Consultation Feedback

Consultation Responses

- Written – 10 including
  - Woolf Bond Planning – Developers
  - Cllr A Hussain
  - Hughenden Parish Council
  - Widmer End Residents Association
- Electronic – 125
  - Terriers Farm Action Group
  - Brands Hill Residents Association
  - Jansons (Terriers House)
  - Cllrs Raja & Green
  - Hazlemere Parish Council
  - Chilterns Conservation Board
  - Amersham Hill Residents Association

Design Review – d:se

- Supports
  - the landscape led approach
  - Integration with existing communities
  - Some community facilities within the site
  - Expanding consideration beyond the ‘reserved site’
  - Suds area as a communal space
- Concerns over
  - Single access
  - Insufficient detail on landscape measures
  - Development beyond the North South hedgerow.
  - Density in relation to developers products

How we have considered the responses

- The responses have be collated in different action areas
  - Conservation
  - Infrastructure
  - Landscape and Green Infrastructure
  - Highways and transport
  - Community facilities
  - Design and integration

Highways

- Welcome traffic calming measure proposed
- Issues
  - Single access
  - General opposition to increased traffic due to development
  - Concern over infrastructure for walking cycling and public transport, doubt if anybody would use it
  - Look for cycling to Hazlemere shops via Lady’s mile rather than to High Wycombe
  - Concern over parking pressure both on and off site
  - Look to improve bus stops and improve public transport

Response to comments

- Work done on second access
- Looking and where bus pull in could best be accommodated on 404
- Cant make the service operator's alter their routes
- Parking is dependent upon detail and is through BCC parking standards but will be spelt out in the brief. It will be more generous both on and off plot than at Wellsbourne.
- Investigating options with regard to a comprehensive cycling network

Conservation

- Concerns
- Terriers farmhouse does not need to be retained as its not historic.
- Is Terriers house included in the Brief?
- Lady’s mile should respect its historic significance and remain a bridleway

- Response
- Very few buildings worthy of retention but TFH is a link to the past and should be retained to help integrate the development into the area
- Terriers house is not included but the cricket field is.
- No suggestion that Lady’s Mile should not remain as a bridleway.

Community Facilities

- **Issues**
- Loss of existing recreation ground due to potential second access
- Terriers is deficient in community facilities
- Concern about the impact of floodlights and noise from new sports provision within the site.

- **Response**
- Access through recreation ground not to be pursued
- Considering a review of community needs based on increased population
- Floodlight and noise will be a matter for the application stage at which point it will be evaluated to ensure the amenity of existing and future residents is maintained.
- Consider the potential for a community facility in the Terriers Farm Buildings

Design

- **Issues**
- Development is too big and will have a negative impact upon the area.
- Important gap between Wycombe and Hazlemere, the development will destroy this gap and the peace and space it provides.
- Terriers wants a gap as well
- Density is unattractive
- We shouldn’t be zoning the site it should be a mix of housing types
- Three storey is inappropriate.
- **Response**
- Released for development and is needed to provide housing for the growing population.
- seeks to make use of the existing recreation ground and add to it to ensure a gap is maintained between Wycombe and Hazlemere.

Landscape

- **Issues**
  - Loss of the existing playing fields due to the road
  - Loss of the site as green fields should develop brownfields first
  - Concern over potentially relocating sports pitches into the AONB
  - Some of the hedges may be protected by legislation
- **Response**
  - Not taking forward the road through the recreation ground
  - Brownfield sites are being developed as well as greenfield
  - More info needed on the hedges that might be protected but will pass this onto the developers as they will need to be aware.

Green Infrastructure

- Issues
  - Concerns over impact of lighting
  - The playing fields should be wild flower meadows to improve biodiversity
  - Grey water recycling should be required
  - Make sure there are children's play areas
  - Distribute POS across the site rather than having it all to the east
- Response
  - Add lighting control in sensitive areas eg Lady's Mile and N/S hedgerow
  - The brief requires biodiversity offsetting measures
  - Suds deals with Grey water we were not planning to require specific measures through the brief but will look to be more explicit in the suds hierarchy, tanks and pipes as a last resource.
  - POS is distributed across the site but the playing fields need to be linked to the existing facilities.

Errors and Omissions

- Numerous pointed out and these will be picked up on when the changes required in response to the consultation are made to the document

Timeline for development

- 11 Sep Liaison Group (12th)
- 21 Sept First round preapp meeting
- 2 Oct First round preapp feedback AND revised draft of SPD (in response to public consultation) sent through for comment
- 16 Oct Second round preapp sent in, along with comments on the revised brief
- 30 Oct Second round preapp meeting
- 6 Nov Second round preapp comments sent back / confirmation of position on Brief.
- 13 Nov Brief finalised (but may be without full graphics)
- 4 Dec Brief shared with Liaison Group
- 18 Dec Brief (with diagrams) finalised
- 01 Jan Planning application expected to be submitted.
- 5 Feb 2018 Cabinet meeting with recommendation to approve the brief.