

# **Housing Intensification Supplementary Planning Document 2011 Update**

Adopted October 2011

## **Appendices 2; 3 & 4**

Appendix 2: Results of the 2010 workshops (pages 2-14)

Appendix 3: Results of the 2011 Residents Survey (pages 15-23)

Appendix 4: Comments received during the Public Consultation  
(Pages 24-37)

Adopted October 2011

Wycombe District Council October 2011

### Appendix 2 Results of the 2010 workshops

#### Summary of the results of the 2010 Workshops:

We held three workshops last year with members, officers and stakeholders to assess 13 schemes that had been completed since the original Housing Intensification SPD had been adopted in 2005 (see appendix 1 for a list of the schemes that were assessed). The aim of the workshops was to find an agreed baseline of where we think the line should be drawn between Housing intensification schemes we should refuse and those we should permit.

Key findings from the workshops are summarised below.

Of the schemes assessed, all the workshops would have with hindsight refused Skyline Mews, Cressex Road; 12 Beechwood Road; 179 West Wycombe Road and 142 Kingsmead Road, many groups would have also refused Thornbury Place and 106 Hughenden Avenue.

Similarly there was agreement as to what represented good development. 28 & 28a New Road; Woodside Gardens; Temple Side Gardens and The Old Orchard consistently scored highly in all three workshops.

Cometa, Kingsmead Road, the scheme that recently received a national Building for Life award, was the “marmite scheme” being either liked or hated. Some groups scored it highly while others identified it as a scheme that should have been refused.

There was quite a degree of agreement to the issues that lead to either a scheme being acceptable or unacceptable.

#### The qualities of a successful scheme:

Getting the scale right and fitting with the existing character were cited as keys to the success of a scheme; as was the use of high quality materials and finishes; and the successful implementation of a good landscape scheme especially along the frontage. Good schemes took cues from the existing context and had a spacious well designed layout that contributed positively to the wider residential area. Schemes predominantly composed of houses rather than flats were preferred as were schemes that comprehensively redeveloped a site rather than just the in the backland area.

### Issues that lead to unacceptable schemes

The schemes that scored poorly were identified as being too different in height or scale to fit in. The sites often just looked overdeveloped – either the buildings were too big or there were too many of them. They were seen as being too close to their existing neighbours resulting in awkward front to back or front to side relationships. All these aspects together had an adverse effect on the street scene and created a harsh transition between the new and existing development.

Tight, narrow and long access roads were criticised especially when bounded by tall fences. As well as being unattractive they made the new development feel cut off from the existing development and would give rise to issues with security, surveillance and inactive dead frontages.

How parked cars were accommodated also contributed to the unacceptability of schemes. Parking which dominated the frontage exacerbated by a lack of landscape treatment and overuse of tarmac were identified as issues well as the sheer amount of parking often required in denser layouts. Some groups felt that the use of rear or under-croft parking contributed to the unacceptability of some schemes.

### Detailed Results of the 2010 Workshops:

48 people attended the three workshops which took place on the 19<sup>th</sup> October; 17<sup>th</sup> November and 8<sup>th</sup> December last year.

The first workshop was composed of members of Wycombe District Council with some planning officers helping to facilitate the discussion. The second was composed of development management officers; planning policy officers; and other specialist officers of the council. The third was made up of developers and architects who are members of the agent's panel and representatives from local amenity groups and societies.

Each workshop followed the same format. First there was a presentation to give the policy background to housing intensification including the recent changes to government policy and outline the aims of the update to the SPD.

The rest of the workshop was spent assessing 13 schemes which had all been approved and built since the original guidance had been adopted in 2005. These were selected to represent the various types of intensification commonly seen:

#### Development in the backland area of existing houses accessed by a road located in a gap between existing dwellings:

- **Thornbury place**- 5 houses developed in the backland area behind existing retained dwellings in School Close, High Wycombe
- **Skyline Mews** – 23 flats developed in the backland area behind existing retained dwellings in Cressex Road, High Wycombe
- **Bramley Close** – 5 houses developed in the backland area at right angles (perpendicular) to the existing street behind existing retained dwellings in Cressex Road, High Wycombe

#### Existing houses and gardens redeveloped comprehensively:

- **Templeside Gardens** - 12 flats along the frontage of the West Wycombe Road in High Wycombe and 11 houses to the rear accessed by a new street
- **Woodside Gardens** - 9 flats and 11 houses developed as a square with open space in the middle, fronting Little Marlow Road, Marlow
- **The Old Orchard** – 5 new houses – two fronting Stag Lane, Great Kingshill and three behind in a tandem arrangement (the fronts face the rear gardens of the houses fronting Stag Lane)

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

### Existing houses are replaced with development just along the frontage:

- **Cometa:** 12 new dual aspect flats fronting Kingsmead Road, High Wycombe with parking in front of them and private /communal amenity space behind.
- **142 Kingsmead Road:** 10 new dual aspect flats fronting Kingsmead Road with parking underneath them and private/communal amenity space behind.
- **179 West Wycombe Road:** 23 new single aspect flats fronting West Wycombe Road, High Wycombe with parking to the rear and private / communal amenity space at the front and rear of the new building.

### Development involving just one or two new houses:

- **106 Hughenden Road:** One new house added attached alongside the existing house using up the existing side garden.
- **New Road:** Two new houses replacing one house fronting New Road in Stokenchurch.
- **Beaumont Rise:** One new house built in the front garden of an existing house fronting Beaumont Rise in Marlow in a tandem arrangement.
- **Beechwood Road:** one new dwelling built behind an existing house in part of their rear garden in a tandem arrangement accessed along the side of the existing house fronting Beechwood Road, High Wycombe.

First everyone individually gave a score out of ten for each site using aerial photos; movie clips and photos presented from the front.

These scores were then collated together in groups of 4-5 people and a leader board created to rank the schemes.

The groups then decided which of the schemes they would have with hindsight wished had not been built.

They then discussed and identified the reasons why they made that decision and also what lead them to think the other schemes were acceptable.

The workshop concluded with each group feeding back to everyone and a time for discussion and questions.

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

Detailed results of the scores for 13 schemes assessed at the three workshops:

### Combined results of all three workshops

Average Score (out of 10)	Rank	Site address	Groups that would have refused this scheme
7.4	<b>1st</b>	New Road, Stokenchurch HP14 3RT	0/12
7.3	<b>2</b>	Woodside Gardens, Little Marlow Road Marlow SL7 1JA	0/12
6.9	<b>3</b>	Temple side Gardens, West Wycombe Road High Wycombe HP12 3AP	0/12
6.6	<b>4</b>	Beaumont Rise, Marlow SL7 1EF	1/12
6.1	<b>5</b>	The Old Orchard, Stag Lane, Great Kingshill HP15 6EW	0/12
5.8	<b>6</b>	Cometa, Kingsmead Road, High Wycombe HP11 1JB	4/12
5.3	<b>7</b>	106 Hughenden Avenue, High Wycombe HP13 5SN	7/12
5.1	<b>8</b>	Bramley Close, Cressex Road, High Wycombe HP12 4TY	4/12
4.8	<b>9</b>	Thornbury Place, School Close, High Wycombe HP11 1PH	8/12
4.0	<b>10</b>	142 Kingsmead Road, High Wycombe HP11 1JB	10/12
3.6	<b>11</b>	Beechwood Road, High Wycombe, HP124AJ	10/12
3.4	<b>12</b>	179 West Wycombe Road, High Wycombe	11/12
2.5	<b>13</b>	Skyline Mews, Cressex Road, High Wycombe HP12 4UB	12/12

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

### Members workshop results

Average Score (out of 10)	Rank	Site address	Groups that would have refused this scheme
7.2	<b>1st</b>	Woodside Gardens, Little Marlow Road, Marlow SL7 1JA	0/4
6.4	<b>2</b>	Temple Side Gardens, West Wycombe Road, High Wycombe HP12 3AP	0/4
6.4	<b>2</b>	New Road, Stokenchurch HP14 3RT	0/4
6.4	<b>4</b>	The Old Orchard, Stag Lane, Great Kingshill HP15 6EW	0/4
5.9	<b>5</b>	Beaumont Rise, Marlow SL7 1EF	0/4
4.8	<b>6</b>	Cometa, Kingsmead Road, High Wycombe HP11 1JB	2/4
4.1	<b>7</b>	142 Kingsmead Road, High Wycombe HP11 1JB	2/4
3.9	<b>8</b>	106 Hughenden Avenue, High Wycombe HP13 5SN	3/4
3.8	<b>9</b>	Bramley Close, Cressex Road, High Wycombe HP12 4TY	3/4
3.6	<b>10</b>	Thornbury Place, School Close, High Wycombe HP11 1PH	3/4
3.4	<b>11</b>	179 West Wycombe Road, High Wycombe	3/4
2.9	<b>12</b>	Beechwood Road, High Wycombe, HP124AJ	4/4
1.3	<b>13</b>	Skyline Mews, Cressex Road, High Wycombe HP12 4UB	4/4

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

### Officers workshop results

Average Score (out of 10)	Rank	Site address	Groups that would have refused this scheme
7.9	<b>1st</b>	New Road, Stokenchurch HP14 3RT	0/4
7.4	<b>2</b>	Woodside Gardens, Little Marlow Road Marlow SL7 1JA	0/4
7.1	<b>2</b>	Templeside Gardens, West Wycombe Road High Wycombe HP12 3AP	0/4
6.6	<b>4</b>	Cometa, Kingsmead Road High Wycombe HP11 1JB	1/4
6.5	<b>5</b>	Beaumont Rise Marlow SL7 1EF	1/4
5.6	<b>6</b>	106 Hughenden Avenue High Wycombe HP13 5SN	3/3
5.2	<b>7</b>	The Old Orchard, Stag Lane Great Kingshill HP15 6EW	0/4
5.6	<b>8</b>	Bramley Close, Cressex Road High Wycombe HP12 4TY	0/4
4.5	<b>9</b>	Thornbury Place, School Close, High Wycombe HP11 1PH	4/4
3.6	<b>10</b>	142 Kingsmead Road High Wycombe HP11 1JB	4/4
3.3	<b>11</b>	179 West Wycombe Road High Wycombe	4/4
3.1	<b>12</b>	Beechwood Road, High Wycombe, HP124AJ	4/4
2.9	<b>13</b>	Skyline Mews, Cressex Road High Wycombe HP12 4UB	4/4

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

### Stakeholders workshop results

Average Score (out of 10)	Rank	Site address	Groups that would have refused this scheme
7.9	<b>1st</b>	New Road Stokenchurch HP14 3RT	0/4
7.8	<b>2</b>	Beaumont Rise Marlow SL7 1EF	0/4
7.4	<b>2</b>	Templeside Gardens, West Wycombe Road High Wycombe HP12 3AP	0/4
7.4	<b>4</b>	Woodside Gardens, Little Marlow Road Marlow SL7 1JA	0/4
7.0	<b>5</b>	The Old Orchard, Stag Lane Great Kingshill HP15 6EW	0/4
6.7	<b>6</b>	Thornbury Place, School Close, High Wycombe HP11 1PH	1/4
6.5	<b>7</b>	106 Hughenden Avenue High Wycombe HP13 5SN	1/4
6.2	<b>8</b>	Bramley Close, Cressex Road High Wycombe HP12 4TY	1/4
5.9	<b>9</b>	Cometa, Kingsmead Road High Wycombe HP11 1JB	1/4
5.3	<b>10</b>	Beechwood Road, High Wycombe, HP124AJ	2/4
4.3	<b>11</b>	142 Kingsmead Road High Wycombe HP11 1JB	4/4
3.6	<b>12</b>	179 West Wycombe Road High Wycombe	4/4
3.5	<b>13</b>	Skyline Mews, Cressex Road High Wycombe HP12 4UB	4/4

## Detailed summary of issues raised at the workshops:

### Issues that make a scheme not acceptable

Key to comments:

- ❶ Issue identified at the members workshop
- ❷ Issue identified at the officers workshop
- ❸ Issue identified at the stakeholders workshop

### Issues that make a scheme not acceptable identified by all three workshops

#### ***Tall fences:***

- ❶ Visual impact of long tall fences to boundaries with no “green” features
- ❷ Boundary treatments often too high, too close to road and of poor quality
- ❷ Poor security – driveways/ access roads with poor natural surveillance
- ❸ Fences too high and poorly located (e.g. next to entrances)

#### ***Narrow access:***

- ❶ Narrow access
- ❷ Narrow & long access between existing dwellings with lack of overlooking and high fencing of poor visual quality and positioned close to the access.
- ❸ Narrow and tight access roads

#### ***Character:***

- ❶ Impact of new development on character, not blending in with existing.
- ❶ Harshness of the transition between new and existing development
- ❶ Adverse Impact on the streetscene
- ❶ Design not respecting cues of existing especially roof/ dormers
- ❷ Lack of attention to levels in relation to adjacent properties
- ❷ Wider adverse impact on character
- ❷ Existing building line ignored
- ❸ Schemes out of character with surrounding properties

#### ***Scale:***

- ❶ Scale issues with height & overbearing upon existing neighbours
- ❷ Scale of new buildings not relating well to the context, often look over developed – need to do a better job of assessing and taking account of the context
- ❸ Schemes out of scale with existing

## ***Density:***

- ❶ Over development
- ❷ Fundamental issue that often the development is simply too big for the site and too close to adjacent existing properties even if the design itself is of good quality
- ❸ Insufficient space for the development/ cramming/ overdevelopment

## ***Parking:***

- ❶ Impact of parking on the frontage; inappropriate positioned parking; lack of sufficient parking
- ❷ Lack of landscape treatment and dominance of parking particularly at the front
- ❷ Parking provision (amount and location) often undermines the quality of the schemes
- ❷ Rear and under-croft parking less successful
- ❸ Under croft parking/ access that goes under buildings

## ***Surface treatments:***

- ❶ Excessive use of tarmac instead of other surfaces
- ❷ Over use of tarmac especially in supposedly “shared spaces”
- ❸ Too much hard standing

## **Issues that make a scheme not acceptable identified by two out of three workshops**

### ***Materials***

- ❶ Poor use of materials
- ❷ Poor quality of finishes/ materials

### ***Landscape***

- ❷ Poor quality of landscape (lack of existing retained and new)
- ❸ Poor quality of landscape/ boundary treatments
- ❸ Lack of respect for wildlife corridors

### ***Privacy & dwelling relationships***

- ❶ Lack of privacy between new properties when developed face to face
- ❷ Awkward front to back and front to side relationships

## Issues that make a scheme not acceptable identified by one out of three workshops

### ***Traffic:***

- ① Traffic impacts

### ***Impacts on existing dwellings:***

- ② Adverse effect on dwellings and garden areas that are retained
- ② Exposed private boundaries
- ② Poor security – exposed rear garden boundaries

### ***Activity/ security:***

- ② Dead frontages
- ② Poor Security – lack of surveillance of under-croft parking

### ***Application process:***

- ② Inaccuracies or poor information on submitted plans leading to poor implementation
- ② Influence of appeal decisions on planning decisions made

### ***Comprehensiveness:***

- ③ Form within the development/ Contrived morphology
- ③ Piecemeal development
- ③ Lollipop backland layout – lack of comprehensiveness

### ***Social inclusion:***

- ③ Gated developments/ Lack of social inclusion

## Issues that make a scheme acceptable

Key to comments:

- ① Issue identified at the members workshop
- ② Issue identified at the officers workshop
- ③ Issue identified at the stakeholders workshop

## Issues that make a scheme acceptable identified by all three workshops

### ***Front gardens/ good landscape***

- ① Creation of defined front gardens (hedges etc)
- ① Soft landscaped entrances
- ② Retention of frontage boundary hedgerows
- ③ New landscape that has potential to establish and last
- ③ Retention of existing landscape

### ***Design Quality & implementation***

- ① Design quality of the development
- ② Good design of buildings
- ② Attention to detail in all aspects
- ③ High quality of finishes
- ③ Quality of implementation

### ***Respecting Context***

- ① New buildings matching the roof designs already in the street
- ② Following through lessons of context to all aspects of the scheme – scale/ materials/ keeping existing landscape features
- ③ Respects existing setting/ scale/ character/ street scene

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

### Issues that make a scheme acceptable identified by two out of three workshops

#### ***Spacious well designed layout which contributes to wider area:***

- ❶ A feeling of space within the development and in relationship to existing dwellings
- ❶ The quality of public space created benefiting wider area and creating a good setting for the new development
- ❸ Well designed layout and buildings giving a good sense of place
- ❸ Space for landscape and setting /Spacious layout but not desolate
- ❸ Could see it being a place that residents would look after / social inclusion/ community feel

#### ***Houses rather than flats:***

- ❶ Houses rather than flats
- ❸ Provision of family homes

#### ***Type of intensification:***

- ❷ Frontage intensification tends to be more successful
- ❸ Comprehensiveness

### Issues that make a scheme acceptable identified by one out of three workshops

#### ***Dedicated Pedestrian routes linking to wider area:***

- ❶ Path linkages to existing developments helping the development fit into the wider community
- ❶ Dedicated pedestrian access (not shared with vehicles)

#### ***Limiting road space:***

- ❶ Limiting access road lengths and the impact of service vehicles manoeuvring areas

### Appendix 3: Results of the 2011 Residents Survey

#### Summary of the results of the 2011 Residents Survey:

Surveys were sent out to all the residents of the 13 schemes assessed in the workshops so that we could gain an understanding of what it was like to live in these new developments, and what concerns they had. The survey was also made more widely available through an online version and publicised through the council's website and the planning weekly bulletin.

In all 33 surveys were returned representing a 26% response.

The most important factor cited when looking for somewhere to live was the type and size of the home. Other important factors were the cost of the home; car parking; the appearance or character of the development and the private garden/ outside space. When looking at the wider neighbourhood good safety and security was the most important factor followed by good local services and facilities; and having a green well maintained area and pleasant street layout.

Most residents had one or two parking spaces allocated to them and two thirds thought this was adequate. People preferred the space to be as close as possible to their home and have exclusive use of it. Spaces provided to the rear of the home were the least liked way of parking arrangement. Many residents thought that there were not enough spaces allocated for visitors.

Residents felt that their amenity space was of the right size and orientation, but in the case of balconies; front gardens and in some rear gardens they felt it was not private enough being overlooked by neighbours.

Most residents felt their new home was spacious although a third complained of not having enough storage space. Only half of those with bike storage used it while most had suitable and convenient space to store their bins.

Most residents felt the new development fitted in with the surrounding area and was safe to access and easy to locate. Residents were less sure that the development felt well connected and part of the wider community.

Overall half of the residents were very satisfied while a third were partly satisfied with where they live. Approximately one in twelve residents were not satisfied with where they live. Residents like most, the attractive appearance of their houses and development, the good commute to work, the spacious feeling of the developments and the close connection with local facilities. Residents most disliked bad or insufficient parking; noise and the quality and quantity of private outdoor space provided.

The results of the survey largely agreed with the conclusions of the workshops. However whether residents were satisfied or not did not relate well to the overall scores given for developments at the workshops. For example, residents responding from Templestide Gardens which scored highly in the workshops were mostly either not satisfied or only partly satisfied with where they lived. Whereas residents responding from Skyline Mews which scored bottom in the workshops were either partly or very

## **Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update**

satisfied with where they lived. From looking at the written comments this apparent contradiction may be due in the case of Templeside Gardens to factors beyond the development as many residents complained of noise and police sirens. While for Skyline residents quite liked the introverted / isolated nature of the scheme which was disliked at the workshops.

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

### Detailed Results of new resident's survey undertaken in January/ February 2011

#### PART 1: About you

**Q1:** What type of property do you live in?

44% Flat    56% House

**Q2:** What is your postal address?

**Q3:** How many people in each age group live at this address?

11% 0 - 18

25% 19 - 30

45% 31 - 64

19% 65+

**Q4:** How long have you/ your household lived in this home?

22% Under 1 yr

13% 3 - 5 years

0% Don't know / can't remember

59% 1 - 2 years

6% 5+ years

**Q5:** When looking for somewhere to live, what are the most important factors for you?

% of respondents that ticked the box

<i>The Home</i>	<i>The Neighbourhood</i>
84% Type and size of home	81% Safety and security
47% Cost / rent / value for money	47% Local services and facilities (e.g. schools, shops)
47% Car Parking	38% Green, well-maintained area
41% Appearance / character	31% Pleasant street layout
38% Private garden/ outside space	31% Close to place of work
22% Privacy	28% Sense of community
13% Environmentally friendly building	25% Good pedestrian, cycle and public transport links
6% Flexibility of home	3% Access to play spaces / parks

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

### PART 2: Parking

**Q6:** How much parking is allocated to your dwelling?

- 41% 1 space
- 53% 2 spaces
- 6% 3 or more spaces
- 0% No specific/ allocated parking provided

**Q7:** Is where you normally park within sight of your dwelling?

- 94% Yes
- 6% No

**Q8:** Do you consider there to be adequate parking for your household?

- 63% Yes
- 38% No

**Q9:** (a) Do you have a garage?

- 34% Yes
- 66% No

(b) If yes, do you use this for parking?

- 73% Yes
- 27% No

**Q10:** Regarding parking, which of the following are important to you?

% of respondents that ticked the box

- 81% As close as possible to my home
- 72% Private space exclusive to my dwelling
- 50% Within sight of my home
- 31% In front of my home
- 13% Private space shared with neighbours
- 13% Public space within the street
- 6% To the rear of the home

**Q11:** How far do you agree with the following statements about parking where you live?

	Strongly disagree	Tend to disagree	Neutral	Tend to agree	Strongly agree
“there is enough car parking for visitors”	31%	25%	22%	19%	3%
“car parking is located conveniently for residents”	7%	7%	10%	52%	26%
“car parking dominates the development”	19%	42%	23%	3%	13%

**Q12:** Parking – Any Comments?

- Several comments about the lack of visitor parking
- Car park at rear difficult to access
- Need to park half on pavement to avoid obstructions and damage to car
- Lack of parking resulting in issues with emergency access
- Dangerous parking on verges
- No one takes seriously the requirement to have one car per household
- Initial issues with unmarked parking areas now resolved as people get used to where to park
- People use the road for parking when visiting the town centre
- To accommodate more car spaces less houses would need to be built

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

### PART 3: Space and Privacy

**Q13:** Where applicable, how do you rate your outdoor amenity space?

6%: of respondents have no outdoor amenity space

Size:	Very Poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very Good
Balcony	0%	0%	18%	27%	55%
Patio	8%	8%	17%	58%	8%
Private back garden	5%	0%	47%	42%	5%
Front garden	11%	21%	47%	21%	0%
Communal Space	5%	21%	37%	21%	16%
Orientation/ Aspect:	Very Poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very Good
Balcony	9%	0%	36%	36%	18%
Patio	0%	9%	18%	64%	9%
Private back garden	0%	18%	41%	35%	6%
Front garden	13%	19%	50%	6%	13%
Communal Space	6%	19%	44%	31%	0%
Privacy:	Very Poor	Poor	Neutral	Good	Very Good
Balcony	42%	17%	8%	17%	17%
Patio	18%	18%	9%	55%	0%
Private back garden	22%	22%	17%	39%	0%
Front garden	50%	19%	19%	13%	0%
Communal Space	13%	25%	44%	19%	0%

**Q14:** Do you get enough daylight in your home?

81% Yes

19% No – I often have to turn lights on in the day

0% Don't know/ Neutral

**Q15:** Are the rooms in your home large enough for purpose?

81% Yes

13% No

6% Don't know / Neutral

**Q16:** Do you have enough storage in your home to meet your needs?

56% Yes

31% No

13% Don't know / Neutral

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

**Q17:** How far do you agree with the following statements about where you live now?

	Strongly disagree	Tend to disagree	Neutral	Tend to agree	Strongly agree
“there are too many houses/ flats built too close together”	<b>22%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>19%</b>
“my/ our home feels private – we are not overlooked by our neighbours”	<b>13%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>3%</b>
“my/ our home feels spacious”	<b>3%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>16%</b>
“the development has a pleasant feel with good plants/ trees”	<b>7%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>20%</b>

**Q18:** (a) Do you have use of a storage building for bikes?

**47%** Yes  
**53%** No  
**0%** Don't know

(b) Is this...

**67%** ...communal?  
**33%** ...exclusive to you?

**Q19:** Is it convenient to use?

**55%** Yes  
**20%** No  
**25%** Don't know/ Neutral

**Q20:** Do you use it?

**45%** Yes  
**40%** No  
**15%** Don't know

**Q21:** (a) Do you have a suitable space to store your bins?

**87%** Yes  
**13%** No  
**0%** Don't know/ neutral

(b) Is this...

**54%**...communal?  
**46%**...exclusive to you?

**Q22:** Is it convenient to use?

**86%** Yes  
**10%** No  
**4%** Don't know/ Neutral

**Q23:** Space and Privacy – Any comments?

- Complaints about smoke and litter from cigarettes in common areas
- Lights would be useful in bin storage areas
- People using bike stores for general storage
- Outdoor shed space for upper floor residents needed
- Location of bin storage close to entrance is poor visually
- Secure outbuilding for bikes never completed
- Well considered compared to development size

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

### PART 4: Integration with the wider area

**Q24:** How safe is it to access the new development....

	Very unsafe	Unsafe	Neutral	Safe	Very Safe
<b>...on foot?</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>...by car?</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>26%</b>
<b>...by bicycle?</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>...for visitors?</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>10%</b>

**Q25:** How easy is it to locate the new development....

	Very difficult	Difficult	Neutral	Easy	Very Easy
<b>...on foot?</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>...by car?</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>...by bicycle?</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>...for visitors?</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>13%</b>

**Q26:** How far do you agree with the following statements about where you live now?

	Strongly disagree	Tend to disagree	Neutral	Tend to agree	Strongly agree
“the new development fits in with the surrounding area”	<b>3%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>28%</b>
“the new development feels unique and distinctive”	<b>3%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>36%</b>
“the entrance to the development is pleasant”	<b>0%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>22%</b>
“I feel comfortable returning to my home in the dark”	<b>3%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>16%</b>
“the new development feels well connected and part of the wider community”	<b>16%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>3%</b>
“we have a good relationship with our neighbours – we would help each other out if needed”	<b>0%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>41%</b>

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

### Q27: Integration – Any comments?

- Several comments about the new development being in the wrong place / not fitting in
- Place well hidden which is an attraction to living there
- New development in rough area meaning difficult to integrate
- Some areas between town and development are not pleasant to walk through
- The development will not fit to the wider community in until it falls into a state of disrepair

## PART 5: Conclusions

### Q28: Overall, how satisfied are you with where you live?

Very satisfied	Partly satisfied	Neutral	Not satisfied	Not at all satisfied
<b>50%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>0%</b>

### Q29: What do you like and dislike most about the development that you live in now?

% respondents who ticked the box:

LIKE MOST	DISLIKE MOST
<b>72%</b> Attractive appearance of house / development	<b>52%</b> Bad/ insufficient parking
<b>41%</b> Good commute to work	<b>31%</b> Noisy / not peaceful
<b>34%</b> Spacious feeling	<b>28%</b> Nothing
<b>31%</b> Good / close / well connected to facilities e.g. shops	<b>24%</b> Quality and quantity of private outdoor space
<b>28%</b> Quiet/ peaceful	<b>17%</b> Too many houses / built too close together
<b>22%</b> Area feels safe	<b>10%</b> Poor relationship with neighbours
<b>19%</b> Convenient car parking	<b>10%</b> Area feels unsafe
<b>16%</b> Like neighbours	<b>10%</b> Other: Litter; Bad Lighting; Badly designed development
<b>13%</b> Fits in with surroundings	<b>7%</b> Development feels out of place
<b>13%</b> Quality and quantity of private outdoor space	<b>7%</b> Unattractive style of house / development
<b>9%</b> Good / close to play areas/ parks	<b>7%</b> No / poor facilities nearby, or feels isolated from them
<b>6%</b> Nothing	<b>7%</b> No / lack of play areas / parks
<b>6%</b> Other: Size of House/ Build quality	<b>3%</b> Bad pedestrian, cycle and public transport links
<b>3%</b> Good pedestrian, cycle and public transport links	<b>3%</b> Difficult commute to work

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

**Q30:** If there are any further comments you would like to make, please use the space below.

- Several comments stating they have settled in well and very happy
- Several comments regarding road noise and sirens reducing quality of life
- Several comments about speeding cars, taxi's and lorries
- Some comments regarding lack of maintenance by developer
- One comment about good build quality
- One comment about poor sound insulation between flats
- One comment about lack of parking
- One comment about misuse of entrance by cars u- turning etc.
- One comment expressing concern that increased housing and "work Units" will alter the character of the area
- One comment that the although the development feels safe the area around it does not
- One comment that the development would be better suited to a more affluent area
- One comment about lack of bike storage leading to having to use the car or walk
- One comment requesting free parking for the university gym

### Survey Process

The survey was sent out to all the residents of the 13 schemes assessed at the workshop and was as available online on the council's website. It was carried out between the 10th January and 11<sup>th</sup> February 2011. Of 127 surveys sent out 33 were returned or completed via the website.

**Appendix 4: Comments received during the Public Consultation (24 June -19 August 2011)**

Response from	Comment	Response
<p>Mike Chadwick Chiltern Society</p>	<p>(i) We support the suggested amendments to the HISPD which improve it still further; if the provisions therein are fully taken account of by applicants and Planning Officers, we believe the document will make a key contribution to securing a high-quality living environment for existing and new residents.</p> <p>(ii) We particularly welcome the integration of the Living Within Our Limits SPD checklist into the Sustainable Construction question (Q3.7).</p> <p>(iii) Similarly we welcome the enhanced and expanded guidance on biodiversity, including the signposting to sources of further guidance on nature conservation and development (Q2.4), and the clear expectation that all new residential development will incorporate biodiversity measures with a list of examples (Q3.8). However, we feel the latter section could usefully retain the reference to and suggested measurements of block size from the earlier version of the SPD.</p>	<p>(i) Comment Noted <b>No change to SPD.</b></p> <p>(ii) Comment Noted <b>No change to SPD.</b></p> <p>(iii) This section was taken out as it did not apply as most of the intensification sites that have come forward are not of a size or scale to form a whole perimeter block and was also quite prescriptive. It is now included in Q2.4 which says that areas of high and medium ecological potential should be maintained or improved and that areas of low ecological potential should deliver a net improvement in ecological provision. <b>No change to SPD.</b></p>

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

Response from	Comment	Response
Mike Chadwick Chiltern Society	(iv) Another area where there might be benefit in quantitative guidance is in relation to acceptable densities, particularly in residential areas identified / categorised as having a particular character, and / or in relation to how the density of sizeable areas to be "intensified" should relate to the densities of adjoining development.	(iv) This type of prescriptive approach would involve a fair amount of work to both identify and characterise particular areas. We believe a better approach is to judge each individual scheme on its merits using information gained from the context study (Q1.2 & 3.1) <b>No change to SPD.</b>
Michelle Kidd Environment Agency	(i) With regard to Question 2.3 on page 22, the answers appear to be confusing and perhaps mixed up. The question asks 'Does the site negatively impact any species or habitats that are statutorily protected?' One would expect that if the answer was 'No' that the site might be suitable for intensification subject to Question 2.4 and other issues, but that if the answer was 'Yes', then it would be unlikely that the development could proceed. This must be addressed.	(i) This was an error in the drafting. <b>Question 2.4 will be reworded so that the response is the right way round</b>

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

Response from	Comment	Response
Michelle Kidd Environment Agency	<p>(ii) One other point in relation to protected species and habitats is that bringing more people into an area can lead to increased visitor pressure into areas of conservation interest, which could have the potential to have a negative impact on those sites and the species that inhabit them.</p> <p>(iii) With regard to Question 2.4 on page 23, within the 'No' answer box, the text should be amended to read 'amend proposals so that the site's ecological contribution to the area is maintained, and enhanced where appropriate'.</p> <p>(iv) Given the value of the watercourses that run through the District, particularly along the River Wye and its tributaries, which run through built up areas, specific mention should be made of the ecological value of rivers and the need to protect and enhance them. Reference should be made to relevant policies which cover rivers (e.g. CS4 and L5 (or its replacement) and to the River Wye Guidance Note for developers.</p>	<p>(ii) Comment noted – this aspect is would be covered generally through the Ecological survey and assessment that should identify and provide mitigation for any impacts. <b>No change to SPD.</b></p> <p>(iii) Agreed will amend the wording <b>Amend Q2.4 No box to read 'amend proposals so that the site's ecological contribution to the area is maintained, and enhanced where appropriate'</b></p> <p>(iv) Agreed <b>Will add references to river polices and guidance where they are not already given</b></p>

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

Response from	Comment	Response
Michelle Kidd Environment Agency	<p>(v) With regard to Question 3.8 on page 35, the 'Potential Biodiversity Measures' box should include ecological enhancement to river banks.</p> <p>(vi) With regard to all the above questions, future management of the areas of ecological value/enhancement areas is important in order to maintain the ecological value in the long term. Landscape and ecological management plans will be necessary where there are several infill properties in particular.</p> <p>(vii) We support the consideration of SUDS, waste management and water efficiency in Question 3.7. However fluvial flood risk and contaminated land and its potential impact on groundwater have not been included here. These issues should be included.</p>	<p>(v) Agreed <b>will add ecological enhancements to river banks to the measures box in Q3.8</b></p> <p>(vi) This is already included in Q2.4 and the wording has been strengthened following comments from Natural England (iv) <b>No change to SPD.</b></p> <p>(vii) The issues of fluvial flood risk and contaminated land are already covered through information required in the Applicants Guide to submitting a valid planning application (Local List) and so do not need to be repeated here. <b>No change to SPD.</b></p>
Carmelle Bell Thames Water	<p>(i) Thank you for allowing Thames Water to comment on the above Supplementary Planning Document. We welcome the reference to infrastructure within the document. We strongly support Q1.5 and its reference to ensuring appropriate infrastructure is in place.</p>	<p>(i) Comment Noted <b>No change to SPD.</b></p>

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

Response from	Comment	Response
Carmelle Bell Thames Water	(ii) All Intensification development should be required to provide a water and drainage strategy identifying if off site infrastructure has the capacity to serve the development. Where it doesn't the strategy should identify what infrastructure upgrades are required, where, by when and delivered by who. Developer consultation with Thames Water is required for this.	(ii) Agreed <b>A note identifying the need to provide a water and drainage strategy will be added to Q1.5</b>
Trevor Carter High Wycombe Society	(i) We commend the new concern about Narrow Accesses, Height and Mass of buildings and more restrictions on the use of Garden Land.  (ii) However, we have some concerns that inexperienced planning officers could use these rules as a simple tick box exercise and thereby exclude innovative schemes which could improve neighbourhoods. Accordingly your sentence on page 7 "It is acknowledged that alternative solutions may exist by which the issues and principles can be achieved, to deliver high quality environments" is a little weak.	(i) Comment noted <b>No change to SPD.</b>  (ii) We do not agree that the wording is weak or that the guidance rules out innovative design or alternative solutions. <b>No change to SPD.</b>

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

Response from	Comment	Response
<p>Trevor Carter High Wycombe Society</p>	<p>You could possibly say “However, we do not want to suggest that the formulas and diagrams should be followed slavishly in every case. The Council does not wish to discourage innovative, high quality solutions which address the issues and principles by different approaches”.</p> <p>(iii) We also welcome the proposal on page 3 to “place a greater emphasis on assessing and protecting/enhancing the existing character and appearance of residential areas”, which is then taken up in Questions 2.8 and 3.12. However, we wonder how you intend to evaluate this. For example, in a neighbourhood of semi-detached properties, replacing one or two pairs with a block of flats affects the privacy (due to overlooking) and noise levels (due to increased car numbers) for the remaining semi’s. Would this be assessed as a deterioration of the ‘character and quality’?</p>	<p>(iii) This aspect is also covered in Q1.2 where the defining characteristics of an area are identified and improved/reinforced through intensification. The specific issues raised here with regard to overlooking and noise levels are usually covered under considerations of the amenity of new and existing residents rather than character. These aspects are covered under Q2.1; Q3.2; Q3.3 &amp; Q3.6 (noise) and within Appendix 1.</p>

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

Response from	Comment	Response
<p>Trevor Carter High Wycombe Society</p>	<p>(iv) Whilst the Workshops and Residents Surveys have produced interesting results, we feel that you should also have included in the Residents Surveys households living near to intensification sites to discover the problems created and the possible deterioration of their environment.</p> <p>(v) A common concern is that car parking on new intensive developments is rarely sufficient and this then overflows onto existing streets. This has been exacerbated by car parking standards which have set MAXIMA. We are aware that these rules arise from former Government policy to reduce car ownership by denying owners anywhere to park. This policy has completely failed and we would hope that the new Localism policy, which will allow you to set your own housing numbers, will also allow you to change car parking standards and, in particular, to recommend or set minima to suit our town (this has now been announced as Government Policy).</p>	<p>(iv) Noted, unfortunately resources precluded including the existing residents in the survey. We believe that the current revisions in the guidance and other existing policies do though provide sufficient protection for existing residents <b>No change to SPD.</b></p> <p>(v) Comment noted, however a change in parking standards is a much wider issue beyond the scope of this document. This will be reviewed once the recent census results are available and research undertaken. <b>No change to SPD.</b></p>

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

Response from	Comment	Response
Trevor Carter High Wycombe Society	<p>(vi) You note, on page 5, concern about car parking dominating frontages. We also note the Chiltern Building Design Guide advice “Avoid creating parking areas which dominate the front of the building, in full view of the street” and some of us remember the 2005 Quality Counts Tour where a site in central Reading received adverse comment for the frontages being overwhelmed by car parking. Accordingly we do not understand your proposals in the Level 3 Decision Charts to now favour front and on-street parking. You may regard the Chiltern Building Design Guide as only applying in the AONB but it is absurd to have two contradictory policies in adjacent areas. There appears to be a clash of cultures between the new residents of intensified developments, who wish to park their cars by their front door, and the existing residents (of probably much less intense developments) who do not want to look at rows of cars along the frontage. A possible compromise is to discriminate between pre-</p>	<p>(vi) Question 3.2 &amp; 3.3 explain that rear parking courts are the least favoured option as they tend to be shunned by residents resulting in ad hoc parking in the streets which have not been designed to accommodate parking. They also can result in undue disturbance to existing resident’s gardens and reduce the space for new resident’s gardens and amenity. We believe that the best solution is to provide for parking in the places people will use it within the street, but in ways that will ensure that it does not dominate the character of the street. This can be achieved through use of street trees for example. In that respect this policy does respect the Chiltern Building Design Guide which talks about providing a combination of on plot; off plot and on street parking. It is recognised that in some circumstances it is not possible or appropriate to provide parking at the front which is why we have not ruled this option out completely.</p> <p><b>In light of your comments we will though amend the wording of Q3.3 to ensure it is understood that parking at the front should not dominate the character and appearance of the street.</b></p>

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

Response from	Comment	Response
<p>Trevor Carter High Wycombe Society</p>	<p>existing public streets (where rules similar to the Chiltern Design Guide could operate) and streets wholly within the new development where resident-centric arrangements might be allowed.</p> <p>(vii) The Planning Group notes, in the current Draft National Policy Framework, concern about 'sustainability' and, in particular a desire to achieve a balance between housing and jobs to minimise travel. There was such a balance in the Wycombe District for many years but at present there is severe imbalance. We also consider that, at present, there is a sufficiency of housing. Accordingly, where a developer presses for intensification, there should be a test that the dwellings are required to satisfy a local need and not just boost commuting.</p>	<p>(vii) This aspect is beyond the scope of this SPD and is covered in the higher level policies in the Core Strategy that deal with the allocation of housing.</p> <p><b>No change to SPD.</b></p>
<p>Mrs LM Turner Hughenden Parish Council</p>	<p>(i) The Parish Council backs the new approach for the change of use of residential gardens for development.</p>	<p>(i) Comment noted</p> <p><b>No change to SPD.</b></p>

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

Response from	Comment	Response
Mrs LM Turner Hughenden Parish Council	(ii) It is concerned that not enough emphasis is being given to adequate infrastructure changes when intensification is to take place. These should be more specific to include adequate roads and access, together with detailed assessment of increases to basic utilities, such as water, drainage, electricity, etc	(ii) Comment noted, these aspects are covered under Q1.5 and in the Core Strategy Policy CS20 Please also note response to comment by Thames Water (ii)
Olivia Euesden Natural England	(i) Natural England are pleased to see that Ecology questions in level 2 have been amended to deal with issues of protected species/ habitats and the wider issue of ecological networks more clearly and in line with current legislation  (ii) It is noted that in the flowchart, for Question 2.3 the 'Yes' and 'No' outcomes are the wrong way round. Yes is not the good, green answer to 'Does the site negatively impact...'. The Yes and No should be swapped, or the question reworded to retain the current colour coding.	(i) Comment noted <b>No change to SPD.</b>  (ii) Please see response to Michelle Kidd Environment Agency comment (i)

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

Response from	Comment	Response
<p>Olivia Euesden Natural England</p>	<p>(iii) It is Natural England's advice that under question 2.3, where the SPD says 'Any impacts should be avoided, mitigated or compensated for', the wording could be strengthened to say '...impacts must be avoided...</p> <p>(iv) Similarly, under Question 2.4 the sentences '...the effect on biodiversity, wildlife movement corridors, and human amenity should be assessed and mitigated'; 'Any assessment should include proposals for long term maintenance and management of identified significant ecological features' and 'the proposal should deliver a net improvement in ecological provision' could all be strengthened with the replacement of should with must.</p>	<p>(iii) Agreed <b>Q2.3 will be amended to read "any impacts must be avoided, mitigated or compensated for"</b></p> <p>(iv) Agreed <b>Q2.4 will be amended to read '...the effect on biodiversity, wildlife movement corridors, and human amenity must be assessed and mitigated'; 'Any assessment must include proposals for long term maintenance and management of identified significant ecological features'. The third statement regarding ecological provision will remain as originally worded to follow the wording of the policy in the draft Delivery and Site Allocations DPD in policy DSA12</b></p>
<p>Barbara Wallis Little Marlow Parish Council</p>	<p>(i) Little Marlow Parish Council has considered this document and finds it a useful addition to the Wycombe Development Framework</p>	<p>(i) Comment noted <b>No change to SPD.</b></p>

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

Response from	Comment	Response
Victor Savage & Partners	(i) If Aylesbury Vale intends to build only 12,700 dwellings not the 26,890 outlined in the South East Plan, then Wycombe needs to build 11,500 dwellings not the current target of 4,900 dwellings.	(i) This aspect is beyond the scope of this SPD and is covered in the higher level policies in the Core Strategy that deal with the allocation of housing. <b>No change to SPD.</b>
Mrs Patricia Northcroft	(i) I assume this document is not relevant to conservation areas, or is it? I have no problems with the conclusions reached do far.	(i) This document is relevant to intensification which takes place within conservation areas. <b>No change to SPD.</b>
Geoff Armstrong DPP	(i) Clarification and consolidation in respect of affordable housing and viability matters is also noted. The assumption of no grant being available for affordable housing and the HCA's Framework are rightly important considerations, which currently do inform viability appraisals for development sites, where appropriate. Confirmation on appropriate affordable housing tenures is clear, though it should be recognised that flexibility is frequently required in the delivery of affordable housing, with our clients ever keen to liaise with the Council's Housing Department to agree an	(i) Please refer to response given in the Developer Contributions SPD consultation responses. <b>No change to SPD.</b>

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

Response from	Comment	Response
Geoff Armstrong DPP	acceptable offer. This similarly applies to the timing of affordable housing delivery. What the Council expect and what may be realistically deliverable on a site may not always align. Recognition that delivery can be phased is welcomed.	
Steve Williams English Heritage	(i) Under the section headed 'Quality Development', mention is made of the issues raised interweaving new development within an existing built environment in terms of the potential to compromise quality, character and amenity of residential areas. The presence of heritage assets and their settings in such areas can make an important contribution to such character and distinctiveness, and yet there is little specific reference to the historic environment, either by way of referencing national guidance at page 8, or for example at Level Two of the decision chart [Q2.3 refers to any negative impact on species or habitats that are statutorily protected, while Q2.4 refers to wider networks].	(i) Comments Noted. We have attempted to cover the contribution historic assets make to the character and the role new development can play to enhance the historic environment through Q1.2 and Q3.1. There are also several policies in the core strategy and local plan that deal with this issue in more detail.  <b>Q1.2 and Q3.1 and the policy context section to be amended to ensure the protection and enhancement of the historic environment is adequately covered.</b>

## Housing Intensification SPD 2011 Update

Response from	Comment	Response
Steve Williams English Heritage	(ii) PPS5 'Planning for the Historic Environment' requires account to be taken not only assets and their setting that have statutory protection, but also those of more local significance. Q3.1 does refer to appraisal of historic context, but then the historic environment appears to be overlooked when it comes to measures that might lead to an enhancement of that environment, in the same way that measures to increase biodiversity are considered at Q3.8.	(ii) Please see comments above in (i)