

GOMM VALLEY/ASHWELLS LIAISON GROUP MEETING

Meeting Notes

Meeting Title:	Liaison Group Meeting	
Date:	10.05.2016	
Location	Council Chamber,WDC	
Chaired By	Cllr David Johncock	
Attendees:	See membership list at modified by apologies	
Apologies	Mr Hooper – Cathy Sturrock. Mr Morton – Potentially late. Mr Garner – John Hyde as Deputy. Cllr Baughan (advised will be late), Cllr Shakespear Cllr Wood Gill Markham	
Points of Agreement/Actions		
	Notes	Action
1. Introduction Developer's/Agents attending: AXA Catherine Norris (Alder King) Simon Fitton (Alder King) Peter Corrie (LDA) Savills Neil Rowley	Purpose is to provide feedback on the draft brief. Comments from LG have been compiled by RH.	
2. Group Membership	Nothing to report	
3. Minutes of last meeting	Minor amendments made and minutes approved.	
4. Matters Arising from last meeting	Savills – Rights of Way discussed post meeting. Issue likely to arise again. Savills- diagrams too realistic, should be more conceptual. RH to address the issue of catchment areas in presentation.	

<p>5. Review feedback received – Questions, discussion and clarification.</p>	<p>Presentation by Rob Harrison. Summary of key issues arising from representations received. Presentation to be posted on website.</p> <p>Tonight focussing on sections 5-7.</p> <p>Currently trying to keep document more contained – not repeating information in other guidance or policy documents. Agree the need to make objectives more site specific and clearly defined.</p> <p>DJ – question about the style of the proposed dwellings? Traditional or ‘modern and innovative’.</p> <p>MC- observed a lot of thought has been given. Different parts having different styles seems appropriate.</p> <p>Some feedback from Ashwells residents to see something similar to Ashwells rather than the conservation area.</p> <p>MG – expressed a wish to arrange a meeting with Savills to discuss?</p> <p>DJ - Prefer not to separate the site into different groups, instead deal with it as a whole.</p> <p>MG – difficult to discuss without more information. Perhaps later in the process.</p> <p>KC – convinced should be designed for current times not for past times. Should innovate. If it is not possible to specify the standard of design the developer will produce, we might get either</p>	
--	---	--

volume house building, or an architect that can design good buildings that are appropriate for the site. Prefer a well designed scheme and so support incorporating some guidance. Possible not specifying the style but saying more about the process of design to ensure a quality outcome.
Some concern about 2 ½ storeys. Ashwells will have an issue regarding privacy so 2 storeys preferred.
Prefer Ashwells not try to replicate old buildings in TG

KB - 2 ½ storey a significant concern. Also concerned about density around Sandpits Lane area. Also, not a big fan of pastiche; prefer natural materials that will not have a negative impact on views.

GK - Would like to see brick.

MG - No brick with paint on.

NR – no intention that the entire development would be 2 ½ storeys – possibly only in key locations, but will take on board comments made. Will work with the council with respect to design and style and how much of that guidance goes into the brief.

SF – a number of issues, some of them to be expected. Agree with NR on a lot of the issues. How prescriptive does the council want to be, but there is a long road ahead so may need some flexibility.

General Q & A – access and one-way/two-way? More information please?

	<p>NR – proposal is for it to be one way. The access is as far north as possible, but is one-way due to visibility – can't move the Thames Water kit. To make it two-way, the access point would have to move further south. Happy to share further information on this point to inform more discussion.</p> <p>KB – safeguards in place that good intentions are followed at the application stage?</p> <p>RH – the way in which the guidance has been produced will give it weight in the decision making process. Need a coherent plan, backed up by evidence, setting out the case very clearly. Any counter proposals would also need to be evidence-based.</p> <p>KC- two questions about density. Development to be driven by design, density follows design. However the brief gives specific figures for density. How are we expecting to respond to queries? What is the next step? Will amended brief come back to LG before public consultation?</p> <p>RH - the next draft will be shared with the LG at the same time as the public consultation.</p> <p>KC – see what the response is to these comments before the next draft?</p> <p>PC – good comments have been made. Will be taking them on board. Some things there isn't a single correct answer- some things are compromises. So not everything can be absolutely</p>	NR
--	---	----

delivered because there are always compromises that need to be made.

Will discuss means and extent of response and come back to the LG.

DJ – may not be able to respond on a point-by-point basis but will try to respond to all significant issues raised, either incorporating or explaining why not.

MC – strongly support that a response is made to all comments. Anticipate that the comments would be forwarded in full to agents for consideration. In past WDC consultations normally a consultation response paper with comments received, against which is a response. Would support this sort of approach here.

MG – also support an explanation to help communications with the rest of the community. Copy of RH presentation? Timetable moving forward?

RH - Scheduled to go out to public consultation at the end of May, but timetable would be tight. Need to come back on this point. Consultation would be for a month.

MG - how to inhibit spine road from being used as a through-road? Also discussion on two-way v one-way.

DG – NR has offered to share information informing the one-way two-way option.

Approved at 3 October 2014 Meeting.

	<p>NR – happy to share background information</p> <p>Ian – Some transport bits in, and some not. Bottleneck in Cock Lane is considered a good thing at the moment. Would prefer to see improvements to London Road. Also want footpaths on HL. How does transport plan relate to wider infrastructure plan?</p> <p>RH/DJ Will be cross-reference to infrastructure plan.</p> <p>GK – incremental effect of all new traffic. 44vph on peak time does not seem to justify pushing new traffic down Cock Lane. Leave Cock Lane alone and let traffic go where it will. Do not want extra traffic flows through residential areas. Other routes to consider, but no bridge or tunnels required. Need to look east. Thanks for putting together all comments. But concern please be sure that full responses are read, and not just the summary. Some important detail in the full comments.</p> <p>The number of initials after a point do not represent the full extent of support for that point. There may be more support than indicated.</p> <p>Question about weighting? One person might have reported on the comments from a number of people.</p> <p>Concern that weight of public opinion about widening of Cock Lane is not being considered. And limiting the spine road to southern section so that there</p>	NR
--	--	----

isn't a road linking through the whole of the site.

Concern about density too high compared to the existing character which is much lower. Needs to be a balance between human life and wild life. Need to deliver good quality of human life and not just prioritize wild life.

CL – affordable housing. 40% how would this be made up? Socially-rented, how much shared ownership, etc.? How distributed? Mixture of dwelling sizes?

RH – is 40% 2/3 social, 1/3 shared ownership, mix across dwelling sizes, in consultation with housing officer, informed by local need. Ideally spread, but in reality will be clustered for ease of maintenance.

MC – respond to GK – don't agree that important local wildlife sites should be sacrificed to accommodate traffic. Concerns about link between parcels 1 & 2 – only justification seems to be more choice to drivers. Would damage local wildlife site, and would divide and make difficult to manage. Case does not appear to be sufficiently strong. Is there still an option to build on parcel 1 and accessing to Gomm Road?

RH – a link is not our preference. However, the link between parcels 1 & 2 may be needed to provide a sustainable bus route. May be important to link to Robinson Road. We don't currently have enough technical information to support a decision

Approved at 3 October 2016 Group Meeting.

	<p>on this. Also need the ecological information including harm and benefits to help inform the way forward in response to ecological sites.</p> <p>DJ – Agree there is a lot of concern about the Hamersley Lane access. Need more information on this to inform decision.</p> <p>MC – Another option would be to not develop parcel 1 at all. Would remove these difficulties.</p> <p>RH – is an option but not enough information yet.</p> <p>MC - have gone through a lot of trouble to create a wildlife corridor but now considering breaking this link at the bottom by linking parcels 1 & 2. Important to link through with the rail line.</p> <p>GK – road going through a wildlife site is not the end of the world. Wildlife can cross roads.</p>	
6. AOB	None	
7. Date of next meeting	To Be Advised.	

Approved at 3 October 2014 Group Meeting.