



Abbey Barn North Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) consultation statement

Includes the results of Public
Consultation and Summary of Changes
made to the SPD.

Adopted: March 2020

Consultation Statement for the Abbey Barn North Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Habitat Regulation Assessment/ Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening ...	3
SPD preparation and early stakeholder and community engagement.....	4
Who and how did we consult when preparing the supplementary planning document	7
Summary of main issues raised by stakeholders	8
SPD Formal Public Consultation	9
Appendix 1	11
Table summarising the key issues raised in the consultation and the Council's response to them.	11

Introduction

- 1.1 This statement sets out the work involved in preparing the SPD and how the Council has involved the community and various stakeholders in its preparation.
- 1.2 In line with Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) 2012 regulations and with Wycombe Revised Statement of Community Involvement (July 2018). This statement provides details of:
 - (i) the persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document;
 - (ii) a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
 - (iii) how those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document.
- 1.3 This consultation statement has been updated to reflect the responses received as a result of the public consultation, from 20th November to 17th December 2019. This updated statement sets out a summary of the key issues raised during the public consultation and also sets out in detail (Appendix 1) how these representations have been taken into account in the final version of the SPD.

Habitat Regulation Assessment/ Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening

- 1.4 The Revised Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) - including Appropriate Assessment (January 2019) and Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Proposed Main Modifications for the Wycombe District Local Plan concluded that the Plan will not lead to any adverse effects, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, on the integrity of the Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) in or near the District. This included an individual assessment of policies in the plan.
- 1.5 The Abbey Barn North Development Brief Supplementary Planning Document provides additional guidance on the application of Policy HW4: Abbey Barn North of the Development Plan. The SPD does not introduce further potential linking impact pathways. As such it does not change the conclusion in the Habitats Regulations Assessment.
- 1.6 It is a requirement that Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is undertaken in line with the procedures prescribed by the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, which transposed into national law EU Directive 2001/42/EC on strategic environmental assessment (SEA).

- 1.7 In terms of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, this SPD does not significantly affect the findings of the Sustainability Appraisal (which incorporates SEA within it) undertaken for the Wycombe District Local Plan, as it will not introduce anything that would result in any new or significantly different environmental problems than have already been considered through the SA for the Local Plan.

SPD preparation and early stakeholder and community engagement

- 1.8 Abbey Barn North, along with a number of other sites, has been reserved for a number of decades to meet the District's future development needs.
- 1.9 In October 2014, following the publication of the NPPF in 2012 and the change in approach to housing delivery, Wycombe District Council Cabinet (following public consultation) resolved to release the Reserve Sites for development. Simultaneously, the Council sought to begin the process of allocating the site for development in the then emerging (now adopted) Local Plan.
- 1.10 Following the decision to release the reserve sites Liaison Groups (comprising members of the public, local amenity groups and local politicians) were set up and discussions began between developers/landowners in respect of:
- development Briefs; and,
- Infrastructure plans,
- to support the release of this land for development.
- 1.11 Abbey Barn North, which had more complicated land ownership arrangements than a number of the other Reserve Sites, was slower to progress initially. At the start of the process the Abbey Barn Liaison Group was principally focussed on the Abbey Barn South site, which was under option and therefore in a position to proceed.
- 1.12 A Liaison Group was set up to support and influence the delivery of both the Abbey Barn South and Abbey Barn North sites. The liaison group comprises representatives from:
- The Local Ward Members
 - Little Marlow Parish Council
 - Local residents
 - Abbey and Ryemead Neighbourhood Action Groups
 - High Wycombe Society
 - Wycombe Wildlife Group
 - Chepping Wycombe Parish Council
 - Flackwell Heath Residents Association
 - Chiltern Society

- Revive the Wye
- Daws Hill Neighbourhood Forum
- Wycombe Marsh Forum

- 1.13 The liaison group has fluctuated in membership since its initial inception. Similar liaison groups were set up for the other Reserve Sites. Each Reserve Site has progressed on its own timetable in accordance with specific planning and developer constraints associated to that site.
- 1.14 In parallel with the site specific liaison groups a separate, but related, reserve sites infrastructure delivery plan was prepared. The details of this plan are available to view on the [Wycombe District Council website](#).
- 1.15 Work began on the Abbey Barn North site in circa September 2016. Following a change of ownership, in respect of the majority land holding, agreement between the main land owners began to emerge and plans for the site started to form.
- 1.16 An inception meeting, between the main land holders and Council officers took place in September 2016, which was the first of a suite of 5 meetings designed to scope out the issues at Abbey Barn North and set the framework for a future Development Brief. This initial suite of meetings highlighted the significant issues on the site in respect of access, ecology, landscape and topography. At the end of this process it had been agreed that in order to take the Abbey Barn North site forward that it would be:
- 1) necessary to realign Abbey Barn Lane and redesign the junction with Kingsmead Road, which would include the loss of the eastern part of the site;
 - 2) the extent of the developable area should be limited to the south-eastern part of the site for ecological and landscape reasons; and,
 - 3) the open space and S106 requirements were also scoped.
- 1.17 In May 2018 an Abbey Barn Lane Position Statement was published. This document was produced by Wycombe District Council and Bucks County Council. It sets out the Council's response to the recommendations set out in the Transport Framework in relation to the Abbey Barn Lane area. It also takes account of further technical work commissioned by the Councils in 2017 considering the scope to realign Abbey Barn Lane and reconfigure the junction with Kingsmead Road. The documents sets out the priorities for Abbey Barn Lane and how any development proposals in the vicinity should respond to the preferred outline scheme. The draft plan commissioned in respect of this statement is appended to the Development Brief and sets out the anticipated future alignment of Abbey Barn Lane.
- 1.18 In late 2017 a second suite of meetings began to progress work on the Development Brief. This involved officers from Development Management, Urban Design, Landscape, Ecology and the County Highway Authority. In

late 2017 and early 2018 broad agreement was reached between the developers/landowners and Council officers on the appropriate:

- 1) Vision for the site;
- 2) Content of the Development Brief; and,
- 3) Objectives of the Development Brief

1.19 On the 8 March 2018, a Liaison Group meeting was called, the vision for the site was presented and early thinking on the scope and content of the Development Brief was shared. [View a copy of the Design Approach presentation \[PDF\]](#) on the Wycombe District Council website.

1.20 Initial feedback was generally positive particularly in respect of the contemporary design approach and innovative architectural response on a sloping site. However, concerns were raised in respect of:

- infrastructure provision;
- crime;
- the approach to communal and private ownership;
- access to woods;
- the use of green roofs;
- Affordable housing;
- Concerns about congestion and density; and,
- Concern about garages.

1.21 The [full minutes for the Abbey Barn liaison group meeting \[PDF\]](#) are available to view on the Wycombe District Council website.

1.22 A number of the issues raised were beyond the scope of the Development Brief to control; addressed by policies in the Development Plan (such as the provision of affordable housing); or, were covered by the Reserve Site Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The remaining issues were covered by the Development Brief. Albeit early consultation with the liaison group has indicated that further work may be required.

1.23 Given the generally positive steer from the Liaison Group to the initial concept and vision, the developers and officers sought to build on the initial vision and began preparation of the Development Brief. Particular consideration was given to the areas of expressed concern.

1.24 Work paused temporarily in 2019 due to a number of issues surrounding the adoption of the New Local Plan, which included the allocation of the Abbey Barn North site through the New Local Plan. Policy HW4 (Abbey Barn North) of the new Local Plan sought to allocate the site for residential development subject to a number of design, infrastructure, ecology and landscape considerations. Based on high level assessments it was anticipated that circa 100 dwellings could be accommodated on the site. This was not an upper limit, but rather a high level estimate of capacity to inform housing delivery projections. The work undertaken in respect of the

Development Brief has to some extent informed the preparation of the Development Plan policy and would, once finalised, support the Development Plan policy. The supporting text to policy HW4 (Abbey Barn North) requires a Development Brief to be prepared for the Abbey Barn North site.

- 1.25 It should be noted that the preparation of the New Local Plan, which included policy HW4 (Abbey Barn North), involved extensive public consultation in its own right.
- 1.26 On 12th November a further Liaison Group meeting was called in order to share the first draft of the Development Brief. The Liaison Group meeting was well attended. A draft copy of the Development Brief was shared and a presentation was given. A copy of the presentations and minutes of the meeting will be available on the Abbey Barn North home page in due course. The Development Brief was well received, but a number of issues were raised in respect of:

- 1) The number of units on the site.
- 2) The maintenance and longevity of green and sedum roofs.
- 3) The absence of definition between communal and private space and the implications for young children in particular.
- 4) The relationship between Abbey Barn Lane and the development.
- 5) The route of public footpaths
- 6) The need for additional public footpaths in certain locations.
- 7) The location of the access junction to the site.
- 8) The need to ensure the site is capable of being occupied by all.

- 1.27 These issues are addressed following the wider public consultation in the Adopted Development Brief.

Who and how did we consult when preparing the supplementary planning document

- 1.28 The following consultees and consultee methods have been identified:

- 1) All adjoining dwellings written to.
- 2) Flyers in surrounding area.
- 3) Site notices
- 4) Press Notice
- 5) Facebook
- 6) Twitter.
- 7) Local members' bulletin.
- 8) Planning Bulletin.
- 9) Internal/External Consultees:
 - a. Local Members
 - b. County Highway Authority
 - c. BBOWT

- d. Leisure and Communities
- e. Crime Prevention Design Advisor
- f. Wycombe Wildlife Group
- g. Env. Health
- h. Lead Local Flood Authority
- i. Wycombe Society.
- j. Thames Water
- k. Public Rights of Way Officer

Summary of main issues raised by stakeholders

1.29 This section includes the main issues raised by stakeholders during the preparation of this draft SPD, and how those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document.

Main issue	Council response
(i) Infrastructure provision.	This matter is addressed in part by the Reserve Sites Infrastructure Delivery Plan, which has been consulted on and published separately.
(ii) Crime.	<p>There has been a meeting with the Crime Prevention Design Advisor to explain the intended strategy.</p> <p>No in-principle objection was raised. However, it was advised that there is clear and robust compartmentalisation of space with railings and defensible planting to ensure clear definition between public and private spaces.</p>
(iii) The approach to communal and private ownership.	A plan on p.35 indicates the relationship.
(iv) Access to the woods.	An access and movement strategy has been proposed at 4.5
(v) Use of Green roofs.	Section 4.1 addressed the need and benefits for brown/sedum roofs.
(vi) Affordable housing.	This is addressed by New Local Plan policy.
(vii) Congestion.	<p>The site allows for the realignment of Abbey Barn Lane, which will address a local highway constraint.</p> <p>General congestion issues are addressed by the Reserve Sites Infrastructure Delivery</p>

Main issue	Council response
	Plan. The site will be expected to make a contribution towards strategic infrastructure issues.
(viii) Garages	No garages are proposed or illustratively indicated in the Development Brief. A small number of car ports are shown illustratively.
(ix) Density	The Development Brief does not seek to address issues of density or the overall quantum of development.

SPD Formal Public Consultation

1.30 As set out above, formal public consultation took place on the draft Abbey Barn North Development Brief SPD between 20th November 2019 and 17th December 2019. 30 responses were received to the SPD during this time period.

1.31 People were made aware of the consultation through:

- Notifying statutory consultees and generic and specific stakeholders on our consultation database including parish councils.
- Including information about the consultation in the Weekly Bulletin which goes out to interested individuals and organisations.
- Placing hard copies of the SPD in local libraries and the Council's Reception Area. All of the consultation material was made available on the Council's website, including a response form.

1.32 In addition, a public exhibition was held at the Council Offices in Queen Victoria Road on Tuesday 3rd December 2019 from 3 pm to 8pm. This event was open to all to attend and offered an opportunity to ask questions relating to the content of the SPD.

1.33 The main issues raised as a result of this formal public consultation included the following:

- Surface water flow rate isn't adequately addressed;
- More needed to address SUDs;
- Clarity must be given regarding the positioning of footpaths and cycle routes;
- More needed on access to the site for potential public transport links;
- Generally, there is also a need to consider segregation and road design to encourage active travel;

- Could a chalk grassland green roof be considered to replace the chalk grassland lost to this development?
- Biodiversity accounting must be rigorously upheld;
- Maintenance regime will be required to ensure the character of the development and ecological value of the green/brown roofs is maintained;
- Public/private space needs to be clearly demarcated;
- Concerns about water runoff from the site;
- Potential light and noise pollution;
- Change needed to the red line boundary;

1.34 Appendix 1 of this report includes a table which sets out in detail the responses received to the public consultation and the Council's response to them and any changes made to the SPD as a result of these comments.

Appendix 1

Table summarising the key issues raised in the consultation and the Council's response to them.

General Issues

It has been flagged that the Development Brief has not been set up as an accessible document in accordance with the 2018 accessibility regulations. Additional information on how to achieve the relevant standard is set out below in the three links:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/how-to-publish-on-gov-uk/accessible-pdfs>

<https://www.adobe.com/accessibility/products/indesign.html>

<https://www.adobe.com/content/dam/acom/en/products/indesign/pdfs/creating-accessible-pdf-documentw-with-adobe-indesign-cs6-v3.pdf>

Ref.	Name	Organisation	Main issue	Council response	Change to the SPD?
1.	Vikki Keeble Sustainable Drainage Team Leader	LLFA at BCC	I have concerns that the current development brief does not adequately address the existing surface water flow route. I would advise that a sequential approach is taken to locating development parcels within the site. I also can't identify any areas within the brief that are	The Council raised this as an issue in a letter dated 23.5.17. The Council were advised by the landowner that following separate consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) that it had been agreed that there were no overland flow issues (see email dated 23.5.17).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Insert a plan on page 17 identifying the overland flow route as a constraint. - P.25 – add B12 – apply sequential approach to the siting of development to avoid areas at risk of flooding and make

			dedicated to above ground SuDS features and in my opinion this approach conflicts with Policy DM39.	The LLFA have responded and advised that hydrological modelling was not provided and therefore this position is not accepted. As such, for the purposes of drafting the Development Brief it must be assumed that the overland flow route is active and should therefore be sequentially avoided. This is likely to have a significant impact on the development potential of the site assumed by the Development Brief. We cannot adopt a Development Brief that assumes flood risk can be overcome without evidence first being produced.	<p>positive provision for sustainable urban drainage features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - P.25 – amend layout diagram to include blue area for overland flow route and SUDs features. - P.43 – amend illustrative layout to accommodate overland flow route and attenuation basins to the north of the site. This is likely to result in the loss of a significant number of dwellings. <p>I am happy for you to caveat the flood risk approach as being dependant on hydrological mapping.</p>
2.	Connor Sheffield	Bucks CC	Whilst BCC are supportive of the consideration to encourage active travel for pedestrians and cyclists within the site, further clarity must be given regarding the positioning of footpaths and cycle routes, the positions of which vary in various diagrams throughout the document. Potential connections with the wider High Wycombe cycle	Documents are all illustrative and high level at this stage. They are not intended to be definitive as to the exact position of any particular route. However, it is accepted that the East/West cycle route needs to be highlighted to ensure it is taken fully into account. Also, a connection to Deangarden Wood needs to be highlighted to ensure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend A2 (p.23) to include connection to Dean Garden Rise. - Amend 4.5 to include E/W cycle route. - On master plan (p.43) show: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o E/W cycle route. o Show cycle and pedestrian link to Dean Garden Rise.

			network and the future High Wycombe-Bourne End cycleway must also be highlighted, along with how the route will safely pass through the site (particularly in terms of crossing the realigned Abbey Barn Lane). A similar connection in Deangarden Rise should also be important to the walking and cycling network from the site.	it is incorporated into future designs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Show potential for route along old railway line (dotted line only).
3.			We would also like to make WDC aware of the High Wycombe to Bourne End Sustrans Cycle Report. Attached to the rep. as Appendix 3.	<p>Aware of this report. Also aware of major land assembly work required.</p> <p>There is potential for a commensurate contribution from the site towards this route. Any sum sought would need to comply with CIL regulations.</p>	No amendment required to Development Brief as it is not intended to address off site S106 matters.
4.			BCC would wish to ensure that development at the Abbey Barn North site does not impact negatively or render any of the walking routes secured as part of the s106 for 2016 Wycombe Summit site obsolete.	Objective A2 requires links to the surrounding footpath network. The masterplan indicates (illustratively) how they could be achieved.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
5.			Please include the consideration of access to the site for potential	The site will not be capable of accommodating a bus given its	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			public transport links, such as new bus stops, or provision for Demand Responsive. Transport (DRT) vehicles which is currently being explored as a possibility for High Wycombe by BCC.	topography. The site will be too small to financially support a demand responsive vehicle. The main access reroute will be built to an adoptable standard and therefore capable of accommodating a demand responsive bus should this be rolled out in the future.	
6.			Further consideration should be given to access to existing public transport, particularly services towards High Wycombe town centre and train station, noting that the existing 35 bus route along Kingsmead Road and Abbey Barn Road does not provide a direct route to the train station.	Strategy to be provided by County Highway Authority to inform any future S106 package.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
7.			The Healthy Streets Approach principles focuses on what makes for a healthy and sustainable street environment. Consideration of these indicators should be given. The 10 indicators of Healthy Streets include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Easy to cross - Shade and shelter 	The 10 indicators are capable of being achieved. The Highway Authority will be consulted at every stage of the design to ensure the relevant standards are met. The residential site will not be a through route. The Development Brief is not intended to go into this level of detail. This level of detail should be	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Places to stop and cross - Not too noisy - People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport - People feel safe - Things to see and do - People feel relaxed - Clean air - Pedestrians from all walks of life. 	addressed at the application stage.	
8.			Although briefly mentioned in the Ecological Strategy in relation to green roofing, there should be further details around how a Sustainable Urban Drainage Strategy (SuDS) is to be applied to the site, especially in light of the relatively tight spatial constraints and steep inclination of the site.	See point 1 above.	Changes set out in point 1.
9.			Alignment of the development access road in Appendix 1 of the Consultation document appears to look too close to existing houses on the north side, to permit house construction on this side of the road (as shown on 4.12 Illustrative Masterplan). Please provide information on whether	This is illustrative. Further design work is in the process of being undertaken in consultation with the developers and County Highway Authority. The illustrative plan will be superseded with a more up to date iteration if one becomes available.	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			this will impact on the design of pedestrian access and rights of way.	The plan is only intended to indicate that this is where the access is envisaged. The precise alignment will follow at the application stage.	
10.			The development should be accessible and inclusive to all. Consideration of access to services such as public health facilities in future documentation would be useful for identifying any potential issues for any people with additional access requirements.	Detailed matter that will be addressed at the application stage and through Building Regulations.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
11.			Broader consideration should also be provided around how this development aligns with the High Wycombe Transport Vision and Strategy, i.e. connecting locally, regionally, and with green spaces.	The illustrative master plan proposes links to all main routes. Link to E/W walk/cycle route and Dean Garden Rise as per comment 2.	Changes as per comment 2.
12.			While we welcome section 2.1, Site History & Heritage, this is somewhat misleading as heritage assets, both designated and undesignated, have been recorded in the vicinity and archaeological remains could be present within the plan area. A cultural heritage	Rub to provide copy of report.	Update 2.1 to reflect key findings in the report.

			desk based assessment for the Abbey Barn Lane realignment was commissioned by BCC and undertaken by AECOM; we understand that this has now been supplied to Wycombe District Council. This document should be used to re-draft section 2.1. Relevant sections taken from the AECOM report are detailed in Appendix 2.		
13.		2.2 The site and its surroundings	Whilst the document helpfully lists travel times to key local primary schools, no secondary or higher education sites are listed. We suggest that consideration be given to access to other types of school and other education facilities such as libraries and colleges. It would also be helpful if indicative travel times to key health facilities were provided in this table (and diagram), e.g. Wycombe Hospital, local GPs, to ensure that the development is accessible and inclusive.	This is an allocated site within the High Wycombe Urban Area. It is not considered to be necessary for the purposes of a Development Brief to identify all schools, colleges and libraries.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
14.		2.2 diagram	This diagram shows the alignment of the former High Wycombe to Bourne End	Potential for route to be created along the old railway line needs to be shown on master plan.	Amend master plan 4.12. Dotted line to show potential

			<p>railway, but this is not included in some later diagrams (e.g. 4.12 Illustrative Masterplan). Clarification is needed around whether this is needed on the diagram, as large sections of the track bed to either side of the current and proposed road alignments are no longer accessible. If this is in the context of a potential High Wycombe – Bourne End cycleway, this should be made clear.</p>		<p>to create route along the old railway line.</p>
15.		2.7 Surrounding Ecological Context	<p>This section should acknowledge that the site itself is designated as a Biological Notification Site. This is indicated in the key and diagram but not specifically listed as part of the text as other relevant designations have been. The list should also include reference to the designated ancient woodland immediately adjacent, also indicated in the key and diagram but not referred to in the text.</p>	<p>The list is not considered to contribute anything which is not also covered by the plan and key. The list appears to be unnecessary text.</p>	<p>Delete 3 bullet points from 2.7.</p>

16.		2.10 Site Constraints	<p>The positioning of permissive footpaths in the top left-hand diagram is inconsistent with illustrations provided elsewhere in the document (i.e. 3.3 indicative movement strategy diagram, 4.5 Access & Movement, 4.12 Illustrative Masterplan). It is currently difficult to determine which of these diagrams is the most indicative of the final arrangement of footways and cycle paths, although it is understood that detailed design on alignment is still to be undertaken.</p>	<p>All diagrams are intended to be illustrative at this stage. What they all clearly show are multiple links to the ancient woodland. The application, which the Brief is intended for inform, will show the precise alignment and connection points.</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>
17.			<p>Whilst mitigation strategies for reducing road noise for homes next to the realigned Abbey Barn Lane are welcomed, it is unclear whether these strategies are related to road design, house design, or other measures. Please clarify the measures being considered here, including any measures within the development designed to mitigate the numbers of vehicles travelling along this road.</p>	<p>The strategy should relate to road design, house design and other measures (enclosure etc). The exact form of mitigation will form part of any future submission and be informed by more detailed design. The Development Brief is simply flagging it as an issue that needs to be overcome.</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>

18.		3.1 Green Infrastructure	<p>BCC would strongly recommend that the Ecology section in part 3 on Development Objectives and Opportunities includes a 6th point to “Set out a strategy to minimise indirect impacts of the development on the ancient woodland and retained (and enhanced) areas of grassland.”</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure/Environment section of Policy HW4 (part 3) in the Wycombe District Plan, paragraph b) states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Enhance the ecological value of Deangarden Wood to ensure the increased recreational use of the wood does not lead to a negative ecological impact;...” <p>Recreational activities can be considered indirect impacts and can cause serious adverse ecological impacts on sensitive habitats and species. For example, increased trampling effects, increased cat predation on birds and small mammals, effects of dog fouling on flora, littering, bbqs/fires etc. Including the above recommended note to section 3.1 of the development</p>	Agreed.	<p>Add the following to 3.1:</p> <p>E6 – set out a strategy to minimise indirect impacts on the retained ancient woodland and areas of retained grassland.</p> <p>E7 - Retain existing ecological connectivity between the habitats within the site and the former Bourne End to High Wycombe Railway Line corridor railway corridor.</p>
-----	--	--------------------------	---	---------	---

		<p>brief therefore provides a consistent message to the developer of the importance of the threat of indirect impacts on the adjacent habitats.</p> <p>In addition, we would recommend a 7th point is included which refers to the importance of the former railway line between Bourne End and High Wycombe. For example “Retain existing ecological connectivity between the habitats within the site and the former Bourne End to High Wycombe Railway Line corridor railway corridor”.</p> <p>The Green Infrastructure/Environment section of Policy HW4 (part 3) in the Wycombe District Plan, paragraph c) states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Enhance the ecological value of the former Bourne End to High Wycombe Railway Line corridor as part of the green infrastructure network” <p>This is currently missing from the ecology sections of the development brief. This feature in the landscape is likely to provide a key corridor for the</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

			movement of wildlife and provide connectivity with the ancient and semi-natural woodland.		
19.		3.3 Access & Movement, A1	Whilst supportive of consideration of pedestrian and cycle access, a more-specific list of modes of transport under consideration to be supported by the site should be listed here, e.g. cars, buses, and potentially demand responsive transport vehicles.	<p>The list is inclusive, not exclusive.</p> <p>It is not considered to be necessary to list all forms of transport. This would unnecessarily add to the length of the brief.</p> <p>There is no plan to bring buses on to the site given that it is essentially a cul-de-sac and only a short walk from Kingsmead Road and London Road. This has been agreed with the County Highway Authority. The roads, which will be capable of taking a bin lorries will also be capable of taking a demand responsive bus should such a service be rolled out.</p>	No amendment required to Development Brief.
20.		3.3 Access & Movement, A2	Although access to the east/west cycle route through Wycombe is mentioned, there are no details around specific or segregated provision for cyclists within the site, nor whether this	The site effectively comprises a cul-de-sac set against a challenging topography. Therefore it is anticipated that vehicles would be slow moving and therefore segregated cycle	<p>Add the following bullet points to 4.5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The realigned Kingsmead Road/Abbey Barn Lane junction

			<p>will align with any cycling measures to potentially be employed along the realigned Abbey Barn Lane.</p>	<p>provision will not be necessary within the residential element of the site.</p> <p>Dedicated provision to the E/W cycle route should be provided.</p> <p>The new junction on Kingsmead Road should not discourage use of the E/W cycle route.</p>	<p>should make provision for cyclists to encourage use of the East/West cycle route.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There should a dedicated cycle connection linking the site to the east/west cycle route. - The residential road network should be designed to a low vehicle speed (circa 20mph).
21.		3.3 Access & Movement, A3	<p>Please provide details of how the proposed network of primary and secondary paths incorporates the existing rights of way through the site.</p> <p>Although connections to existing paths outside the site are appreciated, information regarding lighting and visibility around pedestrian-only routes would be useful, encouraging footway use through an increased sense of security along each route.</p>	<p>There are no existing PRow on the site. There are existing paths, which it is possible have permissive rights.</p> <p>Lighting and the specific alignment of routes is a more detailed matter, which will be resolved at the application stage.</p>	No amendment required to Development Brief.
22.		3.3 Access &	<p>Although consideration of 'pedestrian permeability' through the site is given, there are no</p>	<p>This is a matter of detail that will be resolved at the application stage.</p>	No amendment required to Development Brief.

		Movement, A4	specific details given around the types of pedestrian crossings to be employed within and adjacent to the site (aside from one photograph of a potential design).		
23.		3.3 Access & Movement [general]	Generally, there is also a need to consider segregation and road design to encourage active travel. BCC has recently begun investigating use of the 'Healthy Streets Approach'. This highlights that it would be good practice to ensure there is adequate shade and shelter throughout the entire local centre to make the area accessible for all residents. Although we appreciate that some aspects of this are already covered, we suggest that some aspects of this approach and the associated principles are applied more broadly throughout the development, particularly 'Easy to cross', 'Places to stop and cross', and 'People feel safe'. This will help to ensure it is accessible to all and that residents choose to walk and cycle.	This is a matter of detail that will be resolved at the application stage.	No amendment required to Development Brief.

24.		4.1/4.2 Ecological Strategy and Planting Strategy	Although we welcome the detail given on the ecological and planting strategies, the development will be aiming for a net gain for biodiversity. We would welcome clarity on how these strategies were tied more explicitly to this goal.	This is a matter of detail that will be resolved at the application stage.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
25.		4.5 Access & Movement, A2	It is currently unclear whether provision for pedestrians and cyclists will be along shared paths, or whether there will be segregated cycling routes through the site. Please provide details on measures, including dedicated cycle parking, taken to encourage cycling within the development area and how they will link with the wider network for example the proposed High Wycombe to Bourne End cycle route, Wycombe Summit and Abbey Barn South developments.	This is a matter of detail that will be resolved at the application stage.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
26.		4.5 Access & Movement, B7	Statutory Undertaking facilities should be buried under service margins rather than under carriageways or footways.	Disagree. This would remove the potential for street tree planting in the verges.	No amendment required to Development Brief.

27.		4.6 Parking Strategy	We are supportive of a parking scheme delivered in accordance with Buckinghamshire County Council's current parking guidance, we would welcome inclusion of electric vehicle charging points as a means of encouraging more sustainable travel.	There are existing policies to address this at the application stage.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
28.		4.12	Indicative access roads are not circulatory and therefore do not provide opportunities for vehicles to naturally turn. For that reason it is recommended that designated turning areas are included and located away from residential units to prevent parking that would impair their designated function.	Turning heads will need to be provided. The detail of this will be picked up at the application stage.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
29.	Maria David	Bucks CCG	The CCG has been consulted by WDC on the longer term local plans and has submitted a response stating our commitment to the provision of adequate and appropriate primary care facilities to meet the needs of the local population. However, in order to make best use of resources, we will need to be involved in	Matter to be addressed at the planning application stage.	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			more detailed planning for this development to meet the needs of new patients coming into the area.		
30.	John Shaw	Chiltern Rangers	Could a chalk grassland green roof be considered to replace the chalk grassland lost to this development?	Good idea. Provided suitable for green roofs.	Amend 4.1 to include specific reference to 'chalk grassland green roof'.
31.	Mike Chadwick	Chiltern Society	Overall, this is a commendable and well set-out Brief which should secure a high-quality development.	General support of approach welcomed.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
32.			We note Development Objective E4 to "deliver significant measurable net gains in biodiversity that reflect the site's existing nature conservation interests and its designation as a Biological Notification Site and Green Infrastructure Area". It is absolutely essential that this principle is robustly upheld and applied. Any biodiversity accounting method should use as the starting baseline calcareous grassland in optimum condition, before a lack of appropriate management allowed scrub to encroach.	The Council will use a robust and well recognised bio-diversity accounting methodology. If the Council has adopted an SPD, which identifies the preferred methodology then this will be used.	No amendment required to Development Brief.

33.			<p>We strongly support the widespread use of vegetated roofs, but the focus should be on reproducing and augmenting a calcareous grassland habitat, rather than sedum. According to the University of Sheffield specialist resource http://www.thegreenroofcentre.co.uk/ calcareous grasslands are relatively straightforward to create on a green roof, can be extremely species-rich, and contain many plant species that are ideally suited to green roof conditions.</p>	See 30 above.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
34.			<p>We strongly support the approach taken to amenity space provision, limiting private ownership of such space, taking an imaginative approach involving terraces, roof gardens and balconies, and having a suitable management framework for the ongoing maintenance of the semi-private and communal areas (Development Objectives B7 / B8 / B9).</p>	Good.	No amendment required to Development Brief.

35.			We strongly support the proposed arrangements set out in 4.4 to secure the restoration and long-term management of the chalk grassland.	Good.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
36.			To properly justify and fulfil the claim for the site as a sustainable location with sufficiently attractive and realistic access to bus services, the frequency passed the nearest stops on Abbey Barn Road needs to be considerably improved from the current hourly Mon-Sat daytime only, which may require developer contributions or negotiation with operators; accessing the much more frequent service along London Road involves a longer walk that may be too far for some.	This matter is addressed by the Reserve Sites Infrastructure Delivery Package and would not be addressed by the Development Brief. The site is too small to justify an additional bus to improve the frequency of the service and any such service is unlikely to be financially sustainable beyond any agreed pump priming period. There is no public fund for long term subsidy of the route. Therefore, on present evidence the frequency of buses is unlikely to be improved on Kingsmead Road.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
37.	Alan Dunham – Practice Manager	Cygnets Primary Care Trust	All four surgeries in the Cygnets PCN are at capacity in terms of the number of patients registered. An additional 100 houses (potentially 240 or more patients) would be very difficult to accommodate with the current set ups at our Practices.	This is not a matter for the Development Brief. It will be addressed at the application stage.	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			To take on this level of additional patients then funding would need to be made available to enable extra GP appointment times and to improve the premises and parking at the sites to accommodate the increase. We feel that the healthcare needs of these new residents may not have been considered in enough detail.		
38.	Glen Strongith arm Area 5 Assistant Spatial Planner	Highways England	We have no comments at this time.	None.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
39.	Edward Winter Historic Environment Planning Advisor	Historic England	Historic England does not wish to make any substantive comments on this document at this time.	None.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
40.	Joanna Cox	Crime Prevention Team	3.4 Homes and Community	Natural Surveillance is already covered under 4.3.	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			<p>'All play areas are to be designed with a 'natural play' approach that is in keeping with the landscape character of the site and supported by good levels of natural surveillance'.</p> <p>Natural surveillance from dwellings close by should be included in this statement.</p> <p>The combination of natural surveillance from legitimate activity and neighbouring dwellings will help to deter crime and ASB. However surveillance from the dwellings will be vital during hours of darkness when legitimate usage is likely to be absent.</p>		
41.			<p>4.6 Parking Strategy</p> <p>The parking strategy should include the need for appropriate surveillance to parked vehicles. Parking spaces should be visible from the dwellings they serve enabling the most appropriate guardians to safeguard them effectively. At the very least surveillance</p>	<p>The advice is acknowledged. However, the Development Brief is not intended to go into this level of detail. The Residential Design Guide, which is also a material consideration in future decision making, addresses this matter.</p> <p>The illustrative masterplan primarily envisages parking to the</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>

			<p>should be available from dwellings close by:</p> <p><i>'Parked cars can be particularly vulnerable to crime and, unless they are in a private garage, must be overlooked' Ref. Safer Places – Surveillance</i></p> <p>The challenge for developers regarding unallocated communal parking will be to provide an area with a sense of ownership and guardianship whilst users could change daily. Large unallocated parking areas can be akin to a public car park producing a high level of anonymity allowing offenders to disappear within clear sight. Furthermore this anonymity and activity means these are often located away from dwellings to avoid disturbance reducing surveillance. Unallocated parking should be provided in small groups in close proximity of dwellings capable of providing surveillance and guardianship to deter potential offenders.</p>	<p>fronts and/or sides and/or on-street. Flats would inevitably have some communal parking, but this is indicated as being relatively small scale.</p> <p>Matter will be addressed at the application stage.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Ref. Secured By Design 16.2 Vehicle Parking – Homes 2019</p> <p>I would ask that the wording reflects the need for appropriate surveillance from neighbouring dwellings and that unallocated parking is grouped in smaller numbers.</p>		
42.			<p>4.8 Privacy and Overlooking</p> <p>‘All homes should have strong frontages to the street, encouraging neighbourly interactions and providing natural surveillance’</p> <p>Active surveillance should be included in this statement ie ‘providing natural surveillance from active rooms with the dwelling’.</p> <p>The word ‘active’ in this sense means rooms in building elevations from which there is direct and regular visual connection between the room and the street or parking court. Such visual connection can be expected from rooms such as</p>	<p>This point is accepted and covered by bullet point 3 in section 4.8. The Residential design guide, which is also a material consideration, goes in to more detail in respect of this matter.</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>

			kitchens and living rooms, but not from more private rooms, such as bedrooms and bathrooms.		
43.	Eleanor Sweet-Escott Lead Adviser - Sustainable Development	Natural England	We have some concerns about the classification of the existing habitat. According to Magic Maps, the site is largely covered by designated emerging deciduous woodland priority habitat. If you have conflicting information available that may be able to provide clarity, please do let me know.	The site is largely chalk grassland and orchards, which are gradually scrubbing over. It is assumed that Magic Maps are based on very high level information. The Council's and developers surveys are of a finer grain and supported by site visits from qualified ecologists and arboriculturalists from both the land owners and developers.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
44.	Mr David Newberry Director	Protocol Strategic Land Paras 2.13 / 2.19	Lack of provision for adopted footpaths and cycle paths from Deangarden Rise to Kingsmead road, and to Deangarden Wood.	Show walk/cycle connections to Kingsmead Road and Deangarden Rise.	Amend section 3.3 to inc. link to Deangarden Rise. Amend diagram on 4.5 to show cycle/pedestrian link adjacent to Abbey Barn Lane.
45.	Sarah Townsend	Green Space Project officer	Play Strategy- cl. 1 mentions a natural play focus and materials being appropriate to the landscape. Please confirm that this would involve traditional play equipment (e.g. swings,	This is a level of detail that can be addressed at the application stage. The images indicate a range of play types.	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			slides etc.) rather than just logs, boulders etc.? Play experiences using only felled trees and boulders would not be considered suitable.		
46.			CI 4.4 have Chiltern Rangers been approached regarding the management of the chalk grasslands?	This is a matter between Chiltern Rangers and the developers. However, it is understood that there has been some communication.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
47.			Is there a drainage assessment of the site? It looks from the site plans that the play area is located in the lowest part of the site, I know that the ground is chalk but if there are any issue with the drainage then it might affect the play facilities.	<p>The lowest part of the site is by the railway cutting. Scope for sustainable urban drainage needs to be accommodated.</p> <p>A SUDs strategy, which fundamentally undermines the delivery of the playground would not be acceptable.</p> <p>The Development Brief needs to demonstrate capacity to accommodate a SUDs strategy. The detail can be covered at the application stage.</p>	See response no.1.
48.			The development brief covers the developers obligation to provide an offsite contribution	The S106 obligations for the site are set out in the Reserve Site Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			for both a community facility and outdoor sporting facilities.		
49.	Tasha Hurley Planning Administrator Planning	Savills for Thames Water	<p>In light of the changes which took effect in April 2018, we would request that a paragraph is included in the SPD which states:</p> <p><i>“Developers need to consider the net increase in water and waste water demand to serve their developments and also any impact the development may have off site further down the network, if no/low water pressure and internal/external sewage flooding of property is to be avoided.</i></p> <p><i>Thames Water encourages developers to use their free pre-planning service https://www.thameswater.co.uk/preplanning). This service can tell developers at an early stage if there will be capacity in Thames water and/or wastewater networks to serve their development, or what they will do if there is not.</i></p> <p><i>The developer can then submit this communication as evidence</i></p>	This matter is not individual to this site. The matter is addressed by policy DM38 (Water Quality and Supply) in the Local Plan and the NPPF. Therefore, there is existing powers in place to address this matter.	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			<i>to support a planning application and Thames can prepare to serve the new development at the point of need, helping avoid delays to housing delivery programmes.”</i>		
50.	Richard Carr Principal Planner (Spatial Planning)	TfL	No comments to make on the draft SPD.	No comment.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
51.		Wycombe Wildlife Group	<p>Happy with the proposals for the site set out in the Development Brief and, following consultation with the other members of Wycombe Wildlife Group’s Executive Committee, I am submitting a formal response on behalf of Wycombe Wildlife Group.</p> <p>We are pleased that the unploughed chalk grassland area on the site is to be retained and restored to its condition before the encroachment of scrub. We would like this area to be designated, ideally as a Local Nature Reserve or, if not, a Local Wildlife Site to recognise</p>	<p>The issue of designation of the retained chalk grass land will be a matter for the Council as part of any future Development Plan process.</p> <p>The Development Brief (section 4.4) requires the land to be managed by a suitable organisation. Whether or not this is the new Council is a matter for the future and can be determined at the application stage.</p>	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			its conservation value. As a Local Nature Reserve it could presumably be included in the contract for on-going maintenance of the existing Wycombe LNRs.		
52.	Liz Johncock		Continuing care and maintenance of the green roofing as they need constant attention to maintain them as they should be, and not allow them to become weed patches. Ensure also that an inspection is made regularly to remove any tree saplings.	Agreed. A common maintenance regime will be required to ensure the character of the development and ecological value of the green/brown roofs is maintained.	Amend final bullet point in 4.1 to state: A green/brown roof maintenance plan will need to be submitted. Management of green/brown roofs may need to be included in common maintenance.
53.			Concerned over protection of ones' own private space. I still feel there should be some way of not allowing strangers to encroach on what is your private area. Whatever their circumstances elderly, living alone whatever their age, those with children be it their own or visiting, should be able to be outside and safely contained and the unwanted attention of other people's dogs however friendly!!	Agreed. Public/private space needs to be clearly demarcated.	Section 4.10 will need to be amended and expanded to include a bullet point stating: There will need to be clear definition between the private amenity areas to the rear of dwellings and semi-private ecological areas to ensure containment of personal effects, children and pets. This could be achieved in a variety of ways. It is likely to

			<p>Could not the personal space be marked by a boundary of some type low box hedges or something of that type.</p> <p>My fear is that if there is nothing at all residents will do their own thing with whatever comes cheaply to hand, and the visual effect of openness will be lost.</p>		<p>commonly include a low level railing (or other form of enclosure) and hedging.</p>
54.	Adrian Gibbon	Resident	<p>The houses are too close to the existing properties in Deangarden Rise. 2. You are measuring boundaries window to window - using our property for the purpose of sizing and calculations - thus giving a false impression of privacy. 3. How can we be sure that this is what the development will be like when the plans and drawings are so sketchy 4. Planting trees used to screen houses will cut out light and obscure the sun in the winter. 5. Infrastructure: Roads congested to breaking point and unrealistic travel times to town centre and station etc.</p>	<p>The back-to-back distances are established through the Residential Design Guide SPD and carried through into the Deangarden Edge character condition in 4.11.</p> <p>The Development Brief is a relatively high level document. Further detail will be provided at the application stage(s). The purposes of the Development Brief is to give an early high level steer.</p> <p>The location of tree planting is a matter for future applications.</p> <p>The issue of traffic congestion is beyond the scope of this</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>

				Development Brief and is addressed by the Reserve Sites Infrastructure Delivery Plan and a Transport Assessment that would accompany any future planning application.	
55.	Audrey Railton	Resident	One of my main concerns is water runoff from the site, regarding the number of trees, shrubs which will be removed, and much concrete being laid on site. Current advice is, where possible, to plant trees and shrubs to alleviate any future flooding problems. Will there be adequate storm drains throughout the site? One other concern is that any new development on this site does not build to the lower perimeter of the site i.e. leave a wooded barrier between the development and Kingsmead Road/Abbey Barn Road. The biggest concern for me is the new Abbey Barn Lane realignment but as no plans are available to the public at this point of time we have to wait and see how this will impact on us.	<p>The development would need to achieve greenfield run-off rates, which take into account the increased future likelihood of flooding. Therefore, the current situation should not be made worse and the situation in the future may be improved compared to if nothing was done. The detail of this will be addressed in a drainage strategy that will accompany any future application. However, provision needs to be made on the plan to accommodate SUDs provision. This is addressed above in point 1.</p> <p>Save for the realigned section of Abbey Barn Lane, the northern part of the site is proposed to be retained in its current wooded state. Plans will need to be amended to make this intention clear.</p>	<p>See comment 1 above re the SUDs strategy for the site.</p> <p>Amend plan in 4.1, 4.2 and 4.12.</p>

				Detailed plans for Abbey Barn Lane and the realignment will be provided at the application stage.	
56.	Barbara Price	Resident 4.5	Access and Movement - Road Network Diagram. Will there be Access from one side of Kingsmead Road to the other (extension) across the proposed "roundabout"?	The new aligned road will need to include appropriate pedestrian and cycle crossing points. Requirement A1 under 3.3 and 3 rd bullet under 4.5 in the Development Brief address this point. It is considered to be appropriate to include a further bullet point under 4.5 to expressly address this point.	Add to 4.5 "Incorporate safe and accessible pedestrian/vehicular crossing points as part of the junction improvement on Kingsmead Road"
57.	Cara Nightin - gale	Resident	Will the new roads/ access proposed for the development of Abbey Barn North be within 200 metres of Deangarden Rise? I live at number 46. Could you also give me the date in which these proposals first arose.	The existing Abbey Barn Lane is approximately 130m from the hammer head at the end of Kingsmead Road. The realigned road would be closer. Work on the Abbey Barn Lane realignment strategy began in circa May 2018 around the time of the adoption of the joint BCC and WDC position statement.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
58.	Chris Nevins	Resident	Whilst I appreciate the need for new housing my comments focus on the wider and longer-	It is acknowledged that development will bring with it a degree of light and noise pollution. This can be mitigated	No amendment required to Development Brief.

		<p>term impact of the development in two areas.</p> <p>The first relates to the ecology of the area. It is noted that the area is adjacent to ancient woodland and that the area is classified as a 'UK Priority Habitat and has led to the site being designated a Biological Notification Site (BNS).' The SPD also states that one of the aims is to 'Deliver significant measurable net gains in biodiversity that reflect the site's existing nature conservation interests and its designation as a Biological Notification Site and Green Infrastructure Area.'</p> <p>However, there is no mention in the SPD of potential light and noise pollution and how disruptive this can be to the local wildlife. I would therefore like reassurance that these considerations will be acted upon and there is accountability for the long-term potential impact in addition to seeing detail on the plan to measure and report on the 'net gains'</p>	<p>through design to a certain extent, but not eliminated. Any bio-diversity assessment would need to have regard to this negative impact and account for it accordingly. This level of detail is best addressed at the application stage.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

			post completion of the development.		
59.			<p>Secondly, the increased traffic from the development is a concern. Whilst there is a plan to mitigate these concerns with the road realignment the wider view is the impact on and around the London Road. Whilst mention of various traffic modelling is referred to in various documents, again my concern is accountability. The recent Aldi store opening near Gomm Road has been a disaster for congestion - what reassurances can be given to residents that this development isn't just being 'pushed through?' What reassurances can be given to show lessons are being learned? The bigger picture of new supermarkets opening on the London Road (Lidl) combined with developments in the Gomm Valley will put a huge strain on the road networks that cannot be solved by looking at developments in isolation. Along with infrastructure the on-going</p>	<p>Wider transport and congestion issues are beyond the scope of the Development Brief, which is intended to address matters on the Abbey Barn North site.</p> <p>The Reserve Sites Infrastructure Delivery Plan is based on strategic transport modelling, which identifies a suite of measures to address additional congestion resulting from the development of the Reserve Sites.</p> <p>In addition the site would need to be submitted with a Transport Assessment, which reviews localised congestion issues.</p>	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			<p>maintenance is also a concern. The local roads are in very poor condition; a significant amount of money can be found for a substantial road realignment (£12.5m) but I would like to see funds committed to on-going maintenance and fixing of potholes. Mention of increasing cycle networks are made but the current network is not maintained and is potentially dangerous for users.</p>		
60.	Graham Griffiths	Resident	<p>My objection relates entirely to the existing road infrastructure which is at crisis point now. Development of this site (and the Gomm Valley) will make it virtually impossible to travel at peak times. Clearly nobody in planning lives in this part of Wycombe otherwise development like this would not be considered. Even I envisaged the new Aldi supermarket causing real traffic problems and of course it has. Surely one of the roles of a planner is to help make life better for people not ten times worse.</p>	See response 59 above.	No amendment required to Development Brief.

61.	Julia Wassall	Resident & BCC local member	Is this development in Ryemead Ward and is there a developer?	The site is within Ryemead Ward. Acropolis is the primary landowner who may sell the site or develop it.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
62.	Keith Woods	Resident	I noticed when looking at the drawings and on line your red line drawing has included my land and no one has consulted me about this could someone please call or email me to confirm that this line will be moved.	<p>It is assumed that this refers to the land to the southwest of 26 Kingsmead.</p> <p>Discussion has already taken place in respect of this land parcel.</p> <p>The purpose of the current exercise is to consult with the public.</p> <p>The land was included as it is physically and functionally part of the woodland belt that occupies the north-eastern portion of the site and should be considered as part of the strategy for that area, even if the strategy is to not develop it and allow it to continue to mature into woodland.</p>	The red edge area need to be reduced to exclude the garden area to the rear of no.26, but included the wooded area, which is more physically and functionally related to the Development Brief site. This is identified on slide 2.8, but the red edge area would need to be echoed across all plans.
63.	Koral Bartropp	Resident	I would love to see these being built as affordable housing. The new developments nearby are just not affordable for first	The Council's affordable housing policy requires 48% of units on green field sites to be affordable housing (80% for rent and 20%	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			homes. I am on a shared ownership scheme at the moment. I am a teacher and my partner is metropolitan police. Between us we are on £80,000 and yet we cannot afford any new builds in Wycombe.	affordable route to home ownership). Given there is an existing policy addressing this matter, no further information is required in the Development Brief.	
64.	Oliver Witney	Resident	There are a number of positive outcomes of the development brief but there are also a number of items that I am concerned about. Green/Brown Roofing This is a very good idea and will keep with the surround landscapes. These should be put in as restrictive covenants to the deeds of the properties so that owners cannot amend and potentially change the style.	It is accepted that provision will need to be made to ensure proper maintenance. See response no.52 above.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
65.			Private Amenity Space The shared amenity green space is a good step but then this is completely ruined by the lack of private residential green space. The majority of the site is for houses, which is likely to have families residing, with both children and pets, therefore there should be an effort to	See response no.53.	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			<p>make housing have some safe enclosed private garden space. The surrounding residential areas (Dean Garden Rise, Abbey Barn Road, and Bassetsbury Lane) all have similar housing sizes as the ones in the development brief and all have private garden spaces, making it a key part of the area.</p>		
66.			<p>Parking - There needs to be plenty of space for private car parking spaces. Although there are some local amenities (schools in both Abbey Barn and Marsh), there are a lot that require you to travel. There is only one local bus route into the town centre and this is only in operation part time (last is 6pm weekdays, and 5:30pm on Saturdays), without anything on a Sunday. The surrounding residential areas (Dean Garden Rise, Abbey Barn Road, and Bassetsbury Lane), where there are many car parks on the road due to lack of private parking, show that the area has a strong need for private vehicles. The</p>	<p>The development will need to comply with the County Parking standard in terms of the size and quantum of parking. This is likely to comprise a mixture of on-street and on-plot parking. There is already clear policies available to delivery this so no further guidance is required in the Development Brief.</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>

			development brief has already considered that cars would be hidden away to stay in keeping with the area, however there needs to be enough spaces for the type of residents, which again is likely to be families in the houses, and therefore there should be plenty of spaces available.		
67.			Dwelling Height - The development brief has stated a number of times that the topology of the site means the residential housing are going to have frontages facing the street. There should be a consideration as to the height of the dwellings, including flats, to only two levels. Having tall buildings can end up having them looking over the housing on lower areas of the site, especially when you consider that the illustrative master plan (4.12), shows a number of flats being built to the north of the site which will be above (due to the topology of the site), and directly overlook, houses on the site as well the houses at the end of Dean	Section 4.7 acknowledges that there may be scope for higher buildings at the base of the valley. The exact height is not set out in the Development Brief. This will be subject to Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and urban morphology assessment, which will follow at the application stage. The potential for view out across the valley was acknowledged early on and designed into the scheme. The potential for overlooking of dwellings on lower ground is unavoidable to a degree on a sloping site of this nature. The proposed ecological corridors that traverse the site in addition to providing an	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			Garden Rise. There are also ideas to have the roofs as garden roofs, which will add to the effect of being overlooked if people can view down onto other residents from them.	ecological network should also create a thick belt of vegetation that will filter views between dwellings.	
68.			Walking Access - There is currently a footpath that is not maintained between Dean Garden Rise and Abbey Barn Road. This should be adopted as a maintained path to enable residents on both sides to use as a walkway. Currently, especially during winter months, the path is difficult and inaccessible for some due to the lack of lighting and the quality (lots of mud, very slippery).	As the area becomes more urbanised footpaths through the urbanised part of the site will need to be hard surfaced to accommodate the additional footfall. This would include the link to Deangarden Rise.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
69.	Peter O'Meara	Resident	My objection is based on the impact this development will have on the already congested Sierra Road which has already become a rat run. The road was never designed (in collaboration with WDC) to take heavy traffic but that was a momentous error as the current traffic flows for up to 6/7 hours a day testifies. As there are a total of 3	See response no.59	No amendment required to Development Brief.

			<p>developments being planned on Abbey Barns the horrendous speeding traffic will increase to unmanageable proportions with a serious danger to life and additional pollution in an area which was originally designed to be far away from such nuisance and will blight these expensive homes. At the very least there should be traffic calming, speed cameras or some such controls. We residents were lied to by Berkeley Homes</p>		
70.	Rebecca Sowden	Resident	<p>I live at 50 Dean Garden Rise and like many of our neighbours we have a gate from our back garden into Dean Garden Wood. In fact, our neighbours, at 48, had their gate put in late this summer.</p> <p>I have tried to study the maps of the Abbey Barn North Development on the web site, but it is not clear to me if this access to the wood and the path is to be maintained or not. I would certainly hope that this would be the case and that the new houses will not back</p>	<p>The development is not proposed to extend as far as 50 Dean Garden Rise. Rights of access onto the land at the rear will be a matter between respective landowner.</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>

			<p>directly on to our gardens. We certainly bought our house, two years ago, as it had an accessible wood behind it and these proposals did not come up in that process.</p> <p>It is also not totally clear to me from the plans what will be behind our house and whether this will be houses or open space and I think we are very near this boundary from the maps.</p> <p>I am very upset and concerned by these proposals and I would not want to lose the access to the wood and the Rye, which we bought the house for.</p>		
71.	Ryan Bentley	Resident	<p>I am personally disgusted and disappointed that our district council are prepared to damage the small amount of wildlife left in this area. The woodland area that you plan to destroy to build these cramped houses in, is home to many animals, trees and plants. As a human race we should be doing all we can to preserve wildlife areas like this</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>All allocated sites have undergone a rigorous site selection process to ensure the impact on wildlife and other sustainability factors is minimised. Unfortunately, at the end of this process it remains necessary to develop some green field land.</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>

			<p>one, not destroying them only to contribute further to the overpopulation of our town's facilities. That woodland area is extremely peaceful and enjoyed by many that live nearby. It's also home to many bats which are endangered and we should be protecting. I sincerely hope that you decide against this ludicrous idea, and in future put more thought towards doing your bit in saving this planet from the damage done by humans.</p>		
72.	Stephen Cooper	Resident	<p>Page 2.1 Site History & Heritage It should be highlighted here that part of the site's heritage is the that it has characteristics that declare it to be a Biological Notification Site and that it provides habitation for common reptiles and invertebrates as well as a foraging area for bats, common birds and small mammals. This is mentioned in paragraph 2.8 Site Ecology but it should be highlighted as a heritage matter at the outset of this section. There is no mention of any footpaths which traverse</p>	<p>Heritage is referring to built heritage rather than ecology. Adding ecological matters to the heritage section would lead to duplication and confusion.</p> <p>The access and movement diagram in 2.10 clearly identifies the existing permissive access routes that traverse the site. Section 3.3 A3 introduces an objective to retain the path network. 4.5 sets out a strategy for delivering a hierarchy of paths on the site. 4.12 (the illustrative</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>

			<p>the Site area, either listed or used for many years by local residents. Also missing from the text is any reference to the fact that the north east corner of the site immediately behind the end of Deangarden Rise was at one time used as allotment space.</p>	<p>masterplan) indicates how this may be achieved.</p>	
73.			<p>Page 9. 2.2 The Site and its Surroundings Some of the approximate times for access to key surrounding destinations are substantially adrift from reality. It is impossible to travel to the Town Centre, Train Station, the Rye or Beechview School and possibly the Marsh School in the times stated between the hours of 7.45 - 9.00 or from 15.30 to 18.00 on a weekday when schools are functioning and are still un-achievable when they are closed at these times. Kingsmead Road, both west and east, Abbey Barn Road and the routes through the retail park are generally blocked with traffic through these hours and will be even more so when both Abbey Barn South and North sites are</p>	<p>It is normal for quoted times to be outside peak hours. Walk and cycle times appear realistic at an average pace and should be relatively unaffected by the rush hour.</p>	<p>Include note stating that times quoted are based on off-peak flows.</p>

			developed and the properties therein are occupied.		
74.			<p>Page 11. 2.4. Character of Local Built Form The nearest local built form to Abbey Barn North is Deangarden Rise where the properties to the north east of the site were built in the 70's with further infill in the late 90's. The opening paragraph is therefore incorrect. Using London Road as an example is misleading as it is a noticeable distance away from Abbey Barn North, as is the photograph of the small development of flats in Abbey Barn Road which was built much later and in a totally different style to the substantial number of properties in Abbey Barn Road.</p>	<p>Agreed. Deangarden Rise was constructed in the 70s. The main purpose of this section is to demonstrate the abundance of character in the area.</p>	<p>Amend 2.4 to state "1930-70s"</p>
75.			<p>Page 15. 2.8 Site Ecology In the final bullet point it states that the Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland "is a special and irreplaceable habitat which complements the site's primary habitat". Is it not the case that the site itself also complements the ecological well being of the Ancient Semi-</p>	<p>The ecological synergy between the Abbey Barn North site and the ancient woodland is acknowledged. This underlies the strategy of leaving the north and south western portions of the site undeveloped and restoring the chalk grassland. Also, retaining a</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>

			<p>Natural Woodland and in particular the wild life that inhabits it? I also believe a study was carried out on the Abbey Barn North site within the last ten years that revealed some unusual forms of orchid are to be found in the Site area but these can obviously only be observed at particular times and any ecological surveys undertaken for planning purposes should be carried out over the course of a year to establish the true existence of plants and wildlife.</p>	<p>15m offset from the ancient woodland.</p>	
76.			<p>Page 17. 2.10 Site Constraints Access and Movement The realignment of Abbey Barn Lane is highlighted as a strategic objective and further details are provided at Appendix 1. What is not clear and seems to not be addressed is the management of additional traffic volume that will be generated in a Abbey Barn Lane to London Road and through the retail park and also along Kingsmead Road and at its junction with Station Road in Loudwater. These routes are</p>	<p>The Development Brief is intended to focus on development of the site. Wider traffic impacts were considered as part of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the Reserve Sites IDP (Infrastructure Delivery Plan); - Local Plan IDP when the site was allocated; and, - will be considered in a finer grain of detail at the application stage through the submission and assessment of a Transport Assessment. 	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>

			<p>already extremely busy in peak times and pass local schools. It is noted that the existing Abbey Barn Road is to be closed after the diversion route has been completed. The text says the existing road will be closed to through traffic but as it will serve no purpose why isn't it removed completely and the area landscaped?</p> <p>Utilities There is reference to a no build zone being maintained around the sewage transfer pipeline but would a similar no build zone be required around the existing gas main shown on the sketch drawing.</p> <p>Topography, Views & Proximity The document states that there is to be a minimum 25m rear separation from Deangarden Rise. It would be an encroachment on privacy if it was measured from the building line and it would be more appropriate if it was from the end of plot boundaries in Deangarden Rise. This will be a very sensitive matter in any planning application.</p>	<p>The Reserve Sites cannot be expected or required to address the existing congestion issues in the HW urban area, but rather not make them unacceptably worse.</p> <p>The realignment of Abbey Barn Lane will serve to assist in mitigating the impact of the development, but also address and existing issue.</p> <p>The existing Abbey Barn Lane is proposed to be retained as a walk/cycle route as indicated at 4.5 of the Development Brief.</p> <p>The gas main is likely to have to be moved. The nearest residential dwelling is some distance from the gas main. Therefore, it is considered unlikely that it will represent a significant constraint to residential development. It is likely that a build-over agreement will need to be obtained for the road.</p> <p>The 25m distance rule is set out in the Residential Design Guide SPD, which is utilised district wide. The measurement is taken</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

				from the nearest habitable room in one property to the nearest habitable room window in another. The building line does not come into it.	
77.			Page 18. 2.10 Site Constraints Green Infrastructures Ecology For clarity, although the document refers to a minimum 15 m no build buffer zone from the boundary of Deangarden Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland, should this be stressed as being an area that is not only non build but strictly outside of any area used for any building site activity. Further, should a further buffer zone line be established at the boundary of the area of the proposed building development and the preserved area to be restored as calcareous grassland to prevent deterioration during any building activity.	This is a matter that would be addressed as part of any future ecological management plan. This would be produced at the application stage and secured via condition. This is not a level of detail that would ordinarily be included in a Development Brief.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
78.			Page 20. 3.1 Green Infrastructure Ecology E5 refers to a sustainable management framework via a legal agreement for the funding,	It is acknowledged that this is an important matter of detail that will need to be resolved at the application stage. The parties to any future legal agreement are	No amendment required to Development Brief. The Development Brief goes as far as it can at this time.

			<p>delivery and ongoing maintenance of the grass lands for the foreseeable future. It does not say who will be the parties to such an agreement (it is appreciated that the parties cannot be named but there should be a generalisation of developer, freeholder, leaseholder, WDC etc.) and who should take the responsibility and therefore the costs of any required activity arising from that agreement.</p>	<p>likely to be the new Buckinghamshire Council and the land owners (WDC and Acropolis). The land may be gifted to WDC to own, manage and maintain or put into Trust and managed privately by a responsible organisation to a specification that is agreed with WDC. In all scenarios the developer would be expected to provide a sustainable mechanism for ongoing financing. This is likely to include a mix of commuted sum and maintenance charge.</p>	
79.			<p>Page 21. 3.1 Green Infrastructure Trees Should there be an obligation to plant additional trees on the existing route of Abbey Barn Lane after its realignment?</p>	<p>This is already covered by T3 on p.21</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>
80.			<p>Page 23. 3.3 Access and Movement - Should there be a paragraph that advises on lighting and in particular street lighting that is in keeping with the surrounding area and does not cause excessive light pollution.</p>	<p>The Development Brief should be restricted to matters that are specific to the Abbey Barn North site. This is general to all areas. The nature of lighting columns is to a large extent limited by the Highway Authority adoption criteria. Light spill will be</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>

				addressed when the lighting strategy is agreed. Lighting deflectors are common used in particularly ecologically sensitive locations such as near mature trees.	
81.			<p>Page 25. 3.5 Built Form & Layout The document does not specify the number of properties to be built. Is there a maximum or minimum requirement? The proposed Area for Homes to the eastern end of Deangarden Rise (marked as "V" shape) when considered with the proposed internal road would appear to be very tight to the boundaries of the existing properties. It is appreciated these are sketches without dimensions but the sketches do give an impression that the proposals and spatial requirements for privacy of existing properties will be difficult to meet on his elevation of the development site.</p>	<p>It is very intentional that the development does not set out a dwelling number.</p> <p>The Development Brief is intended to set out site constraints, vision and objectives for the site. The number of dwellings will only be ascertained once the vision has been applied to the site. It is likely to be heavily skewed by the end mix of flats and houses.</p> <p>The number of dwellings will only be determined at the application stage once proofing layouts have been produced.</p>	No amendment required to Development Brief.
82.			<p>Pages 27 to 29. 4.1 Ecological Strategy and 4.2 Planting Strategy Generally, the strategy uses the word "should" in the</p>	<p>Having word searched 4.1 and 4.2 I cannot find any instances of the word 'can'.</p>	Change the word 'could' to 'will' as indicated on page 30.

			<p>first paragraph but thereafter in several paragraphs uses "could" and "can". The strategy should better emphasise the strategy is not negotiable and use "should" or even "will be required" throughout.</p>	<p>The work 'could' relates to tree planting on the boundary, which it is acknowledged may or may not be desirable if it leads to significant levels of overshadowing and therefore is considered to have been used appropriately.</p> <p>Other examples of 'could' have been changed to 'will'.</p>	
83.			<p>Page 34. 4.6 Parking Strategy A1 refers to county-wide guidance that has proven to be totally inadequate in the number of spaces provided on other new developments. Sufficient spaces should be provided not to suit the guidance but to instead to recognise the level of car ownership in a typical household.</p>	<p>Parking levels have historically been provided in accordance with the Local Plan dating from 1995. These were superseded by County Parking Standards in 2015 to address the issue identified. The County standards are based on the most up-to-date census data on car ownership.</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>
84.			<p>Page of 37. 4.9 Architectural Approach As well selecting materials on sustainability properties and appropriateness for the landscape setting attention should be made in particular for the atmospheric conditions that exist in his</p>	<p>Agreed. Although water run-off from roofs other than via gutters is usually a consequence of poor construction rather than design. This is essentially a problem that should be avoided everywhere. This matter is too detailed to be included in a Development Brief.</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>

			<p>particular area. It is a "frost hollow" and damp for much of the year and the growth of moss and green algae is more prevalent than other some other areas. Building design therefore should avoid water run-off from window cills and roof features etc as staining will soon appear on building cladding leading to poor looking buildings.</p>		
85.			<p>Page 41. Abbey Barn Hillside Despite previous statements on the potential for greater building heights at the base of the valley floor, it would appear that the proposal is to place three storey buildings on the Abbey Barn Hillside which is elevated above the valley floor!</p>	<p>The drawings are for illustrative purposes only and not definitive as to the final permitted design. The final scale of development will be determined at the application stage and informed by the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment and Design & Access Statement.</p> <p>Due to the cutting into the slope and flat roofed nature of the illustrative proposal it is not ruled out that three storeys may be appropriate on the Hillside.</p> <p>The mix of two and three storey images is considered to be appropriate.</p>	<p>No amendment required to Development Brief.</p>

86.			Page 42. Deangarden Edge To repeat an earlier comment, the minimum 25m from window to window distance is unreasonable and in places could result in new building tight on existing plot boundaries in Deangarden Rise.	See response to No.76.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
87.			Page 43. 4.12 Illustrative Masterplan. The Plan shows flats on the Developable Area but there is no indication of the number of stories that are proposed or will be allowable.	The master plan is illustrative. It is premature to make a decision on building heights.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
At the Abbey Barn North Liaison Group Meeting					
88.			What is purdah?	Period before an election when sensitive consultation cannot be undertaken.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
89.			How many dwellings proposed?	Exact number to be determined through outline application.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
90.			How long will Sedum or Green roof last?	Many years. Depends on maintenance. Should last longer than standard flat roof as partially protected from UV. Brown and sedum roofs last longer.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
91.			Query about whether trees mitigate noise.	Accepted - trees will not mitigate noise in any significant way.	No amendment required to Development Brief as

				However, acoustic fencing, which is a form of hard landscaping will.	reference was to hard and soft landscaping.
92.			Concern that greens roofs can be full of weeds?	This matter is addressed above under response 52.	Brief changed.
93.			Concern over open plan space and enclosed space and impact on young children?	This matter is addressed above under response 53.	Brief changed.
94.			Scheme needs to have regard to design of ABL?	Design of ABL emerging. Should be more clarity on this before application submitted.	Brief can only proceed with the information currently before us.
95.			Should all permissive paths be made PRow?	In certain circumstances, but not as matter of course.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
96.			Statement: Support concept of communal garden spaces. All housing does not need to be built in a traditional way. Need for choice. Green roofs very common on continent. Good for bio and visual.	Acknowledged.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
97.			Q: Is Chalk grassland a priority habitat? Will chalk grassland colonise green roofs.	Yes chalk grassland is a priority habitat. Could possibly work with green roofs.	Brief amended.

98.			Q: can additional junction be added heading south to distribute traffic.	Proposed junction is give way allowing traffic to pass in both directions. Additional junctions would damage the landscape and serve little purpose.	No amendment required to Development Brief.
99.			Q: Could public footpath be added linking Dean Garden Rise to Kingsmead.	Shown on some plans, but not others. Amend Brief.	Brief Amended.
100.			Q: provision needs to be made for drying clothes, sustainability and grey water features?	Existing Local Plan address sustainability features	No amendment required to Development Brief.
101.			No prohibition of white vans and 2 x schools to be added to school list (St. Michaels and new Daws Hill school).	Accepted. This would be a matter for any future planning application.	No amendment required to Development Brief.