

**TERRIERS FARM  
LIAISON GROUP MEETING**

5 March 2015, 7:00pm

Cabinet Room, WDC Offices, Queen Victoria Road

**Minutes**

	Item	Notes	Action (who)	Completed
1.	Introduction and apologies.	<p>Attendees: Antony Wright, Tony Green, Andy Baldwin, Ian Guy, Brian Swain, Mike Chadwick (MC), Richard Atkinson, David Wainman, Andy Cole, Paula Day, Hugh McCarthy. Also Sarah Nicholson (SN), Rebecca Hart (RH), Riccardo Bobisse (RB). Craig Burden (CB) for part, representing Persimmon and Redrow</p> <p>Apologies: Paul Anderson, John Bland, Charles Power</p>		
2.	Minutes of the last meeting.	<p>Approved unanimously</p> <p>It was requested that the minutes and agendas be emailed as a link or attachment to Liaison Group (LG) members when available.</p>	SN	
3.	Attendance of developer at the Meeting	<p>Craig Burden (CB) (Persimmon but also representing Redrow) requested agreement to attend the meeting. Lengthy discussion Liaison Group members expressed varying views, some expressing the importance of engagement and attendance, by invitation only, particularly in light of likelihood they rather than WDC would be preparing the brief.</p> <p>This sparked a discussion about the preparation of the brief, and SN set out the general process whereby the developer would prepare the draft, which would be viewed in consultation with the LG for amendment or approval, stressing that the brief would not be adopted if Wycombe was not satisfied with the content. MC outlined some benefits of this approach, including primarily the developer funding and resourcing the work, a positive as long as they have taken note of</p>	All to Note	

		<p>the consultation, workshops and feedback from LG. Others stressed the importance of the LG being clear and assertive with the developers</p> <p>Others in the LG were uneasy about early discussion with developers, expressing distrust in the process and the developers, and felt it was too early for their involvement until more is known about numbers, access and layout, which they surely already had some idea about as experienced developers.</p> <p>It was explained by SN that every site is different and that a full understanding of the issues and constraints is required before site planning and layout can proceed. Views were expressed that previous applications on the site, determined at appeal, were not acceptable and should not be used as a starting point. The layout should evolve as work and consultation with the LG proceeds</p> <p>Following further discussion on these points, it was agreed that it would be beneficial for the LG to engage with the developer, by invitation. The majority agreed to invite CB to hear the feedback from the workshop, and sit in for the discussion after.</p>		
4.	<p>Actions Arising from Last Meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Representatives for infrastructure round table.</li> </ul>	<p>It was highlighted that the infrastructure workshop is this Saturday, 7<sup>th</sup> March from 10AM at BNU, and that attendees should register their interest</p> <p>It was agreed by all that Brian Swain and Natasha Howard be put forward for the Infrastructure Round Table.</p>	All To Note	
5.	Feedback from AR Urbanism.	<p>RB presented the workshop results. Most LG members attended workshop. RB outlined background of AR and their role in the process. The presentation and the final report will be published on website.</p> <p>Group findings were presented. It was explained that there was some debate within AR Urbanism whether or not to present the results of group 6, as there was not a shared vision for the site, RB therefore not comfortable presenting a plan which might suggest there was agreement. Views of group 6 were instead</p>		

		<p>presented verbally, including: the need for more than one access point but no on Kingshill Rd, a mix of housing types, tenure and design, including potentially some housing for the elderly. Some debate about developable area, between a smaller but denser area for housing to protect more green space, or larger but more dispersed layout to deliver a better quality living environment. The centre of the site was an area highlighted for potential differences in approach. Issues were raised regarding the importance of existing trees and vegetation, and routes through and around the site was noted, in particular a buffer for Lady's Mile.</p> <p>Overall, very different priorities and responses expressed by the different groups.</p>		
6.	<p>Major Issues Arising from Workshop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access and Connections</li> <li>• Density/new development</li> <li>• Green space protection and expansion</li> <li>• AONB and Ecological issues</li> <li>• Community Services /Facilities</li> </ul>	<p>A query was raised if the demographics of the attendees compromise the result? RB explained that it is always a problem getting young people and young families to attend such events. Some queries about the age profile of the area, with doubt expressed by some if there were a large number of younger people in the area or not. Some felt that significant new development would attract a wider range in respect to age profile.</p> <p>Some felt that the balance between density and green space possibly generated the most disagreement amongst and between groups.</p> <p>There was a query about the Park and Ride, and confirmed that there are no current plans by BCC or WDC to progress this.</p> <p>There was some discussion about the sensitivity of the site, the relationship with the AONB and green spaces and woodland extending through the built-up area of Wycombe. The Fact that it was located between two conservation areas. The importance of open spaces to the community and ecology was stressed. This was felt to demonstrate how sensitive it is and the importance of the relationship with the AONB.</p> <p>Discussion then moved to infrastructure, and particularly schools which were seen as being oversubscribed, and generating a significant amount of traffic in</p>		

the area, an issue which should be taken up by the infrastructure group. Some discussion about the pros and cons of providing additional facilities on-site or elsewhere in the Wycombe area to counteract the 'migration' of children from one area to the other for school, generating traffic. The scope to influence demand for school places through housing type was discussed.

It was felt that homes for elderly people would not create demand for school places or significantly increase traffic, but others felt this was a distraction as there would be a need for a range of housing across the site.

There were some queries about the relationship between elderly accommodation and affordable housing, and if affordable housing would generate financial contributions to contribute to the delivery of infrastructure improvements. The contributions will depend on the mix proposed on the site, and it was pointed out that the political situation is also changing which may impact contributions which may be secured in future.

It was queried if housing mix specifically was dealt with in the workshop? CB explained that Persimmon doesn't normally build elderly accommodation, but that didn't mean it couldn't be provided on site if required.

Concerns about coalescence were noted, as was the diversity of surrounding communities. A view was expressed that this site could bring that all together through appropriate mix of housing and green infrastructure through site.

It was felt that the conservation area and importance of the site to/for ecology might have been overlooked a bit.

A view was also expressed that Terriers House and playing field are outside allocation site, but should form part of site – a query was raised if the council could amend the allocation boundary?

The view was also expressed that the existing buildings on terriers have some character, and an established entrance for the site, two good reasons to keep

		<p>them.</p> <p>In respect to the presentation of the workshop results, it was noted that some subtlety can be lost by trying to summarise the findings and that it is useful to see the information in its raw state.</p> <p>It was also felt by the group that they wanted access to all of the raw material, and that the plan for group 6 should be included in the report, with a note to explain that here was not a consensus on all points.</p>	<p>AR Urbanism to include full workshop findings in report</p>	
7.	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timetable for developers</li> <li>• Date of next meeting</li> <li>• Group site visit</li> </ul>	<p>CB explained that Persimmon have instructed consultants, acoustic engineers, ecologists and arboriculturists who will be visiting the site soon. Once the specialists have confirmed their timescales, a programme could be put forward to progress the site and brief. There will be an interim report from the ecologists following a walkover and first month of recording but no finished report until August, so still some months away from a draft brief.</p> <p><b>Next meeting</b> agreed to be a site visit. CB to check with Persimmon and Redrow in respect to site safety and agreement for group to visit. Regardless can walk public footpaths around the site.</p> <p><b>Meeting to be on site, Thursday April 16<sup>th</sup> at 18:30.</b> LG members are to find their own way there and parking, although walking or car sharing is encouraged. Please meet on the green space on main road outside Terriers House. May visit</p>	<p>CB to follow up with Redrow and Persimmon.</p> <p>All to note</p>	

	pub afterwards.		
--	-----------------	--	--

Agreed 8/9/15