

Main issues raised in the consultation responses to the Draft Slate Meadow Development Brief and the responses to those issues.

Issue	Response
<p>Principle of Development A number of responses objected to the land being released for development. Some believed the whole of the site is in the Green Belt, others stated that it should never have been released from the Green Belt, some thought it is all a village green or was flood plain and therefore cannot be built on.</p>	<p>The brief's starting point is that the site has been released for development by the Council and its aim is to guide how that development should deal with the constraints and opportunities presented by the site.</p>
<p>Ecology and Landscape</p> <p>General concerns about the lack of detail regarding how existing ecology will be protected and the loss of habitat.</p> <p>Concern that the Village Green should not managed solely for recreation but should retain ecological areas.</p> <p>The SMLG have demanded a screening under the Habitats Regulations be done</p> <p>Concerns over additional pressure on Burnham Beeches due to the development</p> <p>Concern over the lack of clarity regarding the provision of wetland areas</p>	<p>concerns over closing the 'gap' and development close to the gap are dealt with separately below.</p> <p>The brief is clear that the developers are expected to maintain important habitats and provide new and more divers ones, thus providing for a more divers ecology within the site. The habitat that will be lost is low value in ecological terms.</p> <p>This is already one of the requirements of the brief.</p> <p>Given the wildlife concerned there is no requirement for a screening under the Habitats Regulations</p> <p>The development brief seeks to provide a local ecological area with access to it for the public and inform areas for dog walking etc which will actually give a local alternative to Burnham Beeches.</p> <p>The brief has been amended to provide clarity and to make it explicit that there will be semi-permanent and permanent wetland areas.</p>
<p>Flood Risk A number of responses seek that the brief take into account and deal with the flooding that is currently experienced in the wider area.</p>	<p>This is not the purpose of the brief, it does have to make the developers aware of the findings of the S19 report that dealt with the most recent flood event in Bourne End (2014) and the developers have to ensure that</p>

<p>A number of responses claim that the site acts as a sponge an equal number claim that the high water table on the site prevents this.</p> <p>Concern that the brief does not explicitly require mitigation for development in flood zone 2</p> <p>General concerns over the impact of developing the site in terms of flooding and the lack of any solutions set out in the Brief.</p> <p>Concerns over whether the site has been sequentially tested and whether it should have been released for development.</p> <p>Concern over width of buffer to the River Wye</p> <p>Demands that the developers should not be allowed to develop the site if they don't deal with the existing folding issues in the Cores End area.</p>	<p>this is taken into consideration in their flood risk assessment.</p> <p>This goes to show that the local population are unclear as to what the actual situation is. The developers are in the process of taking borehole readings across the site so that their development proposals will be informed by actual data regarding the water table.</p> <p>The brief has been amended to make this explicit</p> <p>The brief has been amended so that it now states that, if possible, the developers are expected to improve the impact of Slate Meadow upon flooding in the local area. Previously the draft only required that the development did not make the situation any worse. The brief deals with fluvial flooding, the application(s) will have to deal with surface and groundwater flooding because the impact upon them is dependent upon the type of development proposed.</p> <p>This is not a matter for the brief the brief deals with how the site should be developed not if it should be. However, amendments have been made to require that a sequential approach is made to development on the site.</p> <p>The brief has been updated to clarify that the 10m buffer is from the top of the bank.</p> <p>The council cannot make a developer undertake work to deal with an existing issue, unless it is specifically set out in a Section 19 report from the Lead Local Flood Authority. There are no such requirements in the 2014 Section 19 report on the Cores End/Bourne End flooding. The developers have however done detailed work which shows how the area floods in a storm event so they can model the impact of such an even upon Slate Meadow. They have made this information available to the Environment Agency.</p>
<p>Open Space Provision</p>	

<p>There were differences of opinion, some want the land managed for play others for ecology, general concern over the developers not ensuring funding will be provided and it won't be managed.</p>	<p>The brief seeks a balance, it does not seek any formal sports provision on the site or any contribution to off-site formal sports provision. It seeks to provide informal open space and controlled access to ecological areas through paths and boardwalks. How these areas of open space will be managed and how that management is paid for is a matter for the application stage.</p>
<p>Building design Most concern over three storey development - requests for more control by the council on the overall height of the buildings. Concern that the Council is not prescribing a style.</p>	<p>The brief has been amended to clarify and restrict the area that 3 storey development can be proposed. The style of development is considered to be a matter for discussion at the application stage and not something that needs to be prescribed through a development brief. However the design of roofs has been clarified and now says 'To ensure that roofs are proportionate and attractive, particularly when viewed from above roofspans should be no greater than 9m with a 45 degree roof pitch. Wider spans may be acceptable at a lower pitch. Complicated or crown roofs should be avoided. Buildings with larger internal area can be achieved through 'T' or 'L' shaped building footprints.'</p>
<p>Building Relationships Some concern over the relationship between the dwellings on Stratford Drive and the new development, in particular with regard to three storey development on the site.</p>	<p>The general concern has already been picked up in the draft brief but the area where three storey buildings could be included has been more clearly defined in the final brief to keep it away from Stratford Drive.</p>
<p>Street Design General misunderstanding of what 'flexible on street parking' means. Concerns over whether there will be parking on the main road due to the development, concerns over the possibility of a lack of on-site parking -</p>	<p>The brief has been updated to clarify the on-street parking requirements. The brief requires that parking is in line with the adopted parking standards plus additional on-street parking to help with school drop off and pick up. There is no proposal for parking on the roads outside the area of the brief. The parking standards allow for on-plot and off plot parking but the layout is a matter for the application stage.</p>
<p>The gap between Bourne End and Wooburn Many respondents consider Slate Meadow to be 'The Gap' and want a gap retained. Some complemented the brief on having retained a separation between the two areas of housing but most wanted the gap to be wider or more central when viewed from Brookbank.</p>	<p>In order to accentuate the feeling of a gap from Brookbank the brief has been amended to show that the building line will be pulled further away from the edge of the developable area along the western side of the developable area. The brief does maintain a clearly defined gap between the proposed</p>

	<p>development and the Bourne End side of the site. At the rear of the site (North East) the gap is maintained in its current form due in part to the desire of the local population to retain the Village Green where it is. While the gap will be reduced when viewed from Brookbank it is there and will be clearly definable, this will be helped by the development being set at least 10 metres back from the river which itself is approximately 10 metres back from the road.</p>
<p>Highways Misunderstanding regarding the 'access' referred to in para 4.7 and the number of units that the access can accommodate.</p> <p>Concerns over traffic speed and narrow pavements on Cores End Road.</p> <p>Questions about whether the width of the road on the bridge is wide enough for the traffic accessing the development.</p> <p>Request for a site traffic management plan</p> <p>Concern over congestion on the Cores End Road-A4094</p> <p>The brief should seek to ensure that the developers undertake work within their TA to highlight improvements to the way the traffic flows along the A4093 and this needs to be more explicit in the brief</p>	<p>Brief amended to make it clear that the access being referred to is that off Stratford Drive and into the site not the Stratford Drive access onto Brookbank.</p> <p>Traffic speeds are a matter for the police. Existing pavements a matter for the highway authority however the brief proposes an alternative route for pedestrians along an improved footpath/cycleway either on or adjacent to the disused railway.</p> <p>This has been checked and is acceptable.</p> <p>Not a matter for the brief but could be required by condition on a planning permission.</p> <p>The road has a capacity and traffic surveys have been updated to see what the current flows are when compared with that capacity and what the impact of the development will be on that. These will form part of the Transport Assessment and are not required for the brief.</p> <p>The brief has been amended to set out the requirements of the Jacobs report.</p>

Demands that the council do something regarding parking on Town End Road, and the lack of parking in Bourne End.	Unlawful parking is a matter for the highway authority and the police. Parking in Bourne End is not a matter for the brief.
General concerns over road safety and impact upon pedestrians particular school children	The brief has been amended to include road crossing improvements from the site across Stratford Drive to the school
Utilities Requests that more information is provided in the brief as to how the utility companies will cope with the proposed developments.	An explanation of this has been added to the Utilities section of the brief to the effect that WDC is not responsible for the utilities, we inform the utility companies of the planned housing numbers and they plan for the utility infrastructure.
Additional questions raised by the Liaison Group	
Development off Frank Lunnon Close reasons why this was not pursued and the impact the removal of development in that area should have on the overall numbers – ie without that area being developed there should be less than 150 units	impact upon gap, access road issues ecology and open space - This is already set out at 2.12.7 so no change required. the number at upto 150 already takes this into account. So no change
Will there be affordable housing for local people	The brief has been amended to clarify that it requires that the developers provide affordable housing in line with government advice, local and national policy and that the housing is carefully integrated into the development.
Concern over potential parking on land allocated as green space	The brief has been updated to require that consideration is given to appropriate means to prevent parking/turning in areas of open space.
Concern over the lack of any mention of doctors	A section on health care provision has been added for clarity.
Other matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> concern over additional pollution due to the development the site should be considered together with other sites proposed in Bourne End through the new Local Plan (NLP). Concern that the council is promoting this site because it will profit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is not in a pollution control zone and therefore there is no additional constraint on developing this site over and above any other site. The development is coming forward before the NLP, the brief has to consider the current position and situation. If further sites come forward as a result of the NLP then they will have to consider the situation at that time which would include any development of Slate Meadow. The council is not promoting the site as a developer and has no

<p>from its development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A parking area should be retained opposite the school to ease congestion at drop off and pick up.	<p>interest in the site apart from the Village Green which is not being moved or developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site will provide more on-street parking than is required for the development alone and this will help ease congestion. Dedicated parking would only encourage more parents to drive and would be an inefficient use of land.
<p>Diagrams Concern over the consistency of the diagrams</p>	<p>All diagrams have been reviewed and legends made consistent. The thumbnail diagrams in section 3 have been updated to better reflect the objectives and these have then been carried through into section 4.</p>