

Main issues raised in the consultation responses to the Draft Terriers Farm Development Brief and the responses to those issues.

| Issue | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>General</p> <p>Concern that the vision is too generic it should be a more comprehensive statement that can be tested and measured.</p> <p>The landscape lead approach that looks to identify, preserve and address key landscape features within a clear landscape framework is supported. However, standard green buffers are questioned on the more sensitive areas and a more specific treatment for such areas is recommended.</p> <p>Some feeling that there should be a focal point for the development.</p> | <p>The vision has been updated so it is more comprehensive.</p> <p>The buffers and their purpose has been reviewed and buffers have been updated accordingly.</p> <p>As an urban extension it is felt that there is little need for a specific focal point the main focus being the overall relationship with the landscape into which the development is being set.</p> |
| <p>Conservation</p> <p>Setting the grade II listed Terriers House should perhaps be mentioned under 4.2 as a constraint</p> | <p>Amended to include</p> |
| <p>The 'historic' Terriers Farmhouse has little historic value and could be recorded and reinterpreted in the new development rather than retained, becoming a constraint upon development</p> | <p>It is a non-designated heritage asset that helps to define the rural character of the area and should be retained</p> |
| <p>Enhancements to the Lady's Mile bridleway should respect its historical significance and ensure it remains a bridleway.</p> | <p>There is no suggestion that it will not remain a bridleway</p> |
| <p>Reference to retaining and protecting any historic landscape features and/or any archaeological finds on the Historic Environment Record should be made.</p> | <p>This would be a matter for the application stage.</p> |
| <p>Terriers Farm Barns have no historic values and their retention would be a constraint on development</p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board requested a number of minor changes to</p> | <p>The brief has been amended to only include the one wooden frame barn and its curtilage as being worthy of retention, it helps to define the rural character of that part of the site, provides context and a focal point.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>draft and its references to the AONB and the relationship between the site and the AONB</p> | <p>The majority of these changes have been incorporated in the final version – some paragraphs have been altered for other reasons and the changes were no longer appropriate.</p> |
| <p>The county archaeological service considered that the background report from BSA Heritage (submitted by the developers) does not include an assessment of the current information held by the Historic Environment Record that the survey was undertaken in 2005 and only covered 40% of the site. They would normally expect the whole area to be surveyed and trial trenching to be undertaken to assess the geophysical survey results. They would expect any application to include an assessment of the current HER information and to undertake further evaluation. As Geophysical does not appear to have been very helpful in this case they would expect to see 4% trial trenching to inform the planning process. If significant finds are recorded these should be taken into account and preserved in situ.</p> | <p>The brief has been updated to take the comments of the County Archaeological service into consideration.</p> |
| <p>Infrastructure & Utilities <i>Health services</i> Figure 4.8 on page 13 confirms the lack of any healthcare facilities in the mapped area No health services shown in the area on the presented plan, and existing health services outside of the shown area are already overstretched.</p> | <p>Noted - Additional provision for school places, healthcare and other social facilities are being made across the Wycombe area in accordance with the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The diagram has been updated to remove reference to healthcare.</p> |
| <p><i>Retail</i> The range of shops in the area is poor and walking to them would be a challenge for anyone. The local Tesco (petrol station) on the Amersham Road is the local convenience store. Approximately 90% of the time the queue has from 3 to 10 people in it and the staff seems to struggle to maintain supplies on the shelves. 500 new homes would worsen this.</p> | <p>Noted – changes made to improve connectivity to Hazlemere crossroads and the shops there.</p> |
| <p>Housing is concentrated to the west end of the site however most useful retail facilities are in Hazlemere to the east.</p> | <p>There are shops at both ends but connectivity for walking and cycling to Hazlemere will be improved – brief updated to clarify this.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><i>Schools</i></p> <p>With the location of the new development there are concerns that the new families moving to the area will take priority on catchment school places.</p> <p>The development puts a strain on schools in the area.</p> <p>The only proposed new school at Gomm Valley is approximately a 3 mile journey on the already congested A40 and it is unlikely children from Terriers will attend this school.</p> <p>The Draft Brief makes no mention at all of the provision of childcare and crèche facilities for Terriers Farm.</p> <p>Question over the clarity of the statement regarding the adequacy of schools in the local area and the overall position within the district. In Para 4.2</p> | <p>Catchment areas are a matter for the County Education Authority (CEA) not this brief.</p> <p>The impact upon schools has been taken into consideration through the Infrastructure Report and the CEA are looking at which primary schools in the local area will need to expand.</p> <p>The Gomm Valley school would not be expected to take children from Terriers it would take children from that area who would have travelled to schools near Terriers so freeing up those places for Terriers children.</p> <p>There is a child care facility at Hezlemere Recreation Ground and other local facilities that provide this service.</p> <p>This has been clarified in the final version</p> |
| <p><i>Utilities</i></p> <p>Dwellings as such cannot be built above or adjacent the large underground gas pipeline that traverses the proposed site.</p> <p>Sewers have already been affected by the density of the properties in Kingshill Grange.</p> | <p>The brief already takes this into account</p> <p>Thames Water will have the opportunity to comment upon any application and to discuss the impact upon the existing sewers with the developers.</p> |
| <p>Landscape and green infrastructure</p> <p>Concern over building on the countryside, the loss of the fields and the loss of places for local people to walk and exercise. Suggestion that we should only build on brownfield sites</p> | <p>The site has been allocated for residential development through the Local Plan and is needed to supply the district's housing requirement. The majority of available brownfield sites in the district have now been built upon.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Considerable concern over building a road across the existing playing fields to the A404 and the potential relocation of facilities onto Grange Farm.</p> <p>There is a suggestion that some of the hedges scheduled for removal may in fact be protected by the terms of the General Enclosure Act of 1845 and the Hughenden allotment awards made in 1855 and 1862</p> <p>A request that the open space is distributed across the site and not all concentrated to the east.</p> <p>Retaining the trees and hedgerows along Kinghill Road would mitigate air and noise pollution from traffic travelling along Kingshill Road and reduce the need for other measures</p> <p>Street lighting in the northern housing area should be low level and not intrude on the night sky within the AONB</p> <p>Questions from the developers about whether they can commute open space off site and the amount of land they have to provide for strategic open space and in lieu of the education provision being at Gomm Valley</p> | <p>The road through the recreation grounds received considerably more adverse comments than that through the woodland and the brief will therefore be amended to show only a footpath through the recreation ground and a road through the woodland.</p> <p>This information has been passed onto the developers for them to take into consideration when working on their proposed layout.</p> <p>The formal sports provision is in the east so that it is accessible from the existing facilities at the Hazlemere Rec. other forms of open space such as play areas and informal open space are spread out across the site. The brief has been altered to show open space on the eastern boundary on the new countryside edge of the development.</p> <p>The brief has been altered to show the retention of trees and hedging on the Kingshill Road past Terriers Farmhouse to retain the feeling of moving from the town to the countryside at that point. The other hedges closer into town can be removed in places to reflect the new urban nature of the area and to help integrate the development into the local area.</p> <p>Brief updated to reflect this</p> <p>The brief has been amended to clarify that the strategic open space is required to be on-site and the amount of land to compensate for the school on Gomm Valley.</p> |
| <p>Wildlife Bats are prevalent in the proposed development area and bat populations cannot be disturbed unless there are exceptional circumstances</p> | <p>Bat surveys would be required at the application stage and any loss of habitat mitigated for within the proposed scheme.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Flooding and drainage</p> <p>Flood prevention depends on there being adequate and regular maintenance of drains and culverts; however this has not been addressed sufficiently</p> <p>Grey water recycling should be required for many of the proposed buildings</p> <p>The developers consider that the area indicated for SuDs is disproportionate to the amount of land required.</p> <p>For point b in TFP 6, the term “naturalistic” is not one which would necessarily be clear or well understood. Suggested wording would be “b. Above ground SuDS design solutions which mimic and reflect the natural drainage processes and are in-keeping with the soft landscape of the development should be used in preference to underground, engineered drainage solutions”</p> <p>Paragraph 6.22 – We would recommend that this paragraph be split into two sentences, “Early consultation with the County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority to address flooding and drainage issues will be essential. The LLFA recommends the preparation of a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy/Statement at pre-application stage.”</p> | <p>The management and maintenance of the sustainable drainage system for the site will be secured through a legal agreement with the developers</p> <p>This is an option as part of the sustainable drainage hierarchy</p> <p>The diagrams are indicative as we don’t know how much storage or infiltration will be possible for the development.</p> <p>The brief has been updated to take its and other comments from the Lead Local Flood Authority into account.</p> <p>Agreed brief updated</p> |
| <p>On and Off-Site Highways matters</p> <p>General concern that the road infrastructure will be unable to cope with this development as roads are already overstretched with traffic and suffer from issues such as noise, pollution and are a risk to pedestrians</p> <p>Concern over all the traffic from the development being forced to access and egress via the Kingshill Road and the impact that will have on the</p> | <p>The infrastructure report did not find that the impact of developing this site would be so severe as to prevent development from taking place. The Brief has been amended to require an access off the Kingshill Road and an Access off the A404. This will help to reduce the potential impact upon the infrastructure at the Terriers mini-roundabouts.</p> <p>The brief has been amended so it now requires a route through the site and an access on both Kingshill Road and on the A404. The general location</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Amersham Hill/Kingshill Road/Totteridge Road mini-roundabouts.</p> <p>Concern that the road through the playing fields to Trinity Road would be congested with parking. that it would result in the loss of the tennis courts and have a detrimental change to the character of the area.</p> <p>Para 5.11 limits the scheme to a single route through the north/south hedgerow the developers felt this is too prescriptive while others including the design review team questioned whether there should be any road through this sensitive green link through the site</p> <p>General concern over the potential for a cycleway that uses Benjamin's Footpath and Green Hill to access Wycombe town centre. Suggestion that it would be more appropriate to have a good cycle way to Hazlemere which is a more level route and therefore likely to get more use.</p> <p>Requests that the council undertake their own traffic surveys so that we can assess the impact of the proposal on up to date figures.</p> <p>Request to make adequate provision for children walking to school</p> <p>A request that the Tower Street access onto Kingshill Road be blocked off to prevent it being used as a rat run.</p> <p>Request to ensure that there is adequate on-street and off street parking</p> | <p>of both access points has been indicated but it would be up to the developers to determine the specific points.</p> <p>This potential access has been discounted to take into account the views of the local population.</p> <p>The single point through the north south hedgerow and GI link is considered to be an appropriate compromise to ensure that the site is connected into the highway network on both the A404 and the Kingshill Road and does not have too great an impact upon the GI network.</p> <p>The brief has been amended to change the emphasis from having cycle connectivity to High Wycombe town centre to ensuring cycle connectivity to Hazlemere crossroads</p> <p>The council has commissioned work to demonstrate that a junction on the A404 through the woodland is possible and this work included traffic surveys</p> <p>The brief has been amended to improve connectivity both to and across the A404.</p> <p>A permeable road network with several potential routes is considered favourable to a reduced network and therefore this request has not been taken forward.</p> <p>The parking requirements for the site have been revisited and clarified within the revisions to the brief.</p> |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>within the site.</p> <p>Request that the site is accessible to public transport.</p> | <p>The brief has been updated to include a requirement that the site is designed to accommodate a bus route through the site.</p> |
| <p>Sense of Place</p> <p>General concern that building new housing estates does nothing for a sense of community and has a negative impact upon the existing community.</p> <p>Specific concern that building on this site will result in the loss of an existing area of green space that is used by the existing population.</p> <p>Equal concern that the draft plan proposes the potential loss of the existing sports facilities – in particular the tennis courts – at Hazlemere Rec.</p> | <p>The brief has been developed with the aim of integrating the new development into the existing community.</p> <p>The actual amount of green space that is managed for and available to the community is actually increased as most of the site is currently private land.</p> <p>The brief has been amended to remove the proposed road through the recreational area and therefore the only potentially small loss would be to improved public footpath links through the recreation area.</p> |
| <p>Concern that Terriers Farm currently forms an important gap between High Wycombe and Hazlemere, that the loss of this gap would be detrimental to the area.</p> <p>The character areas as set out in the draft do not appear to relate well to each other and also don't appear to relate well to the form of development that the those tasked with delivering that part of the site are used to delivering.</p> <p>The character areas are overly prescriptive.</p> | <p>The brief seeks to retain a gap between Hazlemere and Terriers through the positioning of the main areas of open space. It is considered that most of the site is within Terriers and forms an extension to the terriers urban area. The brief seeks to integrate development into the Terriers area and provide a rural edge to Terriers. The brief has been altered to try and better reflect this.</p> <p>The character areas have been reviewed to take this into consideration</p> <p>The have been reviewed and made less prescriptive so they concentrate on the parts of the site that we wish to project a character type.</p> |
| <p>The development should offer a mix of different housing types throughout the area, rather than 'zoning' some areas for affordable housing, flats, retirement housing or executive housing.</p> | <p>The brief seeks to do this</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Concerns that the brief does not include a specific requirement for retirement homes/housing so that local people can stay in the area and move into accommodation that is appropriate for their needs as they grow older</p> | <p>Policy does allow for development to include accommodation suitable for the older generation but the brief is not specifically requiring such forms of development as the sector is already well catered for in the district. The brief will be amended to ensure that a % of the units are built to the lifetimes homes standard as proposed through the New Local Plan.</p> |
| <p>Buildings should be predominantly 1 and 2 storey houses to match those in neighbouring streets some concern over the potential for three storey dwellings fronting onto Kinghill Road which are claimed not to be found in the local area.</p> | <p>The brief seeks to allow for some 2.5 and 3 storey buildings at focal points or on the main street. There are a number of existing three storey buildings in the local area, it is however important that these buildings are well integrated into the overall design. Brief updated to clarify this</p> |
| <p>In design terms the use of concrete would assist in delivering a more contemporary design</p> | <p>This was not ruled out but the brief has been changed for clarity</p> |
| <p>Concerns over the potential for anti-social behaviour</p> | <p>This is not a specific matter for the brief but design against crime is taken into consideration when looking at the layout and structure of the development.</p> |
| <p>Some concern over the density of the development proposed.</p> | <p>We have largely removed reference to density as it is a misleading term open to interpretation.</p> |
| <p>The urban edge will need to allow for extensions in future years</p> | <p>Given that the edge is to the Green Belt and the Chilterns AONB the brief is not contemplating a further extension within the time period for the New Local Plan. No change required.</p> |
| <p>The developers do not consider that the indicative development blocks will make the most efficient use of land and deliver an appropriate number of dwellings</p> | <p>The blocks are indicative and are not to scale as the street network needed to be shown. The appropriate number of dwellings will come out of good design. The Brief does not specify a number.</p> |
| <p>Errors and omissions Section 1 Introduction: Page 4 “The site is dissected by a public right of way”. This should be ‘bisected’ rather than ‘dissected’ Section 2.0: Planning Policy. Should include appropriate references to the design considerations set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. Section 3.0: The Site and Surrounding Area. Figure 3.1 is difficult to interpret and should be amended to include different colours to identify ‘Green Space’, ‘Hazlemere Recreation Ground’ and the ‘Registered</p> | <p>Updated This is not considered to be necessary Agreed the diagrams have been amended to make this clear</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Common Land'</p> <p>Section 4 Key Issues and Site Appraisal: figure 4.3 topography and views. Include illustrative photographs of the views at this point.</p> <p>Section 4.0: Figure 4.3 illustrates views that are not then defined. Moreover, certain of them are not publically accessible. The purpose of this diagram and the relevance of the views should be included.</p> <p>Summary of Constraints Plan: 4.2. "A table of issues and responses has been produced and is available on the webpage." There should be a link to website where issues and responses are documented.</p> <p>Page 18 Section 4.5 – Does this mean to say rooted?</p> <p>Summary of Constraints Plan: figure 4.12 summary of opportunities. Please explain the sun and arrows on this diagram and the opportunity it represents.</p> <p>TFP2 – the developers feel this is too prescriptive and requires the retention of elements (such as various field boundaries) that are likely to conflict with their plans for building on the site.</p> <p>TFP5 - The developers consider that a 15m buffer either side of the north south hedgerow renders a large part of the site undevelopable and is not supported by evidence or justified.</p> <p>Section 6.39 on page 45. Explain the term "place making"</p> | <p>Agreed the views have been removed</p> <p>Agreed the views have been removed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>yes</p> <p>it is the direction that the sun is in in relation to the development – but we have removed it as it is not helpful</p> <p>TFP2 has been reviewed and updated to take the developers concerns into account and provide more clarity as to how 'secondary' hedgerows should be treated.</p> <p>The brief has been updated to ensure that the importance of the north south hedgerow in terms of the GI network is set out and the width of the GI link is justified.</p> <p>The making of a place</p> |
| <p>Pages 46 and 47 are confusing to read because the wrong plans have been used to illustrate the different parts of the scheme with the southern area page showing a plan of the northern area and vice versa.</p> | <p>This has been rectified and the plans have all been updated</p> |
| <p>Why on Figure 4.11 (Summary of Constraints) on page 16 is the Gas Line</p> | <p>Because the gas line is a constraint on development whereas the others are</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>shown but not the water or electricity?</p> <p>Figure 4.8 has a key for healthcare but none shown no shops listed</p> <p>Figure 4.11 difficult to understand and some colours could be altered to help clarify this</p> <p>Figure 4.13: there is a lack of explanation and/or justification for the density figures</p> | <p>not. However for the sake of clarity the diagram has been updated</p> <p>Updated, healthcare removed and local shops added to fig 4.8</p> <p>Agreed and updated</p> <p>The section on character areas has been updated to provide an explanation.</p> |
| <p>Section 6.89 on page 49. The final sentence is incomplete. All text after “In addition...” is missing</p> | <p>This has been rectified and a section on education added to clarify the position</p> |
| <p>Section 6.0: brief for development. Bullets b and c should be more closely linked and bullets e and f need to be reviewed as they appear to conflict with the overall objectives.</p> | <p>This has been updated to reflect the other changes in the brief</p> |
| <p>Other Matters</p> <p>Ensure that the contractors behave responsibly with regard to noise, pollution and sensible working hours 0800 to 1700 Monday to Friday.</p> <p>Requests for a new school, local community centre, post office, a walk in medical clinic or GP surgery and green spaces.</p> <p>Parking provisions should be designed to accommodate all electric charging facilities to promote and encourage environmentally friendly transportation</p> | <p>This would be something for consideration at the application stage. A construction management plan will be required to be submitted with the planning applications and issues such as noise, pollution and nuisance are dealt with by the Council’s Environmental Services section.</p> <p>There will not be a school on site, the brief allocates space for a community facility depending upon local demand this facility could include some of the suggested uses.</p> <p>Electric charging points are referred to in the brief but parking is still based around the adopted parking standards.</p> |