facilities in particular do you think should be provided as part of this development?

1. Meeting facility for up to 250 people. **(8)**
2. Meeting facility for around 200 people with basic catering equipment, **(2)**
3. Community centre. **(2)**
4. Community centre needs to be located in the centre of the new development
5. Multi-functional community hall and nursery.
6. Surgery **(2)**
7. Small-scale entertainment venue.**(2)**
8. Provision of facilities for elderly people (day centre etc) and for young people (Scouts, Guides, Cadets) as well as recreational sport, is supported. **(2)**
9. Children's nursery as part of the school.**(2)**
10. Cycle paths within development and to/from High Wycombe town centre, good quality play area for children, doctors surgery, good bus links to High Wycombe town centre, train station and the new proposed coachway & park and ride at Handy Cross.
11. Youth club for teenagers.

- 12. Will the available doctor surgeries in the area be sufficient?
- 13. This question is academic, Daws Hill cannot support a development of the size proposed.
- 14. Considerable attention has been given to the benefits of a proposed Community Centre, both in terms of providing retail outlets and a community meeting place. These would give a "heart" to the community. We consider that there are plenty of facilities provided in the Wycombe area and residents should be encouraged to use these, therefore putting more into the Wycombe community.
- 15. Providing facilities for indoor sports (e.g. badminton and indoor bowls)
- 16. None
- 17. Taylor Wimpey is intending to include a new multi-functional community building, together with a replacement air cadet facility.

7.6 - Do you agree with the level of open space provision? What facilities in particular should be provided?

Yes	45	No	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes in principle, however it should preserve and enhance the existing parkland features and tree lined avenues within the area. (22) 2. Preservation of the existing parkland features, trees and tree-lined avenues within the area should be encouraged, thus not making a significant change to the site or the environment. This would then mean that the existing wildlife would be maintained. (16) 3. Child and Teenage woodland themed play areas similar to that on the Rye Park – sensitively worked in with existing woodland. We think some open green park space used as community area works extremely well to build a community (as demonstrated on the Warren Wood estate) if it is available to be used by residents for community events: Summer BBQs, Family Fun days, Jubilee events etc. (12) 4. Open space and green space include the creation of green corridors to safeguard wildlife and encourage biodiversity – joining up woodlands and the Chilterns and minimising dangerous road crossings for wildlife. (10) 5. Open space provision could usefully be increased in all categories. Attractive public informal space is in good supply at present, and as much as possible should be retained. (2) 6. I think there should be some open space provision within the high density area, particularly play space so parents can supervise their children near to their homes and not have to cross the indicated main road through the site. (2) 7. The final sentence of sub-section 7.6 should say “ecological potential and/or historic interest”. 8. Outdoor sports facilities should be recreational rather than attracting spectators. 9. With regard to play spaces I would recommend that this makes reference to adequate separation distances from private dwellings and gardens to ensure no adverse effect on amenity. 10. Networks of multi-functional greenspace providing a wide range of environmental and quality of life benefits should be designed into all new regeneration schemes from their outset. Natural England see suitable green infrastructure as an 			

opportunity to provide enhanced landscape setting and to relate development to landscape character, place and context. Open space could be provided in the form of 'green fingers' which thread through the built development as a corridor for wildlife and people. Street trees also form an attractive and functional element of urban streets, helping to define their character. Planting should be of native species with a continuous canopy if possible. This will maximise the habitat potential for birds and insects. Street trees should also be planted as semi mature standards at around 10 years old, as at this age they are less easily vandalised.

11. Facilities should include: Football, cricket and hockey pitches, designed to fit in with existing parkland nature of the site. Outdoor exercise equipment (e.g. steppers) Children's play area with equipment.
12. We agree in principal with the open space provision but this should enhance and preserve the existing features, the creation of woodland walks may help with this. There should be provision for outdoor all age youth facilities to serve the whole area. This should include facilities such as those for BMX bikers as well as the more usual play equipment.
13. Allotments and sports pitches could be used to mitigate noise issues from other facilities.
14. Picnic areas and nature trails.
15. Clarification requested regarding open space requirements for employees as well as residents (TW propose to utilise the open space created for the residential element). Open space on site is to be provided based upon a standard of 4.45 per 1,000 population. In order to provide certainty it is suggested that there would be benefit in clarifying how the future population of the development is to be calculated. The normal rule of thumb is to calculate population based upon 2.5 persons per dwelling and is it requested that this approach be adopted and confirmation of the given within the text in **Section 7.6**. In addition Taylor Wimpey would also like to make the following comments:
 - o Given the adequacy of existing and proposed sports facilities within the local area, it is believed that only one playing pitch is justified. However, to ensure that the overall standard is met there would be a compensatory overprovision of the park and semi-natural greenspace.
 - o The standard expects provision of allotments; however provision for these is not anticipated by Figure 4.1.6 Land Budget Plan. Accordingly, the reference to allotments in the standard should be deleted.

16.

7.7 - Does this brief include the right transport measures? Is there anything else the development should provide?

Yes	5	No	54
-----	---	----	----

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. Proposed enhancements to road junctions are insufficient to improve the existing traffic congestion problems, let alone to adequately mitigate the traffic arising from the developments. Compelling evidence needs to be provided by BCC. The forecasts for the traffic the development will create, I believe, are well underestimated due to the lack of alternative transport and the need to travel to

work and schools. **(13)**

2. Emphasis on cycling will have a minimal contribution – we have hills! **(13)**
3. Travel Plans have negligible relevance; it is known that local schools are abandoning such initiatives, which deliver low value. They cannot be a credible element of any strategic plan. **(11)**
4. Footpaths and cycle routes. The provision of enhanced footpath and cycleway links through the woods requires much more explanation and definition. Which woods? What will it join up with? Are existing footpaths to be redesignated to allow cycling? This proposal doesn't seem to have been thought through and should be deleted from the brief. Adding additional footpaths in principle will damage the woodland and wildlife through fragmentation by allowing greater access to people. Improvement of the existing footpaths should be considered only. **(11)**
5. As stated earlier in our response, we think the transport and congestion issues are underplayed in the brief. Resolving the school drop-off is not the only issue that needs to be completed early on in the development; all the other road improvements must also be completed if the area is not to grind to a halt during peak traffic times. **(11)**
 - 1) Measures identified in the SQTS seem insufficient to resolve traffic congestion either now or in the future. In sections 7.7.3 and 7.7.4, the reliance on cycling (and, to some extent, walking) improvements is not credible due to the hilly nature of the site and its location up a steep slope from the town centre. The "woodland walk" through Deangarden Wood is an irrelevance. Section 7.7.5: The possibility of Abbey Barn South being developed in the future should not be a constraint on achieving the highest possible quality for the Daws Hill development. References to ABS should be removed. There is no obvious solution to road infrastructure problems that would not impact negatively elsewhere. It is therefore vital to keep the traffic generation potential of the site to a minimum by limiting the number of dwellings permitted.**(2)**
 - 2) Unless amelioration measures are taken, the 1000-3000 extra vehicles on the development will cause further congestion. To overcome this, part of the site should be set aside as a park-and-ride to take existing vehicles off Daws Hill Lane to transfer to a coach service to/from Cressex Industrial Estate. A ratio of one park-and-ride place to two new vehicles appears realistic.
 - 3) Concern re existing traffic congestion on Daws Hill Lane
 - 4) The addition of 550 dwellings at RAF Daws Hill will generate far more traffic movements than suggested by the consultants and create gridlock at the rush hour times especially because of the influence of the school traffic. Half the number of houses would be a more reasonable figure to make the new development viable as well as more in keeping to the local environment and reduce the loss of many trees.
 - 5) No, additional traffic is inevitable. This will increase traffic to the already congested area. Proposal for bus lane and cycle lane will not help resolve this issue. Cycling in Wycombe is difficult and the use of additional bus lane will cause nuisance, yet will not eliminate the additional car users.
 - 6) Welcome the inclusion of junctions 3 and 4 of the M40 in the list of junctions /routes that will be assessed in the transport assessment. The HA has previously noted that the Handy Cross development at the sports

centre site might mean that there is little or no remaining capacity at M40 Junction 4 making further development in the area difficult to accommodate . The HA therefore would welcome engagement with the council on the transport assessment of the site and its implications on junction 4 in particular.

- 7) Concerned transport mitigation measures in brief nor clearly presented and therefore RAF Daws Hill site will not deliver required transport improvements. Assessment of transport measures at para 7.7.2 should be requirement of RAF Daws Hill proposals. Need explicit requirements for RAF Daws Hill to deliver :

- East and west school drop off areas;
- Direct bus, pedestrian and cycle links between the site and Handy Cross Hub;
- Improvements to the junction at Daws Hill Lane and Marlow Hill;

6. Daws Lea Proposal

- 1) Objects to Daws Lea bus route (adding to M40 noise, air pollution) safety for pedestrians - children and residents of the nursing home **(9)**
- 2) Bus lane through Daws Lea will make the road unsafe, increase noise and pollution
- 3) We feel we need to see evidence of a study regarding the effect of a public bus route through Daws Lea on the residents. Clearly should such a route be constructed through Daws Lea as shown on page 20 and 21 this would open Daws Lea to the potential for through traffic. We question the suitability of Daws Lea for such a use and would wish to see measures taken to prevent this.
- 4) Taylor Wimpey has serious concerns with the deliverability, cost benefit and impact of a direct public transport link with bus priority school drop-off and high quality cycling/walking routes to the planned Handy Cross hub. This is set out in more detail in the accompanying comments by PBA.

7. School Drop Off

- 1) Locate school drop off for all St Augustines/ St Bernards pupils on Daws Hill site negating need for Daws Lea link **(4)**
- 2) We would suggest that the school drop off point on the RAF Daws Hill site is completed with the first phase of housing and brought into use as soon as possible. We agree it should be as near the schools as possible to encourage use.
- 3) As well as sufficient drop off/pick up parking on site, deterrents essential to prevent school parking, cars and buses, in Knights Templar Way. **(2)**
- 4) It should alleviate the school drop off issue without impacting on other members of the community (i.e. bus lane)
- 5) 7.7.1 School drop off: the need for a Western school link drop off and the Eastern drop off proposed at the RAF Daws Hill site is accepted. Proposing a bus lane through Daws Lea is unnecessary and will seriously affect the residents living in Daws Lea. The buses should run along Daws Hill Lane as at present. The school buses should be directed off Daws Hill Lane to the schools they are serving and then pass through to Handy

Cross Sports Centre area to exit on to the Marlow Road but School Close should not be used. Access to Handy Cross should be via a new access road between the schools and the M40. This will allow easy access to the new facilities proposed at the Handy Cross hub. The proposed new access point on Daws Hill Lane for access to and from the RAF Daws Hill site and the improved footway for the Eastern school drop off point are accepted as necessary.

6) We agree congestion at peak times is exacerbated by school buses and parents of St Augustine's and St Bernard's Schools' children who drop them off and pick them up in the Daws Hill Lane area. However we feel arranging school drop off points elsewhere in the area will not mitigate this problem as much as anticipated unless it is enforced. Without enforcement we anticipate the percentage take up of the school drop off point on the RAF Daws Hill site will be greater than that off the Sports Centre Access Road due to the shorter distance from the schools. The provision of a shorter, dedicated footpath from the Sports Centre Access Road area may help to mitigate this.

7) Strong objection to a Western school drop off as

- it would increase traffic to an unacceptable level for Cressex /Daws Hill residents
- it would cause huge delays to our access and egress of the estate,
- noise pollution would increase to unacceptable levels, causing reduced quality of life
- The scheme is ill considered in conjunction with the sport centre redevelopment. Can a direct transport link run along side the M40 motorway to the sports centre with suitable health and safety measures considered for Daws Lea residents? **(3)**

8. Specific queries re rights of way (new and proposed) between Daws Hill and Warren Wood

9. Only have one vehicular access to the site (in vicinity of existing access) plus one pedestrian access at western end of the site

10. Private car usage by the residents of the proposed development has not been adequately addressed.

11. Improvements to Winchbottom Lane, including anything which would change its quiet rural character or make Winchbottom Lane/Abbey Barn Lane a main through route should be excluded from any transport strategy.

12. Would not support any "improvement" to Winchbottom Lane, which is currently a lovely rural backwater (rather than a rat run). I consider that footpaths along Daws Hill Lane should be appropriately provided / widened to allow for the safe passage of school children.

13. A new road allowing access out to 404 towards Marlow and a new road from the development leading down to High Wycombe town centre taking traffic away from Daws Hill Lane area which is already unable to cope with the quantity of traffic at peak times.

14. Public transport by bus will have little impact for commuters using Daws Hill as a base for travelling all around the Thames Valley and SE.

15.7.7.3 Public transport: an improved public transport frequency is essential. As a frequent user of the number 36 bus it does not create any significant delay to traffic. It also takes little time to turn left at the Marlow Hill traffic lights and then

stop outside the High School. If there is a demand for the number 36 to go via the Handy Cross hub then it should follow the same route as the school buses.

- 16.7.7.2 Off site road improvements: The left turn from Daws Hill Lane into Marlow Hill must be improved. The proposal to introduce a junction 3A on the M40 to cater for Oxford direction traffic will relieve Daws Hill Lane and should therefore be pursued urgently to ensure it is open long before the new development is completed. Every effort should be made to reduce noise from the M40 with low noise surfacing and acoustic barriers as residents have endured a big increase in disturbance over the years and the addition of a new development will significantly increase the number of people affected. Noise disturbance bands shown take no account of weather conditions which does increase noise to intolerable levels.
- 17.7.7.4 Footpaths & cycleways: an improvement to footpaths and the provision for cycle lanes between the Handy Cross hub and Flackwell Heath should be considered. This should encourage the use of cycles from the new RAF Daws Hill site as well as other residential areas off Daws Hill Lane.
- 18.7.7.5 On site transport: ok as proposed.
19. We realise there is no one solution to the traffic issues in this area, however we feel that to only be looking at the issues for 10 years is somewhat short-sighted and that perhaps more radical solutions need to be explored now and implemented as soon as possible, particularly as this could prove more beneficial financially in the long term.
20. This is the most important issue! Existing transport infrastructure is already inadequate. The Southern Quadrant Transport Strategy must be agreed and proven to be adequate for future predicted transport needs, before agreeing the details of the RAF development.
21. We believe the transport measures (both WDC and BCC) are inadequate to cope with the extra traffic generated by the RAF Daws Hill development alone, and wholly unable to cope with the combination of the RAF Daws Hill development in conjunction with the Sport Centre re-development.
22. Why move one apparent traffic problem to another area, just to appease one set of residents and upset a new set?

7.8-12 - Do you agree with the approach taken towards health; emergency services; waste and utilities?

Yes	22	No	22
-----	----	----	----

If no, please give your reasons below:

1. As stated earlier in our response, the drainage issue needs more emphasis. **(11)**
 - 1) Concern that local infrastructure cannot cope (already under strain)
 - 2) Particular care must be taken about land drainage. Weather events were forecast some years ago to become more severe, and this is being seen in practice. Concreting/tarmac-ing over large areas of previously porous land, particularly land on top of a hill, coupled with more intense rainfall (4 inches in a 24-hour period is now becoming much less rare) is a recipe for disaster unless very large volumes of surface water can be transported safely away from the site to a river with proper flood prevention measures. Do such facilities exist, or will development of this site cause flooding

problems elsewhere in the Wycombe area?

2. This is not clear in the proposals at present
 - 1) I am concerned that insufficient research has been obtained.
3. A comprehensive pharmacy/doctors surgery with adequate parking should be factored in.
 - 1) There should be a Doctors surgery on the site as it is currently necessary to travel by car to the existing surgeries.
 - 2) With the closure of the Cherrymead Surgery in Flackwell Heath a new doctors' surgery and pharmacy should be provided as part of this development.
 - 3) Health Facilities – We have concerns where the residents of this site would find a doctor and NHS dentist. At present many of the residents of the Daws Hill area use Flackwell Heath. However the closure of the Cherrymead Surgery in Flackwell Heath has led to a number of folk changing practices. As this closure is very recent we believe the full effect of this may not yet be apparent and in any event at present the Hawthornden Practice can only take a limited number of new patients, so we feel this needs very careful consideration as does the provision of NHS dental services.
 - 4) On the basis of the workshop outputs and reference group meetings, we are not entirely convinced that the health, dental, education and emergency services have been adequately defined in the context of what is available for current Daws Hill residents. For example, Cherrymead surgery has closed and moved to Loudwater, there are no NHS dentists in the Daws Hill area or Flackwell Heath (where the 30-40% of affordable housing residents will want to apply to).
 - 5) Whilst acknowledging the status of RAF Daws Hill as a brown field site which must be developed prior to green field, the indicated size of the development along with the redevelopment of Handy Cross cannot be sustained by the present transport infrastructure.
4. Is there sufficient capacity for utilities/ can broadband capacity be increased to support home working objectives whilst not impacting on broadband provision to existing community.
5. Should be a section about improved broadband provision appropriate for a new centre for houses and business.
6. The removal of A&E and doctor led maternity wards from Wycombe General Hospital is a major concern in the light of planned increase in development and presumably population including young families in affordable housing.
7. I understand that Taylor-Wimpey have rejected the idea of a heat-and-power plant on the site. The new development should be built to carbon-zero principles with very high levels of insulation, grey-water systems to minimise use of mains water (particularly given the current problems with mains water supply), and building waste-heat recovery systems.
8. All commercial areas should provide recharging facilities for electric vehicles.
9. We would support a police presence on this site, we are only sorry that Flackwell Heath lost its police presence some time ago.
10. We have concerns regarding the existing deficiencies in household waste and

recycling centres, with the waste water network being close to capacity and also upgrading being needed in the water supply network. Clearly these issues need attention if any further development is to take place.

11. Please ensure that all utilities for the Marlow Hill / Daws Hill communities are sufficiently supported/warned well in advance, as this was not done previously.
12. Taylor Wimpey considers the approach proposed towards health, emergency services, waste and utilities to be an appropriate one.

8 – Any further comments?

1. The timetable for all the off-site road improvements needs to be stated with all key assumptions and rationale clearly stated. **(12)**
 - 1) Impact of various other development proposals including Sports Centre in combination with Daws Hill will lead to significant cumulative negative impacts in transport terms
 - 2) Pick up/drop off on the John Hampden side of the road to reduce inbound traffic into the Sports Centre side of the road?
 - 3) One way road from Daws Lea Lane exiting the Handy Cross roundabout side of the proposed Park and Ride? Return route as current.
 - 4) Are there any plans for pedestrian crossing from the estate into the Sports Centre as due to the traffic increase, especially during the school runs, it is very difficult to cross the road?
 - 5) Has there been any consideration into heavy good vehicle deliveries/access into the new supermarket?
 - 6) The Daws Hill area is a semi-rural suburban area characterised by substantial tree coverage and low housing densities. Maintaining and enhancing its ambience should be a priority of the new development. Because of the location of the development site close to Handy Cross, many if not most residents are likely to be commuters seeking access by car to the M40 east and west or the A404 south. This will impose significant extra pressure on what is already an overburdened road system, bringing the plan potentially into conflict with WDC Core Strategy Policy CS20, which states that development proposals: “Be appropriately located to the strategic road network and provide satisfactory vehicular access(es) to and from the area of development so that the convenience, safety, and free flow of traffic using public highways ... are not adversely affected. “Ensure that all vehicular traffic generated by future development does not materially increase traffic problems, for example, congestion...” These issues are best addressed through three key measures: Removing the requirement for a minimum housing density of 30 dph and replacing it with a maximum of 20 dph overall density, stipulating an upper limit of 300 dwellings for the site overall. Strengthening protection for existing attractive open space amenity features of the site—in particular trees. Requiring the inclusion of alternatives to general residential use that might generate less traffic, such as community elderly/care homes and student accommodation. **(2)**
 - 7) I would also like to see some acknowledgement of the additional congestion due to construction traffic during the development of the various sites in the Southern Quadrant and a plan to mitigate the impact.
 - 8) Access for emergency vehicles will be restricted unless adequate off-road provision is made for vehicle parking. Given the site’s location, each property must have a minimum of 2 off-road parking places, preferable 4 (two in garages and 2 in garage approaches).
 - 9) Further work needs to be done on the entrance to the site and the traffic infrastructure the current proposals are inadequate and not sustainable.
 - 10) The proposed road will have detrimental impacts on air quality / quietness for residents, as well as on property value. Proposed development at RAF Daws Hill should be a retirement village **(7)**

2. Dedicated access to Fair Ridge/ The Spinney (re Sports Centre development and proposal for bus link through Daws Lea) **(5)**
3. Proposals will lead to excessive development on RAF Daws Hill **(2)**
4. Unclear about the 'buffer' between existing homes that border the site and new on site homes. Taylor Wimpey's intentions were very clear that they would leave a buffer zone. However Brief 4.1 Key Responses, states 'Back new development onto residential boundary to protect existing rear boundaries and enhance existing tree belt through longer gardens'. (The existing tree belt being in the gardens of existing houses). As the close boarded fence bordering the site is now owned by Taylor Wimpey, I assume ownership will transfer to new householders on site whose gardens will back on to existing residences. **(2)**
5. Finally I UNDERSTAND THAT THIS SITE IS REGARDED AS A 'BROWNFIELD SITE' THEREFORE TOP OF THE LIST FOR REDEVELOPMENT. HOWEVER IT'S PREVIOUS USE MAKES IT A UNIQUE SITE. OCCUPATION BY THE MOD DID NOT IMPACT ON THE LOCAL NEIGHBOURHOOD OR ITS INFRASTRUCTURE. HIGH DENSITY HOUSING, COMMERCIAL CENTRE, BUSINESS USE WILL HAVE AN ENORMOUS IMPACT. **(2)**
6. The implementation of the redevelopment of the site has not been publicly addressed. If the whole site is to be demolished what is the impact for local residents? Dust, noise, physical removal of waste impacting on Daws Hill Lane, where will all this waste go and how will it get there? What is the time scale for demolition work and then construction work? I imagine this will take years so how will all this development work affect the value and saleability of our homes, particularly those bordering the site, should we need or want to move? **(2)**
7. The proposed plans would be a disaster for the local and surrounding areas. **(2)**
8. Security issues (potential opportunity for burglaries).
9. Adult learning centre?
10. Welcome proposed police facility – need to be kept informed about phasing of development to ensure timely delivery of facility (suggest phasing of development is incorporated into the development brief)
11. Any consideration for preserving the bunker that is on the site, has been thought of?
12. Are there any plans for a park or green space for children as there are no amenities in this area, e.g. swings etc. A lot of young families moved into the new estate and their children are forced to play outside on the street which does not appear to be safe as cars are constantly coming and leaving the estate.
13. Plans for a path circling the new development for jogging, walking, etc
14. As part of the introduction of new offices, there is an opportunity to bring fibre optic broadband, cable and data services into the area as the road will undoubtedly be dug up to provide connections from the Wycombe Exchange to the new development. This should be included to incentivise high-tech workers into the area.
15. A proportionate amount of land planted to woodland in the Abbey Barn area to compensate for the disturbance that this development will cause to existing woodland. This should be a general principle for all developments if the developments are not going to lead to a 'creeping' degradation of the environment. The expertise of organisations like the 'Woodlands Trust' should be called upon to provide advice.

16. Would like to see the demographic model which shows we need more residential, commercial and retail units above and beyond those vacant units throughout High Wycombe and the surrounding areas.
17. We will of course require a desktop study in respect of ground contamination in the first instance, and this may lead to further studies, investigations, remediation as necessary
18. Recommend within transport assessment (section 7.7.2) includes costing for future improvements and funding sources to ensure mitigation costs for potential highway infrastructure improvements can be met. Need to mention phasing to ensure right level of infrastructure is in place before occupation of the site. Agree a residential travel plan will be developed. Support the use of regular bus services and provision of footpaths/cycle routes to help reduce use of private car.
19. Concerns that insufficient information has been made available for community to assess DHDB/SQTS. Specific information requested in response concerning transport modelling, public transport options and appraisal, environmental impact assessment, planning policy frameworks and their approach to transport issues, details of the limit of the public highway for Daws Hill Lane and the A404 near the development, and recent personal injury accident history for Daws Hill Lane/A404.
20. Historic Assets – detailed points from Taylor Wimpey setting out concerns regarding the need to account for historical aspects and in particular the historic rides - it would be inappropriate and unduly onerous to require any development to re-use and reinstate the alignment of 'rides' as part of the overall master plan approach. To do so would impose a rigid design constraint that would undermine the shared aim of delivering a high quality mixed use development. It would, however, be possible to interpret this character as part of the detailed design, including the landscaping strategy, to preserve a 'memory' of this landscape character in the approach to the street layout, disposition of the buildings on site and their relationship to retained and proposed landscaping.
21. Note detailed supporting information submitted by Taylor Wimpey (employment issues report) and annotated version of the Daws Hill Development Brief.