

# GOMM VALLEY/ASHWELLS LIAISON GROUP MEETING

## Meeting Notes

Meeting Title:	Liaison Group Meeting
Date:	3.10.2016
Location	Committee Room 1
Chaired By	Cllr David Johncock
Attendees:	See membership list at modified by apologies
Apologies	Cllr Ian Forbes. Mr Garner – Deputy John O’Brien. Katie Bushell. Cllr Paula Lee – deputy Matt. Ian Morton. Cllr Katrina Wood.

Points of Agreement/Actions	Notes	Action
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<p>Purpose is to facilitate discussion and answer any questions arising from the publication of the Development Brief.</p> <p>Comments can be made as part of consultation process.</p> <p>Neil Rowley is unable to attend but extends offer to answer any questions arising via email. Emails to be sent via RH. Equally RH happy to put any questions arising to the AXA team.</p>	
<b>2. Group Membership</b>	Nothing to report.	
<b>3. Minutes of last meeting</b>	1.Previous meeting 10 May 2016 – accepted as record.	
<b>4. Matters Arising from last meeting</b>	<p>RH - AXA exhibition held by applicants as part of preparation for submission of their application. It is currently understood by officers that their application will be broadly in-line with the Brief.</p> <p>RH - WDC has taken over brief to fine tune amendments in the most efficient manner. There has been no falling out and the Brief remains a collaborative effort. However, inevitably there are some areas where AXA and WDC are not in agreement. The respective landowners will be making submissions on the Brief along with the</p>	

	<p>public.</p> <p>RH - Ashwell's exhibition is expected towards the end of October or beginning of November. This is a matter for the Council's property team to advertise in due course.</p> <p>RH - Gomm Valley and Ashwell's applications are expected to come in together to provide a comprehensive solution for the site. However, AXA have indicated that their application may come sooner. In meantime, WDC planning focusing on production of the Development Brief to set out strategic vision for site.</p> <p>RH – The principal reason the developers are not present at the meeting is because the LG meeting was advertised alongside the publication of the Brief, which went to LG members separately from the wider public. The developers' who along with WDC officers are not technically members of the LG were not sent the same notification. When this error was picked up by RH the landowners were regrettably given very short notice. The landowners have in no way disengaged from the LG process.</p>	
<b>5. Frequently Asked Questions</b>	<p>LDA response to comments raised in respect of the Spring consultation were circulated. LG members were invited to review feedback in respect of earlier comments before making comments on the latest version of the Brief.</p> <p>Presentation given by RH on key changes and a number of key questions that are expected to arise. Presentation on website.</p> <p>RH – Design Review being undertaken by Design South East in Oct/Nov time to provide impartial critical review of Development Brief. 2 volunteers from LG invited to participate (1 from north; 1 from south). Expressions of interest to RH.</p>	ALL
<b>6. Questions and Answers</b>	<p>JO'B – Pimms Close – potential through route into development disappointing. Bus only route? Will it link to spine road? Fundamental impact on pedestrians owing to speed. Population requirement for bus route – want to see how catchment has been built up to justify route.</p>	RH

	<p>CL – pleased to see that over-looking issues considered.</p> <p>MK – reiterate concerns for Pimms Grove/Close – possible to show in same manner as Wheeler Close? Pedestrian/cycle route ok.</p> <p>AB – endorse Pimms Grove position. Feel transport issue is overstated.</p> <p>SMcD – Hammersley Lane is already heavily congested. Link will lead to more rat runs.</p> <p>MC – link road bus only v all traffic – less impact on wildlife if former. Schematic plans – alignment to follow contours. Extra mitigation? - sufficient to overcome BBOWTS objection? MC to seek statement from BBOWT on what mitigation required to make all vehicle route acceptable?</p> <p>JT – Pimms Grove bus route illogical</p> <p>GK – alternative bus route proposed – will circulate plan. Local wildlife site in parcel 1 – should be reassessed as poor quality. Top of Cock Lane widening – not mentioned in Jacobs report: Link road should be primarily for local residents and not opened up to through traffic. Nothing about capacity but does state that not suitable for material increase in traffic. Where is the proposal arising? Cock Lane should be kept narrow as a bottleneck to prevent rat running.</p> <p>RH: not representative of BCC view – want a 2 lane route N-S but do not minded how it is achieved. The proposed bus route involves third party land and therefore its delivery is questionable.</p> <p>MG – design of spine road: design speed to encourage low speeds. But summary sheet no: 121 incompatible. Integrated traffic calming to be incorporated into design. Aim to make spine road the road of choice over Cock Lane – TA modelling will provide reassurance. Cost to be shared between developers.</p> <p>KC – well-meaning intentions for spine road not adequately specified in Dev Brief. DB should be more prescriptive on design and landscaping –</p>	<p>MC</p> <p>GK</p>
--	---	---------------------

	<p>not a through route for out of area traffic –just to serve new development. (RH to reconsider para 5.12). (DJ – is wording strong enough in DFO2, pg 35?). Account from Quality Counts tour in process of preparation.</p> <p>GM – primary school in GV – para needs rewritten to indicate that residents in Terriers do not get bused in.</p> <p>PH – spine road should not be attractive to external traffic. Cul-de-sacs welcome and attractive to residents.</p>	<p>RH</p> <p>RH</p>
<b>7. AOB</b>	<p>None</p> <p>Handful of comments received to date on consultation. Exhibitions also will be helpful to understand proposals – encourage people to attend.</p> <p>On-going role for LG at pre-app and planning stages.</p>	
<b>8. Date of next meeting</b>	To Be Advised.	

Draft to be approved at next Liaison Group meeting