

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Comments

As a resident of Wye Dene who would directly be impacted by the proposed waiting restrictions, I firmly disagree with proposal. I should be able to stop outside my house to bring my children in to the house when it's raining. I should be able to stop to offload my shopping or luggage without being worried about getting a fine. There are so many families on these roads that would agree that a no waiting time proposal would directly impact them in an extremely negative way. I understand the need to find a solution but I think this proposal will be to the detriment of the people who live on the estate. Surely the needs of the residents should come first. How does this benefit any resident on Wye Dene? Please consider this as my objection to the proposal.

As a resident of the Wye Dene development I would like to raise a number of comments and objections to the above proposed amendment.

(1) Timing of consultation: it appears the consultation is due to run from 22nd November (a future date?) through to 15th December despite some of the listed documentation being dated back to September. I do not believe this is an adequate period of time to consult in any meaningful way with a development that contains over 500 dwellings. In addition, we are entering a period of Purdah with regards to the general election meaning that those of us who feel strongly about this issue (as many do) are unable to engage our local representatives. A rushed consultation during a general election may be construed by some to be somewhat disingenuous.

(2) The documentation uploaded appears to be incomplete with many dates missing? Again, possibly signalling a rushed exercise.

(3) The Statement of Reason Document outlines the purpose of these changes as :- 1. For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising 2. For facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians). I entirely agree with this aim, however there are some large sections of the named roads where there are not any 'no waiting' restrictions proposed (First part of Sierra Road, Chequers Avenue, and part of Genoa Way end of Sierra Road). The danger to persons or other traffic is just as serious for residents cars accessing or leaving their driveways (parked cars = dangerous blind spots) on these sections of roads as all others. I would prefer to see no waiting across all sections of all roads.

This consultation also does not mention or take into account the current speed bumps which were introduced to Sierra Road and Genoa Way earlier this year by Berkeley Homes in response to escalating residents concerns around the volume and speed of non residential traffic using Sierra Road as a cut through when the road was opened up to be a through road in late 2017. At the time we tried to engage the council in supporting this but did not get any support being told there would be no funding available for council funded speed bumps. I am now being informed by Ian Sharp that separate to this consultation on parking, the current speed bumps installed by Berkeley Homes will be removed once the roads are adopted. This is of SERIOUS concern. Please see the email correspondence below with reference to this.

To suggest that the few areas of the development with no proposed parking restrictions (as above) will somehow mitigate the removal of the speed bumps because additional parked cars will slow people down is ludicrous. If the council were genuinely concerned with 'avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising ...(and so on)' you would surely also be engaging in a meaningful consultation around adequate traffic calming measures post adoption, not fobbing off residents with such ridiculous suggestions? The volume of traffic is only likely to continue to increase with the construction of the Abbey Barn Lane development, we simply cannot go back to a situation post adoption where the only suitable 'traffic calming' measures are

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Continued:

deemed to be sporadic parked cars, by the council official responsible for road adoption.

As has also already been pointed out to me by Ian Sharp, we are in a period of Purdah meaning any route to garner political interest or influence are not open to us, however rest assured this wider issue around speed bumps removal is not going to go away.

In summary - I object to the proposals on the basis the consultation period should be extended to enable a more meaningful and less rushed consultation, and on the basis of the large areas of the proposed adopted roads where not parking restrictions will be in place. Furthermore I believe the council should be taking a holistic approach to road adoption as an opportunity to genuinely safeguard residents and should therefore engage in a proper discussion around traffic calming before the roads are adopted.

I am writing to respond to the above consultation. The plan to remove the speed bumps installed by Berkeley Homes will be a huge step back for road safety. The average speed of cars driving through the development has considerably reduced since the bumps were installed. As a parent of two young children I am extremely concerned about this. I saw a number of near miss incidents before the bumps were installed and I think the decision to remove them (or not replace them with appropriate bumps for an adopted road) will result in a serious accident.

we have a disabled child and currently we have a disabled badge which allows us to park on the road (chequers Avenue) which allows us to have access to car to put equipment into car as the space that we are given does not allow room for access. Hallmark have said that we can park our car on the road. Will there be disabled spaces put in place for us?

Whilst I welcome these restrictions, I do not think that they go far enough and should be extended along the whole length of Chequers Avenue, with parking/waiting allowed only in residents' parking areas and marked visitor bays.

Under the current proposal, waiting will be allowed along the majority of Chequers Avenue and due to the positioning of visitor bays, entrance to parking areas and driveways, this will result in staggered parking along both sides of the road, resulting in some areas where it will be difficult for larger vehicles to get through, including ambulances, fire engines & rubbish collection lorries as well as the bus once the bus route commences. Parking in the road will also impede residents view of approaching traffic making it dangerous when reversing off driveways or exiting from the parking areas and in some cases, inconsiderate parking could block access altogether.

Additionally, it will make it more difficult and potentially dangerous for residents crossing the road as the ability to see approaching traffic will be severely compromised. This is of particular concern as Chequers Avenue is used as a pedestrian route by many parents with young children to get to and from the Marsh Infant and Nursery School from London Road. I suspect that some cars will also park partly or wholly on the pavement (as is currently the case at the retail park end of Chequers Avenue and occasionally now along other parts of Chequers Avenue). Where insufficient room is left for pedestrians to get by, particularly those with pushchairs, this will force them to walk in the road.

Where vehicles are parked near the exit to the roundabout at the DFS end of Chequers Avenue (on both Chequers Avenue and Sierra Road), this also presents a hazard for vehicles exiting or approaching the roundabout as visibility is restricted and when exiting the roundabout you are forced to drive on the opposite side of the road and often cannot see if a vehicle is approaching until the last moment. At the very least, the waiting restriction should be extended for a fair distance

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Continued:

along Chequers Avenue and Sierra Road to prevent vehicles parking near the roundabout. Finally, I see that no stopping at any time except for buses is being proposed at the bus stops either side of the bus gate on Chequers Avenue, however, no such restriction is being proposed at the DFS end of Chequers Avenue where the other two bus stops are located. I would suggest that the same restriction should also apply to here.

I am a member of the Wye Dene Steering Group, who are bitterly opposed to the proposed adoption.

Your proposals are a threat to the livelihood, enjoyment of living in Wye Dene and the creation of a much busier rat run, which will bring additional pollution, nuisance, misery and dangerous speeding in what is a residential area. Your suggestion that parking restrictions proposed will mean that cars will have to weave in and out, thus slowing traffic, is nothing short of ludicrous.

Just because traffic on the London road is so appalling, Sierra Road has already become a rat run and the new Abbey Barns development will bring further chaos to this residential area. Berkeley Homes were coy and evasive when selling these houses and many potential buyers were assured that Sierra Road would never become a rat run and that barriers to prevent speeding would be installed. We persuaded them, after some years of complaining when nothing had been done, to install speed bumps which you now say are unnecessary once the road is adopted.

We absolutely must have some method of curtailing speeding similar to what you have installed on many roads around High Wycombe. The roads you are planning to adopt were paid for by the residents, as houses were built. When you see the appalling state of so many roads around the town it is very worrying that any deterioration of the road surface in Wye Dene will not be addressed by the Transport Authority. Furthermore, we are concerned that this rat run will have a negative impact on the value of our houses. Rest assured, in that event, action might well be taken to claim from the council, in a class action to recover any losses.

You will, no doubt receive many similar complaints from residents who despair at the lack of thoughtfulness from our council, to whom we pay significant monies through council rates.

My understanding is that the 'no waiting' restriction applies to the red shaded areas on map AF72 and in areas without red shading there will be a parking free for all.

There should be more 'no waiting/parking' restrictions on Chequers Avenue and perhaps other areas.

The reasons for this are:

- Historically there has been no parking and this has worked well
- When residents were asked to vote on a parking scheme a 'no parking' rule was selected
- Based on periods in the past when there were no restrictions/restrictions were not enforced many people park inconsiderately and dangerously (for example blocking the view of drivers leaving parking areas)
- Parking anywhere in Chequers Avenue will impede the bus travelling on the planned bus route

I would also like to state that the bus gate must be fully enforced to prevent Chequers Avenue becoming a 'rat-run'.

I thought I ought to write to you as I am very concerned about the proposed changes to the parking and traffic calming measures on the Wye Dene development. As a resident here I am very aware of the safety issues that may arise from the proposed changes - if parking is completely unrestricted in some areas of the estate

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Continued:

(e.g. not just confined to parking bays) cars may park in un-allocated slots along the road potentially blocking access to ambulances and emergency vehicles as the road will be too narrow for these to pass through.

Unrestricted parking may also make it more dangerous for cars to pull out of car barns/driveways as there will be reduced visibility if cars are allowed to park anywhere (driveways/access to car barns may also potentially be blocked).

Please note that I say this despite being a resident who struggles to find parking with the current number of allocated bays. Safety is more important.

Furthermore, the removal of speed bumps will encourage the dangerously fast speeds that some vehicles using the estate as a cut through for London road used to use.

As a secondary point removal of any parking restrictions may actually make it harder for residents to park on the estate as anyone using the retail park etc to park here in allocated bays.

As a tertiary, and much less important, point the aesthetics of the development will be completely changed from what they are currently and one of the reasons that attracted me to live here in the first point which is really disappointing.

I look forward to hearing of the outcome of the consultation and welcome proposed changes to keep traffic calming measures (eg speed bumps) and parking to parking bays only.

I am writing to you in regards to the above public consultation (Wye Dene Area of High Wycombe - Waiting Restrictions (Amendment 1039)), and to raise some objections to the proposal.

I understand the implementation of this proposal, is the first step towards adoption of Wye Dene Roads (Sierra Avenue, Chequers Avenue and Genoa Avenue). I also assume that introduction of a 'No waiting at any time' means that other parking restrictions currently enforced will be lifted. This has been confirmed in writing by Ian Sharp on the 18th November in an email to Wye Dene resident Sharon Murray.

My concerns on the above are thus:

- Traffic calming measures currently in place will be removed. For background, Wye Dene residents (many of whom are families with young children) complained of traffic speeding through the estate, with resulting collisions putting the lives of pedestrians and other road users in danger. There are a number of blind corners on the estate, and this is a real concern for those who live in the area. Speed bumps were implemented after consultation with the residents on the Wye Dene estate, and have had a positive effect on traffic moving through the estate.

The most effective traffic calming measures for reducing vehicle speeds involve vertical shifts in the carriageway such as road humps, plateau and cushions. These measures are very dependent upon spacing for their effectiveness. At a spacing of 40-60m, 85 percentile speeds of less than 30kph may be achieved.

8.2 Other measures may be used in supporting roles such as road narrowing, chicanes, islands etc., however, these measures are less effective in reducing speeds when used in isolation.

8.3 Studies have shown that traffic calming can reduce accident levels by up to 40%, and have a significant impact on reducing the severity of accidents. Air pollution can also be reduced, although detailed information on this is limited.

Leeds University Traffic Calming Review

http://www.its.leeds.ac.uk/projects/primavera/p_calming.html

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Continued:

- When asked for more information on the consultation, your colleague Ian Sharp in aforementioned email (18th November 15:53) stated that "if you look at the plans there will be more parking allowed on the carriageway, which will mean that any cars coming through will need to weave in and out reducing speeds".
- Psychological traffic calming has proven to have less of an impact on speed when used in isolation. They should be used in conjunction with other calming measures such as speed limits and speed bumps.

"For example, frequent junctions, the presence of parked cars, and interventions that encourage increased levels of pedestrian and cyclist activity might reduce vehicle speeds. However, this type of intervention should not be used purely as a traffic calming measure. For example, if driving speeds are not sufficiently reduced, these interventions might actually decrease safety because of the additional hazards that accompany them and because of the extra demands they place on the driver"

Road design measures to reduce drivers' speed via 'psychological' processes: A literature review. Prepared for Charging and Local Transport Division, Department for Transport M A Elliott, V A McColl and J V Kennedy

<https://trl.co.uk/sites/default/files/TRL564.pdf> (P.5)

"The speed policy review recognised road humps, chicanes and other road engineering measures as currently the most effective method of reducing vehicle speeds in urban (and some rural) areas."

Department of Transport

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/329454/ltn-1-07_Traffic-calming.pdf (P.8 Section 1.1.8)

- Although additional cars parked in road will ease parking congestion for residents, it will make the roads dangerous to travel through. It has been raised many times to Hallmark/Berkeley Homes and MTVH that there is an inadequate amount of parking on the estate for the number of residents. It should not be underestimated how many cars will attempt to park on the road, when restrictions are lifted. Resulting narrowing of streets will exacerbate the hazards of the several blind corners on the estate, and reduced speed limits will need to be implemented and enforced to reduce the impact.
- Additional traffic caused by other developments in town (Aldi/B&Q, Bassetsbury Lane, Abbey Barn Lane, Lidl/Homebase) has congested London Road/A40. This means that cars will be more likely to use Wye Dene as a rat run, thereby increasing traffic, and making the roads more dangerous for road users and pedestrians.
- Removing parking restrictions encourages drivers to park on pavements, thereby making pavements inaccessible to pedestrians, especially those with prams/pushchairs or those with accessibility considerations (wheelchairs, visually impaired etc).
- Adoption of the Wye Dene estate by the Council, implies that proposed bus services will be implemented. There is a concern that buses will be unable to traverse the narrow roads when restrictions are lifted, as more cars will be parked on the roads.
- Unless this "No waiting at any time" restrictions are strictly enforced, cars will ignore any parking restrictions in place, increasing congestion for residents.
- Wye Dene is located close to local businesses, schools, woodland, and soon to be bus routes. Lifting restrictions will encourage non residents to use parking, (especially now there are parking restrictions in place at DFS and Wycombe Marsh Retail Park), again increasing the amount of cars parked in the estate and resulting in increased congestion and hazards.

The main concern I have on this proposal is that it assumes that everyone is a considerate, careful driver and keeper, which is simply not the case. Responsible road planning should account for 'real world' considerations.

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment on your proposals for parking controls in the Wye Dene area. I have studied the documents that contain your proposals and I write to express my objections to the proposals on transport and environmental grounds. My concerns relate specifically to the purposes of designation and the likely environmental impacts of the proposals which I explain more fully below:

Purpose of designation

This is specified as:

1. For avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising
2. For facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians)

It is a matter of concern that no evidence is presented to justify these concerns. Having lived on Sierra Road for 3 years now, I am not aware of any KSI incidents having occurred that would clearly justify such significant action. Moreover, if the concern is about safety for road users, I would have thought a more appropriate remedy would be the installation of an area wide scheme of speed control measures. Properly conceived and delivered, such a scheme could offer real and sustainable safety and environmental benefits for residents, wildlife and leisure users of the amenity corridor that passes through the estate.

These proposals, together with the planned removal of the existing traffic calming measures following adoption of these roadways, are more likely to result in an increase in traffic speeds and volumes which, more likely, would be prejudicial to highway safety. This would be contrary to the expressed intentions of the scheme. Officers will be fully aware of the causal link between traffic speeds and highway safety, particularly for vulnerable road users like children, the elderly and those with mobility impairment. The safety of domestic pets and wildlife would also be compromised.

In providing the roads on the estate it is clear that one of the key objectives agreed by the Local Planning Authority and the developers was for a road network that served the development whilst at the same time discouraging through-traffic. These proposals run entirely contrary to that objective.

Environmental impacts

The increase in traffic volumes and speeds that these proposals would cause increases in traffic noise, vibration and emissions that would be prejudicial to the amenities of residents and users of the amenity space within the Back Stream corridor. At a strategic and policy level, this would be contrary to POLICY CP10 – GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT of the newly adopted Local Plan as well as the Water Framework Directive (WFD) requirements as set out in the Thames River Basin Management Plan (RBMP). The Water Framework Directive is a key directive that seeks to protect and improve the quality of water. Its overarching aim is to prevent deterioration in the status of water bodies and to achieve 'good status' for rivers, lakes and groundwater by no later than 2027.

Specifically, this includes:

- Protecting all forms of water (inland, surface, transitional, coastal and ground);
- Restoring the ecosystems in and around these bodies of water;
- Reducing pollution in water bodies; and
- Ensuring sustainable water usage.

This is a significant obligation falling on the local and county council equally that should be given full consideration in all decisions affecting the environment of relevant area.

At the local and detail level, the signs and lines associated with the disjointed areas of control proposed would themselves have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the areas: Assuming two signposts for each area of control to mark the start and finish of regulation, there would be more than 50 signs and posts in or adjacent to the Back Stream corridor. This would be in addition to the existing plethora of signage which will generally need to be retained to control

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Continued:

parking in the non-adopted areas. This proliferation of 'street furniture' in an area of high landscape and amenity value would fundamentally change the appearance of the area benefitting only those wishing to pass speedily through the area at the expense of residents and leisure users.

Conclusion

Whilst I appreciate that the objective of controlling parking is a worthy one, this is only justified where there is a clear problem that must be urgently addressed. This simple first step does not appear to have happened in this instance resulting in proposals of dubious value in relation to parking control. Moreover, there would be significant adverse effects in terms of traffic volumes and speeds which would have an adverse effect on the amenities of local residents. There would also be an adverse effect on the environmental quality of the area contrary to local and strategic planning policy. For these reasons, the proposed scheme of parking controls should not be progressed.

I am responding to this Consultation as a concerned resident of the Wye Dene Development.

I am raising a number of comments/concerns/objections to the proposed order as follows:

- The timing of this consultation is particularly poor due to it clashing with the General Election and as such creating accessibility issues with important individuals running for election.
- Whilst I understand that it is not a responsibility of this process, I still feel that some of the proposed changes to waiting restrictions will significantly reduce safety on the development when combined with other elements of the road adoption process that is also in motion, in particular the removal of the current 'temporary' speed humps on some of the impacted roads.
- Based on our experience prior to getting the temporary speed humps laid and when parking restrictions were not being enforced, Sierra Road will once again become a speed track for the significant amount of rat-run traffic trying to bypass the traffic on the A40 London Road in the quickest way possible. This is a residential area with many small children and limited footpaths, with the speeds that this type of traffic employs being very worrying. On their own, the addition/removal of parking restrictions that are being proposed along all sections of Sierra Road simply won't control vehicle speed, as was previously experienced.
- Allowing on-road parking along Sierra Road as it runs alongside the old railway line embankment, whilst removing the enforcement of the existing covenant regarding parking of commercial vehicles, will result in potential access issues for emergency vehicles. This will also apply to the section of Sierra Road running between 82 Sierra Road and Genoa Way.
- Similarly, allowing on-road parking along Sierra Road between the fountain roundabout and the backstream bridge, will result in an almost certain collision involving residents vehicles trying to leave/enter their now blinded driveways.
- Considering the three proposed new developments on Abbey Barn Lane, the volume of additional traffic trying to use Wye Dene as a rat-run to/from Wycombe town centre is going to be significant and needs to be taken into account during this process.
- It is already common for speeding vehicles to drive the wrong way around the fountain roundabout at the junction of Sierra Road and Chequers Ave, in an attempt to overtake slower moving vehicles. Introducing on-road parking on the approach to the roundabout from both roads and thus reducing visibility, will inevitably result in an accident happening sooner rather than later, with a head on collision being most likely.

I would propose that (at a minimum) an additional "no waiting" zone be added to the T-junction on Carolina drive. As one of the residents of Carolina Drive, we've

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Continued:

had issues in the past with people parking on the junction as there is a little inlay there. The reason for that inlay is because the corner is very tight and the road very narrow. If cars are parked there, even medium-sized vehicles can be unable to get out of Carolina Drive at all.

However, I would recommend that the entire section from Sierra Road to the junction (i.e. the bit parallel to Froxfield Way) be marked as "no waiting" because the road is a single lane with no room for cars to pass each-other. A parked car could prevent any of us going to work, let alone completely blocking service vehicles. You will see this when you come to measure the roads though.

I would also recommend that some sort of traffic calming measures be implemented on the "rat run" through the estate as prior to the speed bumps we had documented reports of people doing up to 50mph down Sierra Road. There are children that play on the grassy areas around the estate and vehicles travelling at those speeds are a recipe for unpleasantness. I do not place any faith in non-residents adhering to the speed limit, nor that the addition of parked cars will suddenly make them reconsider their speeds. The developers thought that the road geometry (with its tight, single lane corners) would do this and it seems there is no lower limit to human recklessness when it comes to shaving a few seconds off their journey to work time. I suggest you do not make the same mistake (especially as I know I won't be the only resident saying this and we wouldn't want the council to be liable if/when the inevitable happens).

I have a number of concerns regarding the proposed changes to the parking on the Wye Dene development. My concerns are as follows:

1. Unrestricted parking on Chequers Avenue - according to the plans, a large part of Chequers Avenue will have "unrestricted parking", yet by the large and more populated apartment blocks, there will be double yellow lines. I have concerns that the number of parked vehicles on Chequers Avenue will significantly increase due to the number of both house and apartment dwellers parking there. I would suggest permits being provided to households to limit the volume of possible vehicles whilst still allowing an increase in parking spaces for all.
2. No monitoring of visitor bays - these bays are often abused by individuals as their personal space. I am concerned that if not monitored and restrictions made / enforced, that this will only worsen.
3. Speed bumps - these have been a god send since their introduction as it has significantly helped to reduce speed and volume of traffic using Sierra Road as a rat run. I have concerns that removing the current bumps and not replacing them with anything will cause significant issues.

Restrictions

- Please place "No Waiting At Any Time" restrictions for the entire Sierra Road, Chequers Avenue, and Genoa Way except Visitor Bay. This would avoid any confusion among road users and residents.

- Please allow only vehicles that have been issued with Parking Permits to park in Visitor Bay.

Parking

- Please issue Parking Permits to residents who live in Wye Dene to park in Visitor Bay.

Speed Bumps

- Please do not remove the calming measures that have been installed around the estate.

I would like express my personal appreciation of transparent consultation process and express my concerns about the proposed change affecting Chequers Avenue (Area Code AF72):

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Continued:

1. As far as I understand the proposal, all visitor bays at the Chequers Avenue will be no longer monitored. When we moved to the property upon development completion the entire area was full of parked cars from people who did not reside in the area and who used visitor bays as a free parking place. I would recommend retaining the restrictions that only residents and their guests are allowed to use visitor parking spaces. Could you please consider retaining restrictions around continuous parking to prevent visitor bays to be used as a permanent parking or keeping abandoned cars.
2. The traffic through the estate is continuously growing with drivers avoiding congestion on A40 with many drivers not respecting the speed limit at the estate even with speed bumps (recently installed). This creates significant safety exposure to residents including children. I would recommend retaining speed bumps and possibly introducing new speed control measures (speed cameras) to prevent tragedy to happen on estate's roads (Chequers Avenue & Sierra Road).

The proposals look good in general but we think the visitor spaces on the adopted roads should be monitored to prevent their use by non residents.

Please could we have some additional double yellow lines on Chequers Avenue:-

1. Round the entrance to the Noble House car park – to make access easier for emergency, recycling and delivery vehicles.
2. In front of the pedestrian entrance to Noble House from the visitor bay to the end of the cobbled strip – this would make access easier for pedestrians and vehicle deliveries to Noble House. It would also make access to and egress from our drive easier on what is a very narrow road.
3. From Portland Road to the end of our drive at 66 Chequers Avenue on the side opposite the existing 3 visitor spaces. – this would prevent pavement parking and make access for emergency and recycling vehicles easier and would ensure space for the proposed bus service. When we moved in in 2013, Chequers Avenue parking was unrestricted and vehicles were parked on both sides of the road and the pavement blocking emergency and recycling vehicles and forcing pedestrians into the road.

1. It is my opinion that the whole of Chequers Avenue should be double yellow lines so as to restrict parking to visitor bays only! If parking is allowed on the highway, I fail to see how the proposed bus route (which none of us want) through Chequers Avenue would flow smoothly. Similarly, I think that if unrestricted parking is allowed, emergency service, refuse and delivery vehicles would also face serious problems in getting through.
2. If unrestricted parking is allowed this would also cause problems and blind spots for residents emerging onto the road from their driveways or car barns.
3. In addition to this, there are legally enforceable covenants that we residents who purchased property on the Wye Dene estate signed up for! One of the covenants prohibits the parking of commercial vehicles anywhere on the estate at any time, and thus if unrestricted parking is allowed on any of the adopted roads and commercial vehicles park there they would be a breach of the covenant, which you would be aiding and abetting by allowing this to happen!
4. Another concern I have once the roads are adopted is that the existing traffic calming measures will be removed.

A) Why?

B) What traffic calming measures are you proposing to put in place to prevent through traffic speeding through the development? In the case of Sierra Road, which is already being used as a rat run by traffic to avoid congestion on the London road and this will only get worse when the new Abbey Barn Road development opens in the near future and there is even greater volume of traffic! It is an accident waiting to happen on some of the narrow bends in the road.

To suggest that traffic calming will naturally occur when vehicles are parked there is ridiculous, as it does not take into account times when vehicles are not parked and thus through traffic can avoid slowing down as it currently has to with the existing traffic calming measures. There have been several cases of pets being run

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Continued:

over by cars speeding through the development and it is only a matter of time before a child is also at risk of being hit by a speeding car, this is why Berkeley Homes were agreeable to installing the current speed ramps. Please take these concerns seriously before a tragedy occurs!!

When we moved into our House in Wye Dene Estate, Berkeley Homes [BH] assured us that the Visitors Parking Bays will be for the benefit of the residents. BH also assured us that no commercial vehicles will be allowed to park in these bays. Parking is a struggle as the number of cars exceed the number of spaces. Two years ago a residents parking permit scheme was introduced. The scheme allows to park in the V_bays with a permit from 8 am to 8 pm during the weekdays and free for all on weekends. The scheme has worked well.

Previously people could park at DFS or the retail Park. Now both sites have introduced cameras and restricted parking during daytime. Night time parking at the Retail Park has been banned. So this complicated the parking issues.

I have problem in parking when my two children & their families are visiting us from outside of High Wycombe.

Please, please leave the parking bays for the residents only and not open to outsiders. I can see people leaving their cars and travelling to rail station by bus and the onward to London etc. With unrestricted access, people may leave their cars for a whole week thus denying access to the residents.

My request to the Council is, that after the Roads are adopted by the Council, the Parking Bays should be left for the use by residents only, based on either the existing parking scheme or the new scheme introduced.

This has been discussed at the Residents Steering Committee, on several occasions. The members of the Steering Committee are also of the opinion that the visitors bays should be for use by the residents only and not the outsiders.

Please do not deny the residents of the available Parking Bays. Let the residents keep use of the bays.

We are a terraced house with access to the car barn at the side and towards the rear of our property.

1. If parking is allowed on both sides of Chequers Avenue this will turn the road into a slalom course and make driving up the narrow road very dangerous for everyone on the road, pedestrians, cyclists and drivers. Combined with no speed restrictions the increased parked cars will not cause drivers to slow down and houses are situated very close to the pathways and the road. We have also had incidents of mopeds and cars speeding down the road as they believe there is no deterrent and they are off the main London Road. Please see photo 851 which shows an ambulance passing a parked car in the road, there is only just room to pass safely without weaving between other cars. We request you come out to measure the road and see where cars will try to park. If the road cannot be covered by the current parking company as they will be adopted, we would like to see double yellow lines on one side of Chequers Avenue from roundabout to the bus bollard.
2. Can you make clear that parking should be within a safe distance to driveways? See photos 852 and 854. Outside of our house and next to our shared driveway there is a small gap. Any car which parks here, from experience, makes it very difficult for us to turn into and out of the driveway. Each driveway along Chequers Avenue is used up to 10 cars as they lead to car barns for 5 houses. Therefore, one car blocking the driveway is affecting up to 10 people. Could a yellow box or white line be painted in front of driveways to deter people blocking them? Or yellow lines put in further key places where parking a car would impact driveways?
3. What provision can be made for tradespeople with large vans which need to park outside of houses which have waiting restrictions? This is due to there being no visitor parking spaces available, and the vans are too tall to park in car barns.

Other points to be saved:

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Continued:

1. When the road is adopted, we must not allow Chequers Avenue to become a cut through for London Road traffic. Where the bus bollard was installed and which has never worked, we cannot allow this to be opened up without the bollard being in full working order, or for it to be removed and a permanent bollard put in place, should there be no bus route. There is no need for a bus to run down Chequers Avenue adding traffic, congestion and pollution to a school route for parents and residential area. It is a very short walk to London Road which is well served by local buses.

2. We understand that some residents are asking for curbs to be dropped to allow them to turn part of their front garden into car parking. This cannot be allowed as there is a covenant on the properties disallowing such changes in order to keep the look and feel of the development in keeping with the ethos we signed up to on purchasing on this site. Not to mention the impact on pollution to houses when cars are left running very close to houses.

I write to you to submit my objection to the waiting restrictions (amendment 1039) proposed for the Wye Dene estate. I particularly object to the proposals which restrict parking for most of the estate but allow unrestricted parking to part of Chequers Avenue.

As you may know the Wye Dene development currently has parking restrictions, which confine parking to marked bays only. This is enforced by a private parking contractor. Those restrictions were part of the original planning application which is understood to have followed the now common approach of encouraging a restriction of the number of vehicles in any new development. That makes sense for many practical and environmental reasons. Those restrictions were then encapsulated within the covenants of leases, which restrict the number of vehicles for each household to the number of allocated parking spaces – usually one or two.

The approach towards the adoption of the roads appears to have deviated from both the original planning approval and will put persons in conflict of their leases. It is noted from the maps provided with the consultation that there are proposed 'no waiting at any time' restrictions proposed for the majority of the development apart from parts of Chequers Avenue and Sierra Road.

I live in a freehold property (63 Chequers Avenue) where you are proposing to allow unrestricted parking. I object to this in the strongest terms.

The only solution which I can think of which is appropriate is to apply the 'no waiting at any time' restriction to Chequers Avenue in its entirety (specifically that area of Chequers Avenue in Map marked 'AF72').

My reasoning is set out below;

1. Prior to the implementation of the privately enforced parking restrictions, there was universally applied poor parking practices. This included:

- parking over footpaths,
- parking on both sides of the road and restricting the road width to that barely larger than the small hatchback we own. It was extremely common, particularly in the evenings for this to have completely prevented emergency vehicles from passing.
- double parking preventing cars from exiting marked bays.

This added to significant community discord, with neighbours resorting to leaving notes on others cars, threatening (and in some cases actually) damaging vehicles, verbally abusing one another and taking to the estate community Facebook group to name and shame and to abuse one another. That community discord appears to have largely diminished, although I included four photos showing that poor parking practice remains, even with the private enforcement. The vehicles in the photos are parked on Chequers Avenue and outside marked parking bays.

What you are proposing will bring a return to that, but even worse as you are proposing to bring those poor practices and community discord to a very focused

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Continued:

area, including that outside my house on Chequers Avenue (number 63 as shown on map 'AF72'). By doing so you are actively encouraging those with more vehicles allowed by their leases to overload the area outside my house, and for myself and my direct neighbours to shoulder (alongside our friends and neighbours in Sierra Avenue) burden for poor parking from the entire development.

2. We have also noted that when there were no private parking restrictions that some commuters appeared to park on the development when either getting a bus to the train station, or working in the area during the day. Unless your parking officers visit the area several times a day and night there will be no recourse against those parking inappropriately. It is unrealistic to assume that this will not be repeated with the proposal to allow unrestricted parking in this section of Chequers Avenue, but restrict elsewhere on the development.

3. Your proposals encouraging poor parking outside my house is almost guaranteed to result in both refuse, delivery vehicles and emergency vehicles from being restricted access. I cannot accept your proposal which means that emergency vehicles and refuse will commonly be prevented access (as happened in the past, and will be accentuated further with your proposals).

4. Your proposals have legal ramifications as well:

- They put the original developers at risk of legal action in misdescribing the development in all the promotional materials, and misleading buyers when they provided assurance that parking will be restricted in the areas which you have now removed restrictions from, and
- It is unclear how the council will provide of the renegotiation of the individual leases containing covenants restricting the parking. Without doing so you are opening each leaseholder open to being in clear breach of their lease – with repercussion which includes forfeiture of the lease. I do not understand how the council finds it appropriate to intentionally expose persons to the potential to lose their property through your encouraging people into breach of their lease (by parking outside the marked areas for their individual property).

5. Your proposals to apply 'no waiting at any time' restrictions to the majority of the estate and not to a selected area appear discriminatory. The restrictions appear to largely apply to the areas containing leasehold and social flats, and those containing the high end, expensive (and I presume high paying of council tax) houses. The unrestricted areas appear to be almost exclusively targeted at the more moderate sized freehold houses only.

6. Your proposals are in direct conflict with the original planning application which restricted the number of parking places. It is unclear how the council can take an appropriate position to restrict and control vehicle numbers parked on the development, and then just a few years later propose quite the opposite for a selected area of the development.

7. Your proposals will detrimentally impact on our peace and enjoyment of living in our home. Your proposals will focus the community discord discussed above to directly outside our house, and effectively turn our street into the default parking lot for the development. This will be unsightly, and very different from what the expectation when we purchased our property.

8. Your proposals will be more dangerous than what we have now. Currently there is large spaces between the permitted parking bays with no more than two cars parking nose to tail. What you are proposing is encouraging widespread nose to tail parking but in a road which has several intentional indents with a highly variable width. Encouraging nose to tail parking in these areas will mean drivers line of sight is removed for crossing pedestrians – even more so than in a road with a consistent width. This means that pedestrians and animals are more likely to step in front of oncoming cars.

Further comments:

It is unclear what speed restriction is proposed for the development. Once the development was fully opened up it became a 'rat run' for vehicles avoiding the

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Continued:

congestion of London Road, and doing so at high speed. It is necessary as part of the road adoption to retain, or replace the existing traffic calming measures which brought a stop to this dangerous driving.

It is unclear why it is proposed to allow unrestricted parking on the roundabout on plan 'AF72'. That would be encouraging parking actually within the roundabout proper (i.e. an intersection), when parking should not be allowed within 10m of this.

I am the Bucks County Councillor for Ryemead and Micklefield. Unfortunately, I have not been able to respond until now due to the Purdah timescale. I have had several concerns raised to me by residents which I have considered. I feel it would be beneficial to have an extension to the Consultation period for myself or possibly residents too. The concerns that have been raised with me are:

1. Removal of the speed humps fitted by the developer at the request of residents.

I have been allocated 7k funding for 2 sets of BCC compliant speed cushions in the social housing / Genoa Road end of Sierra Road. These will need matched funding by the developer by the end of March 2020. They have been risked assessed and agreed on the basis of child protection risks and I believe are very necessary. In addition, I believe there may be a case for further speed cushions in the stretch of Sierra Road adjacent to the new footpath and cycle way pending on the old Wycombe to Bourne End railway line. Sources of funding can be looked into.

2. Parking shortages

From the outset of discussions with Berkley Homes, they are well aware that parking on the Wye Dene Estate is extremely limited and have agreed to, and made a successful planning application for, 7 additional parking spaces in Genoa Way. Whilst I am very pleased with this progress I would like to see this scheme completed.

3. Car Parking and Disabled Spaces

I would like further clarification as to how many new parking spaces will be created once the proposed restrictions are in place. I am very concerned about this because a balance needs to be reached regarding resident need. And the likelihood of people parking and walking to the town and railway station for work. This is a growing trend in nearby areas such as Pinions and Bassetsbury. I have read the formal and advisory bay advice for disabled parking, however I am not convinced that all residents understand this guidance.

4. Visitors Bays

It is my understanding that these will not be subject to adoption but I do believe clarification is needed with ourselves and the developer about the intention for visitors. Were these visitors bays attached to any particular house number?

5. Bus Route

I am aware that the restrictions in Chequers Avenue are necessary for the bus route to be finalised. I would like final confirmation about the proposed start date of this bus service and whether there has to be full adoption for commencement of the service.

6. Car Parking Spaces adjacent to the Fountain

This idea was put forward to increase car parking spaces, however residents have expressed concern to me that further to the restrictions and DFS furniture store large vehicles might park here or this could be an unsighted accident hazard on the roundabout.

7. Enforcement

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Continued:

I am aware that restrictions we have placed in other areas such as Totteridge Drive have not been enforced very often. This has led to resident dissatisfaction and commercial vehicles parked in restricted areas. Can it be clarified how many weekly or monthly enforcement visits would be made? Or would this be on demand by residents.

8. Picking up and dropping off passengers

I believe that this has been addressed by Officers.

Finally, I am grateful to Officers for keeping in contact with adoption matters.

1) Introduction of box junction (please see attachment for map). On Chequers Avenue, we have four-way traffic in that spot. An introduction of a box junction is fundamental for ensuring the traffic on Chequers Avenue remains flowing.

2) Parking Bays: Currently on Chequers Avenue, the parking bays are managed as visitor bays by PCM. These bays should belong to the council and should be made available for 'Residents Only'. This means, please add signage along Chequers Avenue for the parking bays and provide residents with resident permits. If the road is adopted, the bays should be adopted too, otherwise the parking situation will be lacking transparency for visitors.

3) Vulnerable road users: On Chequers Avenue, we have vulnerable road users such as children and cyclists. There is a big playground on Chequers Avenue, which attracts children from all over the development. As traffic regularly interacts with other vulnerable road users, a 20mph speed limit on Chequers Avenue is crucial. This would also be beneficial to the diverse wildlife of the development (muntjaks, ducks, etc)

4) Bus Service: Due to point number 4, I reject the idea of running a bus service through the residential area of Chequers Avenue. I am taking the bus myself from London Road and it's sufficient.

I am writing to object against the proposed changes to the Wye Dene development: 'Wye Dene Area of High Wycombe - Waiting Restrictions (Amendment 1039)' I strongly object to the proposed plans and the clear lack of missing 'No Waiting At Any time' on part of Chequers Avenue (Map AF72).

The only solution I see possible, is for 'No Waiting At Any time' to apply to Chequers Avenue in its entirety.

Reasons for this:

1. At the current time, Chequers Avenue is privately managed. It has been very clear that parking restrictions are necessary to avoid people parking in any way they deem possible. It has clearly been proven that no restrictions is not a possible solution that will work on Chequers Avenue. During the time we have lived in our house (63 Chequers Avenue) private parking enforcement has been put in place to help residents' control and restrict the parking on the estate which was terrible and unmanageable without restrictions in place.

Without restrictions it has proven that people park with no regards to other residents.

- Cars parked that block entrances and exits.
- Cars parked the block parking spaces in front of houses
- Cars parked that block a clear view when driving
- Cars parked on foot paths.
- Cars parked on both sides of the road leaving no space to pass.

Wye Dene Consultation Feedback

Continued:

2. With no restrictions in place inconsiderate parking will lead to emergency vehicles not being able to pass due to parked cars. Refuse trucks may not being able to make their way to collect rubbish.
3. With unrestricted parking allowed, people will park cars in any place possible which will endanger residents, in particular children. With no clear visibility, the possibility of children or animals hiding behind cars and stepping into passing traffic will increase.
4. With the inconsiderate parking, which will be the case with no enforcement in place, the Wye Dene community will suffer. In the past there has been threats and strong ill feelings between residents and between neighbours. This will affect the social welfare of the residents living in the area due to the hostility that will grow between people. The Wye Dene facebook group clearly shows these tendencies and the need for restrictions for residents to live peacefully in a community together.
5. From the maps demonstrating the proposed changes, only certain areas are to be covered by the 'No Waiting At Any Time'. With the length of the Chequers Avenue showing in Map AF72 hardly having any restrictions proposed, this will result in this piece of road becoming the parking lot for the remaining residents and even by cars from outside the development. We did not purchase a house on Chequers Avenue only for this road now to allow for an unlimited amount of cars and people to park in front of our property and on our street with no regards to the residents owning property on this street. It will affect us in our daily lives and coming and going to our property.
6. The fact that 'No Waiting At Any Time' is suggested on all parts of Chequers Avenue on one side of the bus bollards (Map AG73), yet no restrictions on Chequers Avenue on the other side of the bus bollards (Map AF72). It must have been identified that restrictions are necessary on Chequers Avenue and as this has been identified in the proposed plans this should clearly apply to all of Chequers Avenue, which is the exact same type of road and same type of use for its entirety, and not only on one side of the bus bollards.
7. There seems to be a discrimination between where 'No Waiting At Any Time' is proposed to be enforced. It seems clear that restrictions are mainly proposed on parts of the development where freehold houses are more expensive and the issues with no restrictions to apply are where freehold houses are of more moderate and medium size and cost.
8. We have on a number of occasions struggled to get our small hatchback out from the side road. Marked in map below in an orange colour. This will no doubt only be even worse with people parking cars onto or very close to the edge of the road entrance leaving no space to manoeuvre a car around the turn. Based on all my points below – I strongly object to the current plans and insist the 'No Waiting at Any Time' is applied to Chequers Avenue in its entirety highlighted in the map above in yellow.

We oppose the proposals on the grounds that more vehicles could use Chartwell Way to avoid Sierra Road and its proposed parking restrictions. Chartwell Way is a private road, has no footpath, is narrow and used by pedestrians. An accident has a higher chance of occurring along Chartwell Way if these proposals come into being.