

GOMM VALLEY/ASHWELLS LIAISON GROUP MEETING

Meeting Notes

| Meeting Title: | Liaison Group Meeting | |
|---|---|--------|
| Date: | 02.8.2018 | |
| Location | Council Chamber | |
| Chaired By | Cllr David Johncock | |
| Attendees: | See membership list as modified by apologies | |
| Apologies | Cllr Matt Knight Geoffrey Stevens (Deputy - John Hyde) Gill Markham (Deputy John O'Brien) Tony Garner | |
| Developer Attendees | Jonathan Smales (Human Nature) Simon Fitton (Alder King – Planning Agents) Doug Stewart (Consultant Specialist) | |
| <p>Liaison Group Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cllr David Johncock (Chairman) • Cllr Andrea Baughan • Mike Chadwick • Ken Cooke • Cllr Ian Forbes • Tony Garner • Miles Green • Gerry King • Cllr Matt Knight • Paula Lee • Carolyn Leonard • Ian Morton • David Shakespeare • Geoffrey Stevens • Cathy Sturrock • Janet Tully • Roger Wilding • Cllr Katrina Wood | | |
| Points of Agreement/Actions | Notes | Action |
| 1. Introduction | The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and stated that this was a 1 agenda item - for the H+N Team to outline their vision for Gomm Valley prior to pre-app discussions. | |

| | | |
|--|--|----------------------|
| <p>2. Group Membership</p> | <p>It was timely to review the formal membership of the Liaison Group and it was agreed to circulate the current list for information. Members were asked to propose any changes to this list at the next meeting.</p> | <p>All</p> |
| <p>3. Minutes of last meeting</p> | <p>The Notes of the meeting on 10 May 2018 were agreed.</p> | |
| <p>4. Matters Arising from last meeting</p> | <p>The only action from the last meeting was that the H+N presentation would be posted online. This hadn't been done but the presentation being given at this meeting would be made available to group members.</p> | <p>H+N</p> |
| <p>5. Presentation by Human Nature.</p> <p>Feedback on public consultation event.</p> <p>Update on design work.</p> | <p>Jonathan Smales gave the H+N presentation which finished at approx 8pm.</p> | |
| <p>6. Questions and Answers</p> | <p>Chairman: Following a short discussion, it was agreed that H+N should host a workshop at WDC before the end of August. Provisional date 21 August - TBC.</p> <p>KB - new area proposed on upper NE slope adjacent TG. This will negate the gap between HW and P&TG as required by the brief, as development would directly adjoin the boundary of TG.</p> <p>H+N - Feel the proposal does keep a gap. Demonstrates a gap of 200m.</p> <p>MO - Approach is very innovative. Will the councils respond in a similarly innovative way? CLLR DJ – confirms that WDC is prepared to consider an innovative approach to development on the site. It was noted that the Local Plan is going through examination at the moment which may influence what is permitted on the site</p> <p>JOB – came away from the public consultation event with the impression that the development would be for 357 plots, not 970. H+N confirmed that the materials used for the public event are the same as those being presented tonight, with the same number of units</p> | <p>H+N & RLH</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---------------------|
| | <p>indicated.</p> <p>??? – Queried how the site would be managed in the long term H+N confirmed that this matter was being considered, including possible covenants and service charges. Likely to be a community trust.</p> <p>TG – Jacobs is being used for modelling work but queried if it was possible to get a second opinion? H+N explained that the model belongs to the county, and can only be accessed through Jacobs, but that they had confidence in the transport team for the site.</p> <p>SM - queried if TW had been in touch about their site? RH confirmed that TW had not been in contact with the Council.</p> <p>PL – queried why traffic surveys were being undertaken for this site towards the end of August, when most people are away on holiday. H+N responded that they were not aware of traffic survey work being done for this site at this time but will follow up if PL will email details she has been given.</p> <p>CLLR DJ confirmed that the strategy/works being considered for the A40 would deal with current traffic and not new traffic generated by this proposal.</p> <p>CL queried if BCC would adopt the road if it is non-standard. H+N indicated that the preference would be for BCC to adopt the road, but this would need to be negotiated with BCC.</p> <p>PM queried how through traffic would be deterred H+N indicated that the proposals now show a relocated access point from Cock Lane and that the new streets would not be designed to encourage through traffic, and would instead slow traffic.</p> <p>MG queried what H+N were planning to say to the LP inspector, and asked if they would request the removal of the existing plan indicating development parcels and spine road, and the</p> | <p>PL & H+N</p> |
|--|--|---------------------|

indicative number of dwellings?

Alder King explained that there was only one question the inspector will ask – if the site is viable and deliverable, and that it is this matter which goes to heart of soundness test. AK is Planning to say that only 400 dwellings is not viable, but not aiming to cause the plan to fail. The aim is to seek flexibility in terms of number of dwellings and layout.

The Chairman explained that the inspector was hoping to visit every site, even ones not put in the plan.

KC reiterated that P&TG residents regard the gap as sacrosanct and prevent coalescence, and that they would not want to see development creep further north. Welcome the omission of previous parcel 9 however the increased numbers will alarm local people and it will be important to make a very compelling argument in respect to traffic.

GK said he was pleased with the more southerly connection onto cock lane but queried what was proposed to happen with the junction onto Hammersley lane, and if it would allow traffic to travel north, or would movements be restricted. H+N responded that there would be a connection on Hammersley Lane and that he didn't believe movements would be restricted.

JT queried why there was no surgery
H+N indicated they would look into this.

KT - queried the relationship between this proposal and that on Ashwells, and if Ashwells was coming forward?

The Chairman indicated that Ashwells was proceeding separately, and that he would ask if a presentation can be given to local people by the property team.

RH indicated that he was expecting amended plans in autumn and that there would be further public consultation on the amended plans before recommendation made. RH feels it likely there will be a decision before Christmas.

GK expressed concern about contentious comments appearing on the Ashwells website from BCC relating to two-way streets, bus lanes, and traffic calming.

| | | |
|--------------------------------|---|--|
| | <p>RH explained that all information was being made available, and suggested that concerned residents make further comments at the next consultation on the application.</p> <p>PM queried if a one-form entry primary school was sufficiently future proofed if the proposal had increased from 400 to over 900 dwellings. He also stated the importance of considering not only traffic and congestion but also environmental impacts of traffic.</p> <p>H+N confirmed that these matters were being considered and that H+N would be happy to come speak to local groups about their concerns.</p> | |
| 7. AOB | There was none. | |
| 8. Date of next meeting | To be advised as project progresses. | |

Draft to be approved at next Liaison Group meeting