

## Summary of feedback Gomm Valley and Ashwells

### Contributors

Mrs Kati Bushell (KB) 24.09.15

Tony Garner (TG) 15.09.15 & 30.09.15

Neil Rowntree (NR) 28.09.15

Den Winterburn (DW) 23.09.15 & 16.09.15

Mike Chadwick (MC) 21.09.15

Roger Wilding (RW) 20.09.15

Chris Woodman (CW) 17.09.15

Phil Hopper (PH) 07.09.15 & 16.09.15

Miles Green (MG) 15.09.15

Carolyn Leonard (CL) 14.09.15

Ian Forbes (IF) 7.09.15 & 16.09.15

Gerry King (GK) 15.09.15

Ian Morton (IM) 16.09.15

### Issues

#### **Should any areas of development be included or excluded?**

1. Object to inclusion of parcels 6, 7, 8 and 10 (KB). Justification required (more development or lower density)? Why deviate from 2014 consultation document.
2. Parcels 6 & 7 close the gap between High Wycombe and Tylers Green (KB).
3. Parcel 10 extending Ashwells development (KB)
4. Layout plan shows more development than was proposed in the 2014 Options consultation document (TG).
5. Failure to safeguard the beautiful Gomm Valley (TG).
6. Biodiversity concerns in respect of (NR):
  - a. Overall level of development.
  - b. Parcels 1 (Developer plan), 2 and 3
  - c. Parcel 4 (Developers plan).
  - d. Parcels 5, 6 and 7 on both WDC and developers preferred options
  - e. Link road between parcels 2/3 and 5 on the developers option
  - f. Option 4 road link between parcels 7 & 8.

7. Object to developers preferred option 4, which brings development closer to SSSI (NR).
8. Welcome the fact all options include significant areas free from development. Also, welcome the fact that more areas free from development are on the East side of the valley, which links well with existing wildlife concerns. Potential chalk grassland (NR).
9. The overall layout pattern that any development is concentrated on the Western side and northern tip of the site, with the eastern side of the site left undeveloped, and a strong linkage of the undeveloped area to Kingswood, is the appropriate one (MC).
10. Layouts fail to provide sufficient buffer to wildlife habitats or sufficiently strong functional links between the wildlife habitats (MC). Advise:
  - a. Create a better link between Pimm's Grove Wood and main undeveloped area by reducing southern extent parcel 4.
  - b. Improve connection between Little Gomm's Wood and Gomm's Wood by removing road between parcels 5 & 6.
  - c. Increase buffer around Little Gomm's Wood and SSSI by reducing extent of parcels 4, 5 and 2.
11. Proposed layout keeps central part of valley open, which is supported. However, parcel 2 should be removed and development on the west side of the valley should be restricted to the west side of the proposed spine road (RW).
12. Need to ensure genuine separation between new development at Ashwells and that in Gomm Valley (MG).
13. Object to any possibility of a through route either along the proposed spine road or through a widening of Cock Lane (MG).
14. Further explanation required as to the status of the two plans (MG).
15. Development option at Ashwells amounts to total development. It is not the middle ground (MG).
16. Plans do not take sufficient account of the topographical and environmental value of the valley (MG).
17. Object to development of parcel 8. It is in a different Parish to the rest of Ashwells and is highly visible. The site is also of potential archaeological interest (MG).
18. Parcel 10 is on higher ground than the existing houses at Ashwells and would look down on them (MG).
19. Parcel 7 should be omitted to maintain gap between settlements (MG).
20. Ashwells should contain bollards to prevent circular routing (MG).
21. No demand at Ashwells for bus link to M40 (MG).
22. Plot 10 should be omitted. It was not included in early consultation, it provides an important link to Kings Wood and is highly visible (PH).
23. Too much land being set over for sport and leisure. Out of proportion (PH).
24. A large part of plot 10 is elevated above the existing housing in Ashwells and Greenridge, which may have an overbearing impact and impact on privacy (PH).
25. Properties in Ashwells and Greenridge are presently relatively poorly screened from any development (PH).
26. Views out of plot 10 should be preserved (PH).
27. Not in favour of parcel 8 (GK):
  - a. Not part of the original proposal.
  - b. Land not owned by WDC.

- c. Straddles Ward boundaries.
  - d. Potential archaeological remains beneath parcel 8.
- 28. Separation between Tylers Green and High Wycombe needs to be maintained in a meaningful way. Any spine road would erode the separation (GK).
- 29. Proposed development of Ashwells does not represent middle ground (IF).
- 30. Insufficient justification given for the selection of specific areas identified for housing development.
- 31. Object to parcel 8 (IF):
  - a. Reduced separation between communities
  - b. Not owned by WDC
  - c. Highly visible.
  - d. Important archaeological finds.
- 32. Object to parcel 7, which if developed would leave only 200 metres separation between GV and Ashwells.
- 33. The plans amount to a substantial sprawl of construction. This contravenes Inspectors reports and WDC's strategic Sites guidelines.
- 34. No justification for commercial extension (TG).
- 35. Planned development is larger than expected (IM).

**Do you have an alternative layout option that you would like the Council to consider?**

- 36. Would like to see green corridor or minor access road along the rear of the properties in Sandpits Lane (KB).
- 37. Footpath from Sandpits across site should be preserved to enhance access to Tylers Green Village and for future residents. Pedestrian permeability should be preserved. (KB)
- 38. No justification given for the selection of the preferred option (MG).
- 39. In the event development takes place on parcel 10 part of it should be earmarked for open space with new vegetation and trees being planted (see plan). Buildings should be set back for privacy purposes (PH).
- 40. Area allocated for employment use should be utilised as a school site (TG).
- 41. Propose plot 8 be relocated to the undeveloped area beneath plot 10. Allows second Ashwells access to be relocated to southern boundary of Ashwells. Support for expansion of plot 10 is conditional on lower density housing, additional green leisure space and to prevent further later development on the site (GK and DW).

## Where do you stand on the Cock Lane Issue?

- a) **New Spine Road**
- b) **Widen Cock Lane**
- c) **An amalgamation of options 1 and 2.**

- 42. Support spine road, but believe it should terminate in a cul-de-sac at the top end to limit traffic of new development on Tylers Green and prevent cut through (KB).
- 43. Object to any widening of Cock Lane other than the section between the two proposed access points to Ashwells field (KB).
- 44. Oppose link between Gomm Valley and Ashwells site. Sites should remain distinct and separate (KB).
- 45. Object to the spine road option, which introduces vehicular pollution to the valley and divides habitats (NR).
- 46. Favour option 1, but await findings of Wyc. Transport Study. Possible bus and pedestrian only route (MC).
- 47. Would prefer to see a new spine road. The single track section of Cock Lane should remain unwidened (RW).
- 48. Encouraged by developers position that a N/S road though the site could act as main traffic thoroughfare by passing the southern end of Cock Lane (CW).
- 49. Cock Lane should not be widened to accommodate buses or pavements (MG).
- 50. Any spine road should not connect to Ashwells (MG).
- 51. Heartened that it has been recognised that Ashwells requires an additional access point (PH).
- 52. Ashwells has a strong preference to remain as a cul-de-sac, albeit enlarged (possibly doubled). Possibly bollards to prevent all but emergency vehicles (image provided) (PH).
- 53. Concern over location of additional access to Ashwells (PH):
  - a. Too close to existing access.
  - b. Road very close to properties in Ashwells.
  - c. Entrance too close to existing pumping station.
  - d. Road would run through the middle of a field.Advise access is located further south. Nearer to mobile phone mast (PH & GK).
- 54. Object to the widening of Cock Lane (PH)
  - a. Cock Lane regulates traffic using Tylers Green
  - b. Serves to sever Tylers Green from High Wycombe.
  - c. Safety of TG middle School.
  - d. Widening Cock Lane would lead to loss of hedgerow.
  - e. Any extended spine road would divide green infrastructure link.Preference for spine road to terminate at plot 6. There should be no link to the Ashwells site. Cock Lane should be widened only in sections to increase the number of passing spaces.
- 55. There should be no through route through the valley. Parcel 7 should be omitted and any access road should terminate at parcel 6 (DW).
- 56. Does not rule out a road through valley exiting at Gomm Road, but would need more detailed plans and assurances regarding size, speed and impact on wildlife.

### **Should there be a vehicular link between parcels 1 and 2?**

57. No objection to the link between parcels 1 & 2, but concerned about the potential for additional congestion on Hammersley Lane (KB).
58. Access to plot 1 on a very difficult bend, which may become particularly treacherous in poor weather (KB).
59. Object to the link road, which passes directly through a local wildlife site (NR).
60. No link between parcels 1 & 2 (MC).

### **Any other feedback welcome?**

61. Would prefer Gomm Valley to be retained as a natural environment. Country park indicates traffic and parking issues (KB).
62. No parking to access undeveloped land at Ashwells (KB).
63. Possibility for light and noise pollution for Sandpit residents (KB).
64. Development at Ashwells should have no street lighting (KB & MG).
65. Significance of priority habitat (KB)?
66. The consultation feedback period is too short (MG).
67. Timetable too short (IF).

### **Infrastructure?**

68. Keen to see shops, doctors and social housing in both areas (KB).
69. Surprised to hear about need for more tennis courts in Tylers Green as the Sports and Social club has a number of courts (KB).
70. Topography appears unsuitable for bowling, but reserve judgement until more information is known (KB).
71. Concerns that teenagers would congregate at any facilities provided (KB).
72. Formal open space has the potential to attract additional visitors and therefore traffic (KB).
73. Lighting of tennis courts etc. has the potential to cause visual intrusion in the landscape (KB).
74. Who will be responsible for community facilities? How will anti-social behaviour be controlled (KB). Open fields and woodland are a natural adventure playground (KB).
75. Existing schools in the area should be enlarged rather than a new school developed at Gomm Valley (TG).
76. Cock Lane and any spine road will result in more traffic? The road would become a shortcut from the A404 to the M40 (TG).
77. Cumulative impact of traffic from Lance Way and all reserve sites needs to be considered (TG).
78. The proposed plans will exacerbate problems on the M40 (MG).
79. Public transport to the site is critical in determining the most appropriate layout (CL).
80. Parcel 3 is preferred site for a school. Needs potential to be extended to two form entry. Needs to be a combined school (CL).
81. The presented plans will greatly exacerbate the existing well documented infrastructure issues. Particularly at junctions with A40 (TG).
82. Unsustained traffic loading onto the London Road (TG).

- 83. Community facility for meeting is required; possible dual use of school (IM).
- 84. Parcel 5 considered to be the most appropriate site for a school as it would be in the middle of the development promoting walking and cycling. Playing field could act as buffer for Cock Lane properties (IM).
- 85. London Road/Gomm Road junction increasingly impacted upon (IM).

### **Ecology**

- 86. Quantum of development will lead to a significant recreational impact, particularly on the SSSI. Particular concern in respect of parcels 1, 2 and 3 (NR).
- 87. 50 metre buffer must be established between development and ancient woodlands, LWS and SSSI (NR).
- 88. Lighting needs to be controlled to limit impact on ecology (NR).
- 89. Intensification of residential use of the site would impact on flora/fauna of importance (NR).
- 90. SUDS systems have the potential to provide ecological habitat (NR).

### **Development Brief:**

- 91. Section 4.11 needs reference to the sites status as a Green Infrastructure network and Biodiversity Opportunity Area (MC).
- 92. Is reference to West Wycombe really relevant (MC).
- 93. Para. 4.4.2 needs to provide more detail on pedestrian links. Ashwells would be an important pedestrian link for those going to TG Middle School (PH).
- 94. There is a stile in the top right corner of Ashwells, which is not referenced on footpath plans (PH).
- 95. Pedestrian access should be located in all corners of the Ashwell development (PH).
- 96. Chairmans name misspelt on page 7 (IF).
- 97. Bank Road and Rays Lane in Tylers Green are not public highways (IF).
- 98. The pond is not at the centre of Tylers Green (IF).
- 99. Fig. 4.1 (GK):
  - a. where it says Tylers Green it should say Hazlemere. Tylers Green is lower down.
  - b. it should say Cock Lane, not Cock Road.
- 100. Para. 4.1.2 (GK):
  - a. Need to refer to Carter Walk in addition to Ashwells and Wheeler Avenue.
- 101. Section 4.2 - due to topography Micklefield is poorly connected to the application site and therefore facilities are unlikely to be accessed. This needs to be reflected/acknowledged in the text (GK).
- 102. Section 4.2.1 – Ashhill school is not 300m from the site. Nearer 1.8 to 2.5km. Marsh School, Beechview and Loudwater combined schools, which cover much of the Gomm Valley site, are not mentioned (GK).
- 103. Section 4.2.2 – more information required. Number of people employed. Vacancy rate etc (GK).
- 104. Section 4.2.3 – Tesco on London Road is not shown. Shops in school road and Kings Ride are more convenient than those in Micklefield. In retail park, M&S foods and Pizza Hut are more relevant than Pets at Home (GK).

105. Section 4.2.6 – where is the nearest doctors or dentists surgery (GK).
106. Section 4.3.1 (GK) –
- i. Mention history of P & TG goes back to 12<sup>th</sup> century with earlier prehistoric finds
  - ii. Conservation Area (see character assessment)
  - iii. P&TG does not coalesce with Hazlemere. Proposed change to abuts.
107. Section 4.3.3. (GK) –
- i. West Wyc. Is irrelevant. Just remove it.
108. Section 4.4.1 (GK) –
- i. Brief should say connections to London Road are restricted.
  - ii. Do not say Cock Lane will become attractive route to A40.
  - iii. At end of Cock Lane section it should say “unless it is just a short (100m) section to provide access lower down the side of the Ashwells site”.
  - iv. Extension of Ashwells ????
  - v. Construction traffic ???
109. Section 4.4.2 (GK)
- i. Pedestrian link to services in Micklefield along CWY/14/1 is considered to be impractical due to topographical constraint
  - ii. Consider link between CWY/14 and 15. Could combine as greenway from Kingswood to Hammersley Lane.
  - iii. Only provision of two bus services is considered to be acceptable.
110. Section 4.5.5 (GK)
- i. Para. 3 (views outside) - Looking north up GV leads to Tylers Green, not High Wycombe.
  - ii. Para.4 (internal views) – should refer to filtered views from footpath CWY/15/1.
  - iii. Consider that the area to the south of parcel 10 should be exchanged for parcel 8, which will be less impactful in views.
111. Section 4.6 – Fig 4.9 does not show (GK):
- i. pumping station at corner of Ashwells land, which is a significant feature.
  - ii. 11kv overhead electrical cable, main transformer and entry point for local power grid.
  - iii. Mobile phone masts not shown.
  - iv. Transmission mast for TV reception required.
112. Section 4.8.3 (GK):
- i. Known find areas should be mapped by ground penetrating radar before any plans are made so as to avoid placing housing development over archaeological sites.

**Questions:**

- 1) How WDC reached their conclusions. Significantly more land is identified than in the 2014 consultation (MC)?
- 2) Please confirm school is only Primary (not secondary)?
- 3) Request for summary of position regarding Wheeler Avenue in terms of pedestrian and/or vehicular access? In particular land ownership?
- 4) Regarding sport and leisure facilities:
  - a. More detail required on outdoor sport and leisure.
  - b. Need adequate parking for any sport/leisure facilities.
  - c. Outdoor sport cannot be located on sloping land.
  - d. Noise pollution.
  - e. Light pollution.
  - f. Security/crime issues.
  - g. Impact on privacy of nearby residents.
- 5) Will footpaths be all weather (PH)?