

# GOMM VALLEY/ASHWELLS LIAISON GROUP MEETING

## Meeting Notes

Meeting Title:	Liaison Group Meeting	
Date:	10.5.2018	
Location	Council Chamber	
Chaired By	Cllr David Johncock	
Attendees:	See membership list as modified by apologies	
Apologies	Gill Markham Cllr Matt Knight Cllr Andrea Baughan (apologies maybe a little late) Miles Green Neil Rowntree (BBOWT) Kati Bushell Cllr Katrina Wood Paula Lee	
Developer Attendees	Neil Mcleod (Aviva – Land Owner) Jonathan Smales (Human Nature) Michael Manolson (Human Nature) Simon Fitton (Alder King – Planning Agents) Alex Ely (Mae Architects)	
Points of Agreement/Actions	Notes	Action
<b>1. Introduction</b>	Purpose is for the team to outline vision for Gomm Valley prior to pre-app discussions.	
<b>2. Group Membership</b>	Phil Hooper resigned (moved out of the area).  Cathy Sturrock proposed as replacement for Phil Hooper.  Changes to membership agreed.	
<b>3. Minutes of last meeting</b>	Circulated.  RW – comment by GK saying that local wildlife site in parcel 1 should be reassessed. Actually designated not that long ago, what qualifications this based on?  GK - No qualifications, but visual inspection. Nothing apparently happening there. No action	

	DJ - GK's comment was an expression of personal opinion. Therefore, no change required to minutes.	
<b>4. Matters Arising from last meeting</b>	<p>All actions have been completed except as follows:</p> <p>Outstanding action for Mike Chadwick to seek statement from BBOWT – they are still on the circulation list, but understand they would resist road across the wildlife site.</p> <p>RH was emailed by BBOWT, and stated keen to continue involvement on site. No further action from MC needed.</p>	
<b>5. Presentation by Human Nature. Vision for Gomm Valley.</b>	<p>RH - introduces purpose of AVIVA/Human Nature presenting. To explore the development potential of the site. Discussions with officers to follow.</p> <p>RH - AVIVA are aware of the Development Brief, which remains in place and is the Council's starting point for considering any development proposal. The Council is also continuing with its new Local Plan policy, which was submitted for examination at the end of March.</p> <p>SF – have been involved in site for a while, and planning agent for 18 years. Released in 2014. Brief adopted in 2016. New team looking at the site with new eyes. New landscape, highways etc. consultants.</p> <p>No substantive conversations have taken place with LPA in past year – was clear that new team needed to speak with LG prior to opening negotiations. Are agreeing a PPA to facilitate discussions with LPA going forward. Agreement and input from LG will be critical to negotiations.</p> <p>JS - Human Nature – Founders were previously involved with Greenpeace and therefore value the environment very highly. Agreed that this is a precious Chiltern valley landscape.</p> <p>JS provided PowerPoint presentation and made the following significant points:</p> <p>No resolved plans at this stage – is a process.</p>	

	<p>References to heritage, landscape, local area and precedents.</p> <p>Team has been assembled specifically for this project. Individuals in the team and their backgrounds were set out.</p> <p>Explained that 400m around a centre is a walkable neighbourhood</p> <p>Explained history of the company and prior projects</p> <p>Set out current thinking about the site, and the brief, and proposals for how to move forward with the work.</p> <p>4 LVIA's done on the site.</p> <p>Envision up to about 10 character areas across the site. Involving smaller or local builders, area, groups of single plots.</p> <p>Presentation to be made available to LG Members.</p>	
<p><b>6. Questions and Answers</b></p>	<p>KC - Thanks for putting together the team. Hopeful that what is described can be delivered. Release of reserved site was opposed. Accept it will be developed but now looking for the right approach. Interested to hear how density could be increased in a way that still delivers good design. Quality of the environment is down to good design, not dependent on low density.</p> <p>In respect to Spine Road, it started off being called a link road, but didn't want it to be a link between A40 and Tylers Green. Concern about Cock Lane. Very ambitious programme. In respect to different teams for different parts of the development, but agree this can deliver good places as long as it is coordinated.</p> <p>DW – thanks. Almost excited about the development. One edge of the plot is the A40. Still only have one road through centre of Wycombe, which is a nightmare. Any influence on this in planning and development would be welcomed.</p>	

JS – yes, working with the highways authority, also engineers and modellers. Getting advice on capacity and changes to the network. Also considering how to reduce the need to move on an everyday basis – GP, school, convenience etc. Also when you do need to move, make sure it is accessible. Make travel attractive. Challenge is this is a small project in a big town so limited influence, but looking at opportunities to think differently. Strategic bike connections to rail station is a key. Also some conventional changes to highway.

IM – thought previous plan was excessive in terms of numbers, so concerned about suggestion there will be more. What is plan for cars and car parking? Evidence that proposals will work in this country (families living on top of one another)? Thoughts on location of school?

TG – GV is only one development, and small pocket in relation to others. 500 houses on GV&A, 2000 houses on other sites when they are released. Will generation up to 4000 vehicles on roads. WDC committed to over 13000 houses, but only one road (A40) and Amersham and Marlow hills. Town Centre is the hub. No way this network can cope with this. Ideas are commendable, but remain concerned about traffic. Already difficult to travel. Project will not address this overall situation about lack of infrastructure and lack of scope to provide it.

GS - In last 3-4 year have never had a satisfactory answer to how the cars will be dealt with, and how the infrastructure will be delivered.

RH – how much of site looking to develop themselves? JS - No firm plan at the moment. Maybe ¼ - 1/3, and affordable provider another ¼ - 1/3, and the rest from single plot to groups of 50.

CL – social housing – how to place within the site? Self-build – how much might there be? Various developers working at the same time – how to deal with construction traffic?

GK – London road – route for cycling to railway station 1900 vph in each direction. Not a good place to ride a bike. BCC are aiming to make a

	<p>link road from TG to A40, which will generate 1500 vph in each direction, and will not be compatible with spaces for children playing in the street.</p> <p>DW – appreciate the presentation and can see the challenge. How can the group best present information on traffic movements to the developer’s team? Interested in quality of life for people who will live there and how infrastructure might damage the environment.</p> <p>CS – nothing to add at this time.</p> <p>RW – interested, and sounds good. Last unspoilt valley in Wycombe – will it remain so. Brief did best to retain good wildlife corridor and woodland, and thought it would be a joined up corridor. When developed will be a massive change. Brief did make provision for corridors to link with those to surrounding areas. Concerned that this aspiration will still be met – very keen to see green corridors.</p> <p>Janet Tully – cock lane. Don’t want to see it widened or developed. Currently proposed for it to be widened at the top – not sure if this would happen along the whole length. Would prefer to see the spine road to keeping traffic on Cock Lane.</p> <p>AB – excited about housing association involvement, and feel presentation was positive with good philosophies. Consultation period, please plenty of notice, leaflets, widely publicise and notice boards. Not enough publicity in the past.</p> <p>MC – trusts to manage parkland – existing wildlife trusts? Often come across old-fashioned views when presentation is so aspirational. Is a gulf between vision and current thinking of local residents?</p> <p>JS – the site cannot be responsible for all the exiting ills of the town. Can design this site to function differently within site boundaries.</p> <p>JS - Have spoken to senior at BCC – isn’t their position that they want a link road – is not their</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>policy. Don't think this site is the right place for a link road but agree cock lane is precious so need a strategic response.</p> <p>JS - Developers do need to be prepared to be disappointed but have high aspirations.</p> <p>DJ - Looking forward to working together. I think there are some misconceptions in respect to infrastructure – no intention this will be a rat run.</p>	
<b>7. Update on Ashwell's</b>	<p>RH - Ashwell's application received. First stage consultation complete. Officers fed back to developer with all matters arising from first stage submission and full S106 list. The matter is currently with developers. Officers are awaiting their response. A view will be taken on whether additional consultation is required once the additional information is submitted.</p> <p>DW concern that the applications should be looked at together, particularly in respect to Cock Lane. RH acknowledges that this was always the idea</p>	
<b>8. AOB</b>	Nothing.	
<b>9. Date of next meeting</b>	<p>To be advised following discussion with AVIVA's representatives.</p> <p>Will set this once discussed with the team. JS always happy to speak to LG on issues.</p> <p>Start presentation with the bit that relates to GV – perhaps start with the principles.</p>	