

# Gomm Valley and Ashwells

## 2<sup>nd</sup> Draft Development Brief Feedback

10<sup>th</sup> May 2016

Robert Harrison

Principal Development Management Officer

# Recurring Themes

- Not intended to be definitive of all issues raised.
- Not intended to rank issues by importance.

# Thank you for responses!

- 22 responses received.
- All within time.

# Overarching

- Some positive feedback on style and content of Brief.
- Key on plans.
- Scale on drawings.
- Confusion from land parcel number change.
- No mention of London Road capacity.
- Quantum of development seems excessive.

# Section 5

## Issue

- Application of Principles by recognised bodies.
  - CABE etc.
- Explain high level statements – Define:
  - Quality etc.
  - Innovative vs Run of mill.

## Response

- More work required on section 5.
- More specific to site and parcels.
- Less high level and more site specific.
  - Gap defined etc.
- Design Review - BOBMK

# Cock Lane

## Issue

- No support expressed for widening of top section of Cock Lane.
  - Hedge
  - Character .....etc.
  - Rat running.
- Question findings of Jacobs Report.

## Response

- Strategic highway advise is clear on this point.
  - Cock Lane is already at capacity.
- No sequentially preferable solution for full two lane access North to South.
- Need to balance need to preserve Cock Lane with need to preserve gap, landscape impact and ecology.

# Parcel 1 (Hammersley Lane)

## Issue

- Strong reservation about access onto Hammersley Lane:
  - Congestion.
  - Highway safety.
  - Visibility.
- Support for link to Gomm Road from some.  
Objection on ecological grounds from others.

## Response

- Need more highway and ecological information to take a firm view.

# Ashwells (Parcel 11)

## Issue

- Relationship between Ashwell's and Parcel 11 defined (proximity, levels, boundary treatment).
- Clarity over rear footpath.

## Response

- Subsection for Character Area D.



# Ashwells (Access & P.9)

## Issue

- New access two way.
- Clarity over footpath in wood on northern boundary.
- What character should Ashwells be?
  - Density 25-35.
  - Housing Typology.
  - No brick and flint.
- Lighting

## Response

- Need to be clear on footpath.
- More justification for design approach:
  - Density of 25-35.
  - Housing Typology.

# Parcel 4/5

## Issue

- Alternative proposal
  - Remove top section of parcel 4.
  - Hand parcels 8 & 9.
- Remove bottom half of Parcel 4/5 on eco grounds.

## Response

- In balance of decision making difficult to defend.
- Does not fit comfortably with coherent overall strategy:
  - Joined up undeveloped areas
  - Strong Eco link to Gomm's Wood
  - Preservation of gap.

# Undeveloped Land

## Issue:

- Support for general approach:
  - Conservation
  - Public access
  - Farming.
- Support for general strategy for keeping East side of valley open.
- Management

## Response:

- Need to progress strategy for undeveloped land beyond rudimentary outline.
- Clearly define access and movement strategy.
- Maintenance strategy.

# Ecology

## Issue

- Comprehensive assessment of harm by BBOWT.
- Eco Buffers need justification based on ecological need.
  - SSSI
  - Ancient woodland.
- Significant Concern re link between parcels 1-2.
- Correct test: 'Net Gain'.

## Response

- Need evidence based ecology assessment.
- Need to clearly define harm arising from Parcel 2 and link and review against other benefits.

# Infrastructure

## Issue

- No mention of Transport package for London Road.

## Response

- Dealt with by Infrastructure Report.

# Other Matters

## Issues

- Construction Traffic.
- School Catchment
- Allotments not required.
- GVA is a deadzone for TV.

## Response

- Construction traffic picked up through pre-app.
- School catchments not straight forward.
  - Academies.
- Allotments not required.

# What Next?

- Revise Brief.
- Work on plan for undeveloped area.
- Work on Transport Issues.
  - Bus
  - Hammersley Lane
  - Cock Lane
- Public Consultation on Draft Brief.

**Thank you for listening.**