

GOMM VALLEY/ASHWELLS LIAISON GROUP MEETING

Meeting Notes

Meeting Title:	Liaison Group Meeting	
Date:	25.04.2016	
Location	Committee Room 1,WDC	
Chaired By	Cllr David Johncock	
Attendees:	See membership list at modified by apologies	
Apologies	Roger Wilding (Wycombe Wildlife Group), Paula lee, Gill Markham	
Points of Agreement/Actions	Notes	Action
1. Introduction Developer's/Agents attending: AXA Peter Corrie (LDA Design) Savills Chris Odgers	A while since last 2 meetings, but work had been progressing behind the scenes.	
2. Group Membership	Bill Sadler, Sandpits Lane had proposed that Steve McDermott take his place on the Liaison Group. This was approved unanimously by the group.	
3. Minutes of last meeting	Minutes of 26 th January and 3 rd February meetings accepted.	
4. Matters arising from last meeting	Only matter arising item is covered in agenda item 5.	
5. Update on emerging development parcels and account for position to date.	Presentation by Rob Harrison. Presentation to be posted on-line asap. TG asked if he could respond to the points made about the Pimms Grove proposal. DJ reminded the meeting that he had promised that WDC	

	<p>would explain why some of the proposals by two residents' groups would not be taken forward and this had been done thoroughly and professionally by RH. He saw no point in prolonging debate on these points at this time and wished to focus the meeting on the draft site development brief.</p> <p>DS – wished opportunity for further comments to be made and considered.</p> <p>DJ - Main point of tonight is to make comments on the development brief rather than focus on previously considered issues and there would be the opportunity to do that throughout the meeting.</p>	
<p>6. Presentation of the 2nd draft of the Development Brief.</p>	<p>Presentation by Peter Corrie, LDA Design.</p> <p>Pg 39 development framework objectives. 7 key points. Have built in a number of issues that we've discussed over the months, including visibility work, infrastructure etc.</p> <p>Development framework plan – the outcome of many months of discussion. Is the maximum developable extent, but the entirety of the orange shaded parcels will not be covered with buildings. These areas will also include amenity space, gardens, access & parking, etc.</p> <p>Parcel 12 – have spoken with TW about residential but they remain of view that it is not a good residential site. Considering for employment but would depend on access arrangements. Some public queries about this TG felt there was a discrepancy.</p> <p>Pg 47. Access and movement plan. Trying to bring together a number of seemingly conflicting aspirations/constraints, balancing to achieve a deliverable layout. Sets out vehicular and pedestrian access. Need to connect to the surrounding area is fundamental. Notional network of footpaths have been considered in terms of how the undeveloped areas of the valley are managed e.g. grazing etc.</p> <p>DS – comment on access to parcel 1. Still shows access from Hamersley Lane. Feel it is undeliverable – queues, and congestion. Vehicles coming out of parcel 1 would be added to this queue. Increase danger to pedestrians, no dedicated pedestrian provision here. Concerned about rat-running down Robinson Road. This does not appear to be sensible traffic management. More sensible to join to Gomm Road access.</p> <p>DJ – was raised at infrastructure group. Agree there are</p>	

	<p>serious concerns and have asked about connection to spine road. Acknowledge impact on ecologically important area.</p> <p>RH this is being considered by the transport consultants. Potential of junction at Hammersley Lane will be fully considered.</p> <p>GS - Parcel 5. Currently is a cul-de-sac for Pimms Close. Is a vehicular access proposed?</p> <p>PC – Currently assumed access off spine road. Still considering pedestrian access.</p> <p>RH – Development Brief is in draft form and nothing is currently definite.</p> <p>KW - Bowls & TC off site provision of sport facilities? Is this to go on Terriers? More detail about this please? Terriers is a long way away. RH – advised that leisure facilities need to be provided together for ease of management. More detail in the infrastructure plan. Gomm Valley requirement to be covered at Terriers and Derehams Lane.</p> <p>TG - Grazing would require management. Best to turn over to a farmer to minimise additional layers of management?</p> <p>PC - Different types of land management are envisaged but nothing is decided. Not necessarily suitable for a farmer – some of the areas will need to be managed in a different way than a farmer would do.</p> <p>GK – paths do not match the current ROW – need to be coordinated.</p> <p>CO (Savills) the ROW currently on the Ashwells site is proposed to be slightly amended. To discuss outside of the meeting.</p> <p>PC – Bus Route options 6.3. have amended some of the routing plan and a bit more of Cock Lane will need to be widened.</p> <p>GK – contrary to local opinion? Wanted to avoid widening of Cock Lane and retain single track.</p> <p>RH – we need to provide a transport link between the developable areas to make it work. The congestion on Cock Lane that needs to be addressed. Solution will require some compromises.</p>	<p>RH</p> <p>Savills</p>
--	--	--------------------------

	<p>KC – parallel road?</p> <p>RH – considered but impact on gap between settlements, ecological impact, duplication of infrastructure etc not pursued. Need to provide a clear steer in respect to the preferred option to inform the applications coming forward. Options set out in 14th October 2015 presentation.</p> <p>DJ – need to consider that making the access further up Cock Lane would increase pressure for further development south of the new spine road nif not on both sides of that new road. No one would choose to use Cock Lane if a better route is provided.</p> <p>MG – how to make one route unattractive over the other?</p> <p>PC – Jacobs advice is to make the new road more attractive than the exiting Cock Lane. Is an imperfect compromise. People that live in an area want roads to join up so that they can get where they need to go. Traffic engineers want to avoid loads of junctions because they increase risk of collisions, but long straight roads may lead to high speed. Needs to be a good route that keeps speeds low but doesn't encourage additional traffic. Route will be convoluted to avoid constraints such as badger setts, trees etc. Route needed to be informed by contours, need to avoid cut-and-fill which would increase impact. Also need to ensure a bus route is provided, with its own engineering/design requirements.</p> <p>RH – Bus route 27 is being looked at. Development needs to accommodate a bus.</p> <p>GS – concern is the volume of traffic. Completely gridlocked in the morning.</p> <p>PC – Landscape Character plan pg 51. Blue dashed lines are areas of visual constraint. Mapping of constraints and natural features, views, photomontages. Yellow arrow is about maintaining the visual character of the valley, and extending it up to the top of the site. If you push the junction with Cock Lane further north, you would constrain the quality and effectiveness of the gap. You would also need to consider lighting at the junction and perhaps elsewhere where Cock Lane is widened. Green arrows are about making links between ecological areas. The network of fields being considered also comes forward in the brief, the result of work to date.</p> <p>GI and ecology. Gomm Valley is a dry chalk valley but there</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>will be surface flows that will need to be dealt with. Thick clay over the chalk. Blue arrow is illustrating where the drainage issues might be dealt with. Also highlights buffers around ecological areas, new management areas joining existing habitats to maximise value and link up to surrounding areas of habitat.</p> <p>IM – idea to have link between 6 & 7? PC - Yes, hedgerow maintained and gap between these development areas.</p> <p>Character areas 6.6. Break the site down into these areas based on where they are in the valley – where they are on the shoulders, valley sides etc. C is on higher ground and self-contained. Feels more work is required here, more diagrammatic, and need to deal with different situations within each parcel and how to deal with the different characteristics i.e. development on sloping site etc.</p> <p>Pg 57 deals with sections we might see on different parts of the site.</p> <p>PH – p 68 talks about character of Ashwells. There is sloping ground on the Ashwells site. Existing houses face a field above them. Pg 64 – character area B but still the reverse of the situation that existing Ashwells properties will face if this part of the site is developed. This is a unique situation on the site where all of the other dwellings benefit from land sloping down away from their rear gardens.</p> <p>PC – will need a particular section to pick up this point. And dealt with in that character area.</p> <p>Savills – happy to have further discussions about this.</p> <p>PC – pg 60 thinks these diagrams are too realistic. Needs to be more conceptual. Slope starts to dictate how wide the street, how deep the block, overlooking distance. These are technical drawings to help inform width of street, including bus stops, parking, dwellings will need their own driveways and access points. The layout then stretches when it is put onto a slope. May need to amend to make the ‘rules’ clear. PC feels these may be too complicated and may be a constraint moving forward.</p> <p>DJ – does group think the diagrams are too prescriptive? Do we need it to be more generic?</p> <p>GS – planning application may look entirely different.</p> <p>DJ – are we making this unnecessarily complicated?</p>	<p>Savills</p>
--	---	----------------

KC – is too prescriptive and looks like standard house types.

PC – don't want to end up with lines of repetitive houses following the contours. Want different forms in the different character areas. If roofs removed from indicative forms it looks like flat roofed houses are being proposed. Should avoid specifying a particular style of house at this stage to avoid constraining final proposal.

KC - Brief deal with tenure, affordable housing, shared ownership?

DJ – is already in policy so no need to repeat.

GK – question about section D – p 68 assumption under density. 25-35 DPH, but current density is 5 -150 per ha. higher density than this does not seem appropriate in Ashwells.

PC - Pg 70 takes baseline info in first section of document and responds to these issues. Plan indicates high level drainage strategy. Footpath routes and drainage correlate. Water may be visible in some seasons. School site needs to be designed to accommodate proper drainage rather than blocking flows. Levels and provide natural route for the water to flow. Route and attenuation basins and hold flows and manage them.

IF - 6.5 needs to address water and waste water.

DJ – need to consider services. Ducting? Where – road, verge, footpath?

PC – pg 72 to deal with climate change. House builders often have their own preferred methods of choice. Is a good list to choose from. 15% reduction from the average usage.

IF - 15% is hardly ambitious.

PC - pg 75 summary plan for each of the numbered development parcels. Shows how the principles are applied to each parcel.

KW – widening cock lane impact on the cemetery?

PC – no. Would widen to the east.

MG – pg 79 unexpected arrangement for Cock Lane joining spine road. Explain. Spine road and cock lane width of

	<p>which implies that cock lane will be bigger (wider) than cock lane. This is not intended. Is a graphics thing.</p> <p>Savills - considering a one-way system into Ashwells but still needs to be agreed with highway engineers. RLH – adds and planners.</p> <p>PH - Ashwells is steep and dangerous in winter due to black ice. A one way system would tip all of the traffic down the steep bit of the road in the morning when it is icy. This would be danger to children going to school.</p> <p>CO – trying to balance all of the requirements</p> <p>PH – what about accommodating traffic on the new route? Make it two way?</p> <p>GK – why couldn't the new access be two-way also?</p> <p>PH – heard it is about not directing traffic down narrow Cock Lane.</p> <p>MG – constraint is also about the hedge?</p> <p><i>General discussion ends</i></p>	
<p>7. AOB</p>	<p>Please comments back by 9th of May and hope another meeting to be set up to discuss at that time.</p> <p>Public consultation will take place once comments received and amendments have been made to the current draft.</p> <p>MG- Residents AGM is on the 23rd May – would they be able to consult at that time?</p> <p>DJ – suggest don't consult at that meeting, and simply provide an update.</p> <p>RH - AXA is submitting pre-app later this week. WDC don't know what the pre-app will involve yet. Possibly focus on Environmental Statements and other supporting documents. Therefore WDC, the developers' team and LG need to focus on progressing brief to inform other work going forward.</p> <p>TG – will the site be sold off to other developers? Future purchasers may look at the site very differently and have their own ideas in mind. We could be subject to appeal.</p> <p>RH - Makes it important to base the guidance in the brief on</p>	<p>All</p>

	<p>evidence.</p> <p>CLS – page 14 – services and amenities. Section 4.2.1. says Gomm valley is in school catchment Cressex Community School. This seems incorrect. Should be Highcrest or Ramsey?</p> <p>RH – Needs to be amended.</p>	RH
<p>8. Date of next meeting</p>	<p>TBA but will be after 9th May.</p>	

Approved at 10th May Liaison Group meeting