

31st Oct/1st Nov: BCA representatives review meeting

Present:

M MacInnes: Chair BCA Development Subcommittee
T Squires: Secretary BCA Development Subcommittee
M Edge: Chair Victory Hill Residents Association

Meeting Purpose:

To review outstanding issues and received responses ahead of next full BCA Development Subcommittee meeting.

Timetable:

- * 27th Feb: 24 Points to Cabinet responded by Simon Buckingham B&DBC
- * 30th Jun: B&DBC Hosted Developer Roundtable with DWH (no minutes available)
- * 21st Jul: 34 BCA Public Consultation Points to Simon Buckingham B&DBC
- * 24th Jul: BCA Concerns summarised for Blurb and B&DBC Members
- * Aug: DWH resubmits full planning permission request
- * Sep: B&DBC identifies Open Space planning officer
- * 11th Oct: B&DBC Statutory 21 day notice to neighbours eventually posted at site
- * 31st Oct: Ted requests extension for received comments
- * 31st Oct/1st Nov: BCA representatives review meeting
- * Nov: B&DBC + Cllrs + BCA Development Subcommittee full meeting to have resubmission presented, responses discussed as Development Control process proceeds.

Resolved:

- * DWH response from resubmission to be circulated to the BCA Development Subcommittee (see attached)
- * Attend 6th Dec planned B&DBC Development Control Committee debate
- * Ted obtains definite answers to outstanding 24 points
- * Malcolm obtains definite answers to additional 10 points (from 34 points list)
- * Noted that we need full replies to previous 34 (24) Points and new/clarified issues before full BCA Development Subcommittee meeting.
See new/re-iterated issues/actions arising below.
- * Awaiting Simon Buckingham full hardcopy of planning resubmission
- * Awaiting Lisa Souden copy of Neighbour 21 Day Statutory letter to BVH
- * Awaiting Lisa Souden additional copy of Design & Access Statement that shows the views of the site
- * Returning and thanking our Councillors for the short term loan of their copy of the resubmission
- * Awaiting Lisa Souden/Simon Buckingham/Cllr Shaw/Cllr Jones availability for full BCA Development Subcommittee meeting date

Outstanding Points and detail:

With this meeting, previous presentations, developer roundtable, sight of documents on website and at B&DBC offices we have shortlisted the following:

- * BCA has **not agreed** the development and objects to the development with our points previously raised revisited including new points/clarifications included below:
 - First choice for site should be Nature Park development
 - Second choice for site should be a low density development enhancement to the area including leisure space and low energy premium priced green eco homes.
- * Site Eastern end cross section still missing and is **requested again**.

* Density of development will cause privacy, spatial and safety issues which are unsatisfactory in detail and additional detail is **requested**.
(refer residents emailed concerns which BCA also supports)

* Inconsistent architecture/insufficient detail.

Residents of Victory Hill do not support the concept of Block C if it is to be five storeys as proposed. The residents have submitted their objections based variously on loss of privacy/light, overlooking, density of development and poor personal security for pedestrians. We see no logic or justification for Block C to be designated a Landmark building at all. In support of this, we have cited (i) Victory Hill is already an overpowering landmark and (ii) that if Brook House is to be redeveloped, then that is the appropriate site for a Landmark building. If Block C is required at all, it could be located at the western end of the site, thereby providing a landmark at the ENTRANCE to the town, which is in keeping with the BDBC strategy plan rather than the EXIT as is now proposed

We note that the pitched roof tiling for the bulk of the development is a significant stylistic improvement.

We noted houses (not flats) have window cills and neither have lintels. We would have preferred cills and lintels throughout.

Commitment on more detail for Block C per the above is **requested**.

Jubb Transport Assessment quote:

"...development transport impact would be modest and could be accommodated in the transport network subject to the various **mitigation** measures.." Which to us do NOT mean major junction projects!

Also they point out that less residential units and more social housing means less vehicles!

* Main site entrance CWW left in left out was **requested** by us (preferably utilising existing allotment/waterboard access left in left out), not RHT across CWW (opposal also **previously requested**).

(See attachments)

Recommend one (west) LHT only into main entrance twin towers, one way system within (west to east) and LHT out nearest Brook House at second (east) entrance only.

This would be a more sustainable option as driving eastwards only within the site would require a one way system creating more room for cycling/walking/emergency vehicle access and discourage driving westwards to further encourage walking for within site movements.

As we previously pointed out, anyone driving westwards into/out of the site would have to use Victory and Town Centre West roundabouts. Refer B&DBC Policies about managing vehicle movements and encouraging cycling/walking.

Encouraging more car journeys is not sustainable and creates more CO2 when there are no proactive CO2 energy saving measures (B&Q mini turbines/solar collectors) proposed for the site above the Sustainable Building Code points. These energy saving measures would enable enabling premium pricing per unit with lower annual energy need/running costs (BCA website update pending), positively helping to reduce the impact of climate change.

Incorporation of Renewable Technologies in the development to include mini hotwater solar collectors and mini turbines now these are on sale in B&Q are again **requested**.

Request site one way system and that the RHT signalised junction money is put towards a bridge for ultimate safety of play area children crossing the dual carriageway.

We note that a bridge across CWW (combined with a Town Centre Gateway building) will be at least double the price of the signalised crossing.

However, Eastern European Construction Companies will be keen build the bridge at half the UK price via public tender, meaning no additional monies need be found!

The bridge is the best solution for the Play Area child safety issues of crossing a non traffic calmed dual carriageway

Request commitment to a bridge/town gateway

* **Requested again** new footway/cycleway skirting "new" allotments eastern fence joining far western end of Rialto Victory Hill Residents Gate to DWH to existing cycleway Victory Roundabout - allotments past end of College Road subway, as this is still not included.

We **recommend** that it will be easy to build up this path slope gradient providing disabled access (when there is currently none) BEFORE site construction starts.

Non Rialto Section 106 money **not agreed** on joining up path at Rialto site corner to Victory Roundabout, this should be financed by Rialto (as in finishing the job).

Recommend using DWH/Rialto section 106 money for new path above and leisure area and other residents suggestions. Section 106 Schedule is **requested**.

* Noise Impact Assessment requires additional screening for whole site yet to be defined and is **requested**.

* No mention yet of disturbed soil donated to play area/allotments with provision of proper rabbit fencing, both are **requested**.

* Bus operator concern about turnin/turnout space alleviated by **one pair** left in left out gaps on north side of cww with additional bus stop in Morrisons. Redraw of CWW carriageway mitigation to include two left in left out site accesses and bus stops **requested**.

* Borough/Developer paying for electric infrastructure improvements managed by privatised network utility company is **not agreed**.

* Site connection to new sewer to demonstrate that will **not** increase localised flooding in Brookvale/Town Centre is **requested**.

* Paying money to privatised water company for sewer connection is **not agreed** until Sewerage Treatments Works upgraded at privatised water company cost.

* BCA **request** Consultee clasification.

End

(4 hour meeting time + 6 hours resource consumed in the production of these minutes)

Malcolm
Chair
BCA Development SubCommittee