

GOMM VALLEY/ASHWELLS LIAISON GROUP MEETING

Meeting Notes

Meeting Title:	Gomm Valley & Ashwells Liaison Group Meeting	
Date:	26 th January 2016, 7pm	
Location	Committee Room 1,WDC	
Chaired By	Cllr David Johncock	
Attendees:	See Membership List as modified by apologies	
Apologies	Ian Forbes Tony Garner – Dennis Wheatley as deputy. Katrina Wood Carolyn Leonard – Graham Farden as deputy. Gill Markham – Miles Green as deputy (also member in his own right). Mr Hooper – Kevin Oatley as deputy.	
Points of Agreement/Actions	Notes	Action
1. Introduction	Welcome and introduction from the Chairman. Guests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mrs Marika Reed • Richard Smith, Jacobs • Melanie Radley, BCC Developers excluded from the meeting: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To allow Jacobs and the County Highway Authority to speak freely about proposals. 2. So as not to impact on future negotiations with the developer. 3. Apologies given to developers teams. 	
2. Group Membership	Unchanged.	
3. Minutes of the last meeting held on 14th October 2015	Accepted and signed off.	
4. Matters arising since previous meeting.	Presentation from last LG meeting has been put on web site. Alternative proposals for layouts will be discussed at upcoming meeting.	

	RH to give feedback on progress with undeveloped areas under AOB.	
5. Update on Infrastructure Roundtable	Kati B attended the Infrastructure RT meeting which dealt with transport. Detailed update not provided as transport work presented by Jacobs tonight in any case. Main difference is that we would not be reviewing the site packages for the other reserve sites.	
6. Transport – Focus on Gomm Valley Site Package.	<p>Richard Smith from Jacobs presented. Richard is a Transport Planning consultant to BCC. Accompanied by Mel Radley BCC Highways Officer. This presentation will be posted on the web site.</p> <p>RS Set out purpose of study and presented outcomes as they relate to Gomm Valley & Ashwells. Deals with High Wycombe urban area and Impacts of Reserve sites cumulatively & local interventions in the context of Core Strategy & NPPF</p> <p>There are a number of players involved in the delivery of the GV & A site.</p> <p>2026 22% traffic growth 19% of which is trend and other developments.</p> <p>560 dwellings assumed on GV & A as taken from Options Consultation Document.</p> <p>Spine road assumed, 6 m wide NS route to serve residential streets, local route with potential for public transport and emergency access. Without spine road would need to consider upgrading Cock Lane.</p> <p>Modelling diagram indicating likely routes of traffic generated by reserve sites. A40, A4010 etc. Similar traffic pattern emerges when only considering GV & A.</p> <p>Presented GV & A package diagram from Jacobs report. Acknowledge topographical challenge in respect to walking and cycling. Public transport also a challenge, due to dispersed nature of development on the site.</p> <p>Two-fold approach, extending route 31, also improvement of route 27. Normally want a bus stop within 400m of residential areas.</p> <p>Gomm Road primary access connection to spine road. Will need to upgrade junction of Gomm Road with A40. Capacity upgrade required at this junction</p> <p>Priority junctions (T-junction) except Hammersley Lane</p>	

which due to topography and curvature of road, will need a controlled access point (signals) possibly also with control at the bridge.

Rayners Lane. DS - footway under bridge? RS – agrees, but acknowledges significant engineering difficulties. Will be part of further discussion with developer.

Orchard Road likely to experience rat running so mitigation measures recommended.

A40 is the real challenge, in part with wider reserve sites
Two junctions work in concert (or not) to impact flow of A40.

Micklefield road junction requires more capacity, change timing of lights, and widen A40 back out to 2 lanes. No provision for cycling and pedestrian movements across north side of MR junction.

Rayners Lane. Bus lane is not currently used by rainbow routes so can reallocate to a traffic lane eastbound, so east-bound traffic can utilise both lanes to get through the junction.

A40 package is £Ms, not £Ks.

Next steps, Draft document is on website. Feedback collected, then moving to delivery which will include working out detail, design work, planning matters, costings, etc.

Table explained. Long list of schemes, went through appraisal process, prioritised based on how much impact, cost, deliverability. Some not directly related to reserve sites.

Some are contradicting? RS - No, are simply options.

Moving around table

DS – interesting, and a lot of information. Q – what part will the group play in decision making process?

Micklefield to R Ave section a lot of attention confirm a lot of queuing traffic here, but for info sake traffic runs freely when signals fail.

DJ - Documents are for public consultation – is not just for LG - please read and comment.

RS – is a starting point backed up by evidence, but aware not everyone will agree with all of them. This approach is unusually proactive work to maximise benefits.

KC – how route 31 will physically access Ashwells. Rule

for chicane parking (width?) how to achieve on Orchard Row, also alternative rat run on Bank Street.

Real problem at Micklefield road is traffic coming out of retail park.

Doubt if Ashwells will take a bus, but may be other access points. Chicane parking width is important, but may have sections of single-lane operation. Enough space for car to park and pass?

Accept that dominant mode is currently cars, but need to ensure safe crossing points for other users. Retail park does add traffic.

AB – concerns about bottom of Cock Lane, backed up onto box junction, so can't turn right, forces rat running elsewhere. Also agree pedestrian crossing not good – timing means traffic threatening pedestrians crossing on green man.

MK – CL junction fails at peak times. Possible reduction in Cock Lane traffic? Are there figures?

RS - Don't believe there will be a reduction in traffic using Cock Lane. What is the right first point of access from A40? Believe it is Gomm road, but Cock Lane may attract people 'sneaking around the back' and need to think about signal timing to discourage inappropriate traffic. This is really all one junction (includes junction of MR, CL & ABR).

Dennis – agree points already made.

GS – orchard road is a white knuckle turn, people park on the corner, difficult to get through. Signal timing on all of the junctions is appalling. Nothing moving. Little faith it will be sorted. Used to be a roundabout at bottom of Cock Lane. People running red lights and is very dangerous.

RS – agree needs further consideration.

DJ - Some signals are demand-led and some are timed. Maybe also use roundabouts instead of signals.

DS – certain roundabouts were more efficient so support. What happened to 'green wave' through junction?

Janet – 27 Bus only goes in morning, mon-fri so will need to be considered. Olympic Way completed? (no, in process).

RS – agree frequency not sufficient. Development on its own is not enough for dedicated service, so will need to upgrade existing routes.

MR – encouraging developers to look at long-term solutions in respect to funding.

Developers of Olympic way contribute? MR – no is an

already approved development.

RW – feel points raised previously by group have been taken into account. Provision of pedestrian and cycle routes or buses, but what happens to cars? They are still owned/and must be stored. Want to avoid cars blocking roads. Public consultation will attract wider comments from the public.

MR – current guidance is evidenced based, and recommendations for cycle parking, electric vehicles, etc.
RS – have discussed with public transport colleagues.
Last year 7% increase in patronage of Public Transport.

GK – surprised about some conclusions. Bus routes will need to re-route to avoid orchard road and route through site. Don't understand bus through Ashwells site - only 4 people per hour. Would only be 6-8 people over a two hour period – should walk to bus, would be simpler and still within the 400m guidelines. Would avoid further delay diversion of route through site.

Development along Gomm Valley bottom, but will not start until 4 years from now. Need the road improvements now. There is a scheme in the schedule that has been dropped - don't agree it should have been. Should implement A40 congestion relief package (number 18 on chart) and would deliver significant benefits. Want all of this now, not in 2020.

Shows two different access points onto the Ashwells Site, which is it?

DJ – Can only ask developers to fund the work relating to the sites. In respect of work relating to existing issues will need to find another source of funding; however, there may be some overlap. This work is not about solving today's problems, which is a separate strand of work.

RS – works ongoing in respect to access points, is not definitive. Is to be resolved.

Point system in table is not strictly about value for money. Point system is to rank order. Also, provide indicative budget and timescales, and deliverability challenges. Two schemes mentioned are 2 forms of A40 package. One a modest form of junction improvements and one more substantial, including land acquisition. It is the larger scheme which is judged likely to be more effective. Public transport routing, 31 service, maximise penetration into the site, to overcome distance and topographical issues. Further work required to ascertain if it is feasible.

MC – there are other constraints as well which will dictate.

Plans are intended to be indicative. Are still working through bus strategy.

RH – acknowledges that there are some issues with bus routing to the site, but the policy starting point is that buses are provided.

MG – blue map important. Ashwells concerned with through traffic. Percentage increase over exiting traffic? How to design road to discourage through traffic? NPPF – severe impact? When is it severe?
Concerned about no bridge across Cock Lane or junction 3A – will both affect local traffic.

RS – the map shows distribution of traffic from sites, representing peak hour movements, number of vehicles added to road network, in different directions. Increase is in detailed technical evidence base, and will be provided if it isn't already. Know where access is likely to be, is topographically challenged so will be curvy, and will be designed so that it isn't an attractive through route for general traffic. Will not be a fast route. Impact will be local, and have reasonable confidence in this.

DJ – severe has not been defined. Government has not made this clear so will not know until a case goes to court. No road networks are the same. Roads are still moving despite our concerns. Reserve sites are only 3% of increased traffic. No decision has yet been made about whether to implement a Junction 3a and so has not been factored in to any of the current analysis. Should a Junction 3a be recommended by Highways England in the future then its impact on local traffic will be thoroughly considered at that time. Widening of bridge over Cock Lane would encourage more traffic and be hugely expensive.

RH – even if a case went through the courts there would not be a definitive definition. No two roads are the same. It is a matter of fact and degree to be assessed on a case by case basis.

MR – detailed junction models will help understand what the impact will be assessed to see if it is 'severe'. Will be subjective. Development compared to baseline situation. Also, safety concerns may be considered 'severe'. Developers are keen to do a spine road and not put traffic on Cock Lane.

RS – developers consultants will be producing opposing reports.

BS – Hammersley Lane traffic does back up to $\frac{3}{4}$ mile. No footpath beneath bridge. Could use a left filter onto A40. Widen bridge and road, and create this filter? Currently 2000 cars using at peak hour

RS – is similar to Cock Lane. How much do we want to encourage additional traffic? Is tight at bottom of this junction and deliverability unlikely, and anyway would encourage further traffic.

KB – don't want to encourage use of road, so where do we want them to drive? What are the alternative routes? Don't want further blockages on the existing routes. Is already a nightmare. Rat runs encouraged or discouraged?

RS – roads should provide the right level of capacity that people expect. Current rat-running from north of district to the motorway. Long-distance traffic should be on the main network. The strategy is then to make the A Roads to work better so that they are the routes of choice. M road, then A roads, to attract the traffic from residential routes. If upgrade existing roads this will discourage more traffic on what we consider unsuitable routes. Understand there is congestion – is feature across the country. Two things informed thinking – a lot of side road congestion is due to A40 not working properly. Only way parcel 1 can be safely accessed from Hammersley Lane is through controlled junction.

MR – Hammersley Lane parcel will be a lower number of movements due to fewer properties.

RH - We have concerns about linking to spine road, but also concerns about ecology. Developer currently looking to link them up but we need to consider their evidence.

MC – reinforce point re spine road to accommodate public transport, is essential that public transport uses it.

PL – 560 houses, 397 movements in morning? Most people have two cars so don't think this is accurate. Would expect this to be doubled.

RS – model based on TRICS and actual figures from actual sites. Gives estimate on trip generation, and is what consultants will use so is comparable, and based on sound evidence. Is not totality of traffic, is only a single peak hour.

IM - modelled, cycle path lit? Access point from north to Hammersley Lane?

RS – modelling 3a is not sufficiently advanced. Is not a

	<p>commitment, and modelling deals with reasonable commitment. Cycle path design depends on nature and location of the route. May or may not be appropriate to light it. horses for courses.</p> <p>RH – access onto Hammersley Lane difficult to see how it would be brought forward. Land ownership</p> <p>GF – no comments on the plan. First visit. Comments re London road. assume parallel programme to determine what the traffic flow should be? Only modelling what we’ve got, not what we want. Not doing anything to improve it.</p> <p>RS – evidence includes current and future traffic flows. Is why particular section of A40 has been identified for improvements.</p> <p>KO (deputy to PH) – M40 improvements before this all comes forward?</p> <p>DJ – this is Highways England, along with A404, not us. However, WDC contributing to debate on what can be done to improve these roads [under a project called “Access To Wycombe”].</p> <p>KC – at what point will difficulties of transport influence the number of dwellings to be developed?</p> <p>MR – may be an element of this, particularly in terms of Hammersley Lane.</p> <p>RH – when solution is not economically practical and severe harm can be robustly demonstrated.</p>	
<p>7. AOB</p>	<p>RH gave feedback on 8th January meeting regarding the potential for the undeveloped area of Gomm Valley and Ashwells.</p> <p>Key stake holders were identified.</p> <p>A preference for a nature conservation led approach, followed by Leisure and then farming.</p> <p>Potential for expanding the Chalk grass land creating synergies with the SSSI. Also tree and hedge planting. Interest in ownership expressed by:</p> <p>BBOWT WDC and CWPC (their administrative area only)</p> <p>Management interest expressed by:</p>	

	<p>Chiltern Rangers; and, Wycombe Wildlife Group</p> <p>Issues to be resolved in respect of Capital and Revenue Funding.</p> <p>Issues to be worked through with key stakeholders.</p> <p>Detail to be shared with Liaison Group as it emerges.</p>	
8. Next Meeting	Next meeting on 3 rd Feb at 7pm in Committee Room 1.	RH/DJ

Date.....

Signed.....

Chairman

Approved at 25th April 2016 Liaison Group meeting