

Hollands Farm Liaison Group meeting 3 notes 21.10.20

Introductions

Delay with getting DB out – IT issue. Not appropriate to discuss Development Brief today.

Options: Get update on things that have happened (e.g. CCG, Millboard Road, key things that have been brought forward that we need decisions on), as they shape where DB goes. Alternative is to defer meeting entirely. Colleagues have voted to carry on meeting today to update on issues.

Since having IT upgraded, can't print off documents – extremely useful because of sheet content that we are sent hard copies of DB.

Have another meeting later (Tuesday 3rd November 7pm – need to check it doesn't clash with Parish Council meetings).

Agenda:

Progress to date – completed draft of DB. Working with developers, now have Development Framework Plan / vision / objectives for site / principles for how development should take place.

Completed Appropriate Assessment – triggers need for HRA because of proximity to Burnham Beeches SAC. Requires mitigation package to be put together for Little Marlow Lakes Country Park. Sets out mitigation measures.

Completed Sustainability Appraisal

Local Challenge – outcome has gone in favour of Council but we are now at appeal process, it continues.

Programme going forward – additional meeting in 2 weeks time, starting formal consultation at end of November (6-7 weeks over Christmas period to beginning of January). Requirement is for 4 weeks, but given holiday period it has been extended.

Questions

Appeal hearing date? – Unknown

Consultation timelines, concern LG have not had appropriate time to steer and influence final version – Envisage this period between now and next meeting is to input comments to feed into final version before consultation.

Issue with Highways decisions, do they know what they can promote? – Highways wouldn't adopt roads purely to facilitate development. They would consider adopting land in applicant's control, not in instances where it is not.

Site Analysis – constraints and opportunities

Hedsor Road and Riversdale conservation area, listed buildings need to be taken into account.

Wessex Road employment area, creates a barrier to movement currently.

Areas of FZ3, small pocket of FZ2 at entrance. On the whole, the site is relatively unconstrained. No designated ecological sites

Opportunities for movements, north-south. Opportunity to gain access to former Orchard. Also opportunities to build on existing green infrastructure using existing field boundaries. Dashed blue line represents new primary school.

Access and movement

Proposed link road, Cores End -> Hedsor Road with Millboard as secondary. Footpaths to be diverted to link up to Orchard. Proposed internal footways and cyclepaths. Access through Wessex Road employment site, and consult to have footpath going south, adjoining to back of Garibaldi pub and connect to wider bridlepath.

Link road – development brief proposes it should be residential in nature, low speeds 30mph. Not a thoroughfare, although will be well-used by residents and wider travel. Appropriate to try and get a balance of low safe speeds and provide wider connectivity.

Walking – maximise use of existing green corridors, cycleways shared with footpath or on its own.

Public transport – link road will be new route. One-way or two-way bus route still being decided.

Questions

Is there a deadline to go out to public consultation – timetable is to commence consultation by end of the year, historically December is not a great month to start, so leaning towards starting earlier. Timetable is driven on amount of time needed to make final changes to DB. Now on forward plan for decision to go to consultation. LG would like additional view before it goes out, not done in the past so this wouldn't be appropriate. Suggestion to move consultation to January, this is council decision.

Are we making sure that recent flooding in area is being noted / considered – aware of recent flooding, information is received from EA, using latest flood risk data that's provided. Reflected within DB itself.

Millboard Road, total scheme for Bourne End, concern about traffic and would like Highways to have a view about what ought to happen in this congested area. Put scheme in front of LG, proposals seem to have ignored comments so far. For wider issues, Community Board may be best placed for those (outside of site boundary), they have access to funds that can ease local issues. Given that we can come back to this over couple of weeks, should look at Millboard Road question. Clearly outside development site but could deliver wider objectives as part of development, should be looked at and considered for next meeting. Has owners been spoken to? Mr Noe land ownership has, not willing to commit anything until application stage.

Incorrect element on map, assuming footpath access to Garibaldi pub. Footpath will not be accepted by owners of property and they have asked for this to be removed. Because there

is benefit of joining PRoW, appropriate to take that question to wider community to get wider feedback. If Garibaldi pub are opposed to it, it won't be in the final version.

Bourne End is opportunity to resolve existing problem, but developers are willing to build to boundaries. Unitary brings opportunity to make wider impact. Up to officers and leaders to seek improvement.

Green Infrastructure and Open Space

Retain and reinforce connections between elements in and out of site, use those as basis to green backbone within site.

CK: existing GI on site – retain and reinforce elements to create a backbone within site. Location of strategic open space on w side of site where topography facilitates. Sense of separation from Hawks Hill area. Heritage and conservation – options for dealing with edges. Sensitive junction in setting of church. Hedsor Rd jnc also.

CM: development framework. Higher density towards existing BE – lower towards higher areas. Keeps protected trees in centre of site. Informal O/s by Wessex Rd employment area as a buffer. New PRoW to connect orchard up to Hawks Hill and existing. Landscape led approach – focusing on areas of green space and connecting up existing GI – connecting up existing RoW and f/paths. Using buffers to provide separation. Responding to topography through varying densities.

JL: landscaping and buffer zones should be protected in perpetuity. Trees on Cores End about – will any be lost?

CK: objective to retain trees + green space – can't be certain – design requirements for road are also a factor – so need to retain flexibility. Vast majority should be protected as public spaces so not privately controlled (and passed to a management company). Buffer to Hedsor Rd – not so good as public space at backs of houses – different approach.

JL: emphasise long-term protection.

MA: Plan assumes so many things – would like it to say what proportion of site will be green. Worried that landscaping may have to change radically over time (e.g. if school site has to move). Guide to developer in terms of what they need to do, in terms of greening – principles of what is required.

CK: proportion of green space is set out in DB (there are numbers behind it). Conversations with developers – there is a set reqt for strategic open space. Over and above that, we have set out a quantity of structural landscaping for the specific purposes of buffers and GI weaving through site / around existing trees. The plan is an example of how brief may come together – is not prescriptive. That's for the planning application and associated m/p.

Timothy: what is proposed width of buffer bordering the gardens?

CK: in the order of 20m. This may incorporate existing GI. But not a one size fits all approach – depends on position of individual houses and existing length of gardens.

JA: are slides in DB?

CM: yes all images are in DB

Jodie – width of Hedsor Rd tree belt buffer?

Ck: as above

Timothy: not landscape led – extension of eastern side instead and green industrial estate?

CK: SOS on west – some will be sports pitches (flat) – need to be on site based on current information. Putting on eastern side – topography not suitable – unnecessary and artificial. Eastern side being lower may have function as sustainable drainage – balancing ponds.

Timothy: do circles on junctions indicate roundabouts? Will green space be designated as Local Green Space?

CK: no. Don't know – will come back on that.

SF: Eastern boundary – 'a sense of separation' – DB is informed by the WDLP and policies – see DM32 (4) – an **actual** separation is required. Green buffer to Hawks Hill does not fulfil entire reqt. On the Cores End side – there is no linkage along that whole boundary from the first part of buffer for a green corridor for wildlife. Doubtful orchard is achievable. F/path is not a green corridor. Green space needs to be larger.

CK: There is a green corridor but not a specified width which follows that edge of the orchard and housing to south of it. Follows boundaries... indicative. Where existing RoW is being diverted – meant to be a meaningful green corridor. The intent is there.

CM: Infrastructure requirements – onsite and offsite. Link road + bus route. 1FE primary school, MUGA sports pitches, NEAP, allotments. Junction improvements. Enhanced footpath to village centre (dotted line A). Public access to former orchard (line F). Improve access to and upgrade HW/BE bridleway on disused rly line. S106 contribution for mitigating measures on Burnham Beeches SAC. Implementation – one m/p to show how implemented in a joined up way and i/f delivered in a timely manner. DB sets out phasing – link rd in 1st phase. School will depend on demand for trigger – usually 0.5 form entry.

Timothy – will there be public access to sport pitches?

CK: yes – the school will have its own space.

MA: schools have control of own space – need to assure this is not a problem

CK: school won't have control of public open space.

JC: will entrance to ? be modernised

CK: if that's offsite, no

JA: contributions to Burnham Beeches – should be distributed locally

CM: to improve attractiveness and access to Little Marlow Country Lakes – to divert people from Burnham Beeches SAC.

CM: Appropriate Assessment and SA: sets out mitigation measures for LMCL – improvements to footpaths and cycle ways / signage / car parking / interpretation. Will be consulted on alongside draft DB. Developers will need to submit their own assessment and costs, in consultation with NE. SA focuses on this site – themes and scenarios – used to help shape the DB and layout. Outcomes are informative rather than decisive. Implications for wider connectivity / secondary road access points / locations for primary school.

SF: There are very few traffic mitigation elements. There must be more info than we are seeing – want to know how that was arrived and when can we see this?

CM: no new traffic assessment – what was used for Local Plan.

SF: so it's out of date?

CM: it's proportionate for this stage. There will need to be further assessments as part of the application.

SF: won't that mean a review of the SA?

SM: SA is not a transport assessment – unusual to have one at this stage – was triggered by the AA. We chose to go wider than SEA.

Timothy: transport – developer was going to provide more info on various jncs – can we see this? Transport assessment was not assessing Slate Meadow + Hollands Farm together at the Local Plan?

DB: will check minutes and will come back to you

DA: survey work – up to date assessment will form part of planning application

Timothy: It was supposed to be provided to the group. I don't see how highways can be so passive – they should be seeing this stuff so that they can lead on what amendments and mitigation are reqd.

MH: what you are seeking is premature. LHA will take this information in at the application stage.

CM: Next steps and consultation methods. Different under covid. Proposing a dedicated web page with online survey. Leaflet drop to all adjoining properties. Will also use social media to get the message out there. Local Press release. Will compile a summary of the DB. Likely to be at least 6 weeks. Let us know of particular local groups – could PC spread the word?

DB: what is scope of leaflet drop?

CM: properties adjoining site

DB: what precedent?

CM: comms advice

DB: I think it needs to go wider.

CM: also go into a local magazine?

MA: applications like this – usual to hold a public exhibition – does covid absolve you from that?

CM: face to face meetings are not advised.

DB: could you come to next community board meeting as a Teams call / webinar?

CM: certainly an option

JA: scope of leaflet drop – would happen on any regular application – so would have thought it should go wider.

CM: thank you for your feedback – will take into consideration.

JL: Slate meadow consultation – residents felt let down as comments not taken on board. How will you convince residents will be listened to and comments taken on board?

CM: when DB is adopted, part of the process is to put together a SoC – so we will show how comments taken into account.

Timothy: Local magazine is 'Target': contact the community association.

SF: Online presentations are a good way to reach the public – compare KBEG. MP has written re legal challenge

MA: who makes decision on adoption?

CM: Cabinet Member

JC: please confirm we can have sight of traffic data sooner rather than later.

CM: I will look into that

DB: contact Jodie directly and follow up please.

DB: appreciate your time, apologies for difficulties with receiving draft DB. Next meeting 3/11 at 7 pm. Good debate today. Please contact the officers for paper copies – bear in mind time and cost of these. Copy DB in on emails to officers.