



Summary of Consultation Feedback

from

Members of the Public

The exhibition at Anthony Hall, Aston Clinton on 11th July recorded 197 visitors and the second event held on 17th July at the Holiday Inn, Aston Clinton Road, received 113 members of the public.

Of the visitors who attended the two exhibitions 51 completed a comment form. The break down below indicates the overall tone of the comments:

- 3 Positive - All good comments, no objections
- 6 Indicate support - but with concerns/ questions
- 17 Neutral - some good, some bad comments or simply posing questions
- 23 Negative - objections, no positive comments

The three questions asked on the feedback form were

1. What do you like about the plans such as the link road, green infrastructure, sports and communication facilities, job creation and housing?
2. What do you not like about the plans such as the link road, green infrastructure, sports and communication facilities, job creation and housing?
3. Do you have any suggestions?

Analysis of the comments indicates that the four most significant issues for local residents appear to be:

- Lack of proposed infrastructure/ overburdening of the existing system
- Additional transport/traffic strain
- Design and location of the link road (multiple suggestions have been made regarding this)
- That the creation of additional employment space does not necessarily create additional jobs

A number of respondents did not consider the information provided at the exhibition sufficient to enable them to provide a comment.

The comments submitted in response to the questions posed on the comment form are detailed in full below:

1. What do you like about the plans? (24 mentions)

Supportive Comments (24 mentions)

The link road has the opportunity to contribute towards traffic relief around Aylesbury; it is desperately needed (6 mentions)

In theory I like the overall holistic and integrated approach to the plans, this is probably a necessary development (4 mentions)

It has the opportunity to create good green infrastructure and excellent amenity open space (3 mentions)

Housing creation (3 mentions)

Job creation (2 mentions)

Addition of sports facilities (2 mentions)

More exciting than Aylesbury East and well consulted and feel part of the development process (1 mention)

Commercial development and leisure (1 mention)

I am pleased that ecology has been carefully considered (1 mention)

Additional flood storage to prevent flooding in Aylesbury (1 mention)

Negative comments (17 mentions)

Nothing. I dislike the development plans (17 mentions)

Other comments (6 mentions)

More development is currently planned for Aylesbury than for Birmingham or Bristol (1 mention)

The job creation is only a maybe! We do not know enough about sports facilities! (1 mention)

Aylesbury is the largest town in England without a bypass (1 mention)

As planning is incomplete it is difficult to see any real need for any of it (1 mention)

Are good and are negative for growth and development (1 mention)

At present Tring Road Aylesbury exceeds EU standards for air pollution (1 mention)

2. What do you not like about the plans? (103 mentions)

General (6 mentions)

Everything, this proposal is ill considered (5 mentions)

You are going to ruin our quality of life for the next 20 years. This is shameful. (1 mention)

Infrastructure (15 mentions)

The proposals do not indicate the provision of necessary infrastructure, existing infrastructure will be overburdened and congested - everyone will suffer (11 mentions)

No provision of a school for extra houses – all schools are full in the area (3 mentions)

No provision for churches (1 mention)

We have 2 stadiums in 10 minutes' drive a sports centre we don't need another (1 mention)

Housing (6 mentions)

No details of adequate provision for young people of the villages for affordable housing to buy or rent (1 mention)

There needs to be a social housing policy with positive discrimination towards existing people with long term links to the area (1 mention)

My concern is 'house creep' that the number of houses will leave and that they will look like monstrosities (see Hemel Hempstead for detail). Please can they be aesthetically pleasing and see the current houses (1 mention)

I don't consider that the eastern part of the site is suitable for housing (1 mention)

Houses not affordable for local people (1 mention)

Building too many houses could push prices up (1 mention)

Extent of development /relationship with existing settlements (8 mentions)

Too big a development/too many houses planned (4 mentions)

The development will lead to the joining up of Aston Clinton, Berton and eventually with Aylesbury.

Aylesbury is getting too big. Along with other developments Berton, Weston Turville and Aston Clinton could become a suburb of Aylesbury (2 mentions)

I do not want a large development close to my home. I feel that further building and loss of current farmland/Green Space will devalue my property by making my area less desirable (1 mention)

Surrounding of Broughton Village on all sides by development (1 mention)

Transport/ Traffic (18 mentions)

No adequate road infrastructure (4 mentions)

It could create more traffic without creating a joined up solution around Aylesbury (4 mentions)

The highway system at present cannot cope with existing traffic flows and this proposal will exacerbate the problems (3 mentions)

Please do not join the Link Road to the A41 at the Woodlands Roundabout. This is grid-locked from 7.30am till 9.15am (3 mentions)

Roads currently used for cut through will be blocked (1 mention)

Help move traffic from Aston Clinton Road to Broughton that does not need to go down the A41 Tring Road (1 mention)

Still not got train links to the area (1 mention)

Aylesbury needs a bypass and each development (including this one) is using their part of the road in a piecemeal way (1 mention)

Environment/green amenities (13 mentions)

Flooding is an issue in the surrounding area; I am not convinced your proposals for drainage will prevent future problems (6 mentions)

Hope the green infrastructure happens, we have lost a lot of mature trees for the Kingsbrook development (Broughton/Bierton) and it would be great to see more trees planted (1 mention)

Loss of green space (1 mention)

Green infrastructure as you call it DESTROYS nature (1 mention)

“green infrastructure” – what! It is a green field site. Leave it green. (1 mention)

Loss of amenity bad for local ecology (1 mention)

Taking agricultural land for building (1 mention)

Concerns that wildlife is being relocated (1 mention)

Jobs/ Employment space (11 mentions)

There is no need to create additional employment space, this does not create additional jobs (4 mentions)

No need for workspace, many vacant business premises already – the town needs the money to improve existing space now (2 mentions)

You can't create jobs out in thin air (1 mention)

More housing does not create more long term employment for Aylesbury as Arla have proved (recruiting many outside the area, beyond Watford) (1 mention)

Jobs will be for out of area workers or low paid staff (1 mention)

Not sure what job creation will happen as will probably be decided behind a closed door (1 mention)

New jobs will not sustain the quantity of proposed new housing forcing people to commute – causing further traffic (1 mention)

Other (6 mentions)

The current planned building time for the site is too long. Works traffic will be on site/accessing the site for years! I dislike the upheaval, construction traffic and otherwise the development will cause (2 mentions)

Please removed build from behind Broughton Lane and keep to Arla area as we are already dealing with Barrett 71000 houses commencing in August 2015 (1 mention)

Other developments are not completed (1 mention)

We are not Aylesbury - "Aylesbury Woodlands" rubbish (1 mention)

Profits for its stakeholders (1 mention)

Council and democracy (4 mentions)

There needs to be an independent public enquiry on this and other proposed major development sites (1 mention)

Question how AVDC/Partnership can also be involved in deciding planning permissions (1 mention)

There is no way that this is an independent transparent process (1 mention)

Disgusted that local councillors involved (1 mention)

Consultation Approach (16 mentions)

I cannot comment until more detail is known; there needs to be much more information to make an informed decision (11 mentions)

It is not in consultation with local people and has not been considered as part of the local development plan (3 mentions)

There is no way that this is an independent transparent process (1 mention)

The plans are unintelligible – no existing highway network is displayed so it is impossible to locate the proposed developments (1 mention)

3. Do you have any suggestions?

General

Please don't continue with these proposals (10 mentions)

Please don't build anymore houses (2 mentions)

Like the idea of all suggestions and hope it happens soon (1 mention)

Please massively downscale the development (1 mention)

Listen to the community for once then it won't happen (1 mention)

A referendum/ask the public to vote on it. There was an opportunity in the recent elections but it was not mentioned – no surprise there (1 mention)

BCC and AVDC should produce strategic vision of road links and how this and other developments fit in (1 mention)

Infrastructure and Housing

Please consider and include infrastructure: schools, doctors, dentists and promote better (provide more) social side e.g. sport facilities, community hall and woodlands (to go with the name). Without infrastructure it will fail (6 mentions)

Build it at the other end of Aylesbury where there is already housing, schools and a new train station (3 mentions)

Use brownfield sites in Aylesbury first - there are plenty of them (2 mentions)

Let's have a proper over all joined up housing policy for Aston Clinton instead of all the chaotic free for all we have at the moment (1 mention)

Transport Infrastructure

Transport infrastructure must be planned and built before any further development takes place, a By-Pass/Ring Road is needed for Aylesbury (7 mentions)

Just develop the road as planned without building houses or other development (1 mention)

A41 link road should be dual carriageway from the start and both ends must be completed at the same time (2 mentions)

Link Road Design and Location

Please ensure that the link road which comes off the woodlands roundabout goes as far north as possible before 'swooping' back across to Aylesbury East, so as to minimise the impact on the houses adjacent to the Aston Clinton Road. Please also put measures in place to 'hide' the road from the houses (e.g. embankments, hedges)

The link road needs to be part of a joined up roads solution around Aylesbury

The link road should not rely on Woodlands Roundabout – it is already congested and dangerous

Need to find out where link road is going which should be as far east as possible.

Please revisit junction on old A41 Tring Hill to Wendover. Filter plans already done for original A41 By pass.

Bucks Highways need to take note: The Eastern link road needs to be extended to the Buckingham Road and onwards to the Buckingham Park By-Pass – linking to the Bicester Rd A41 and onwards to the M40.

I feel strongly that the road is carefully maintained for years to come.

The Link Road needs to leave the Aston-Clinton by-pass before reaching woodlands Roundabout with just an access road for local traffic linking into the roundabout.

The link road starts in the wrong place. It must be half way between Arla and Woodlands Roundabout.

The link road must connect with the rest of the Eastern by-pass and join the A41 Waddesdon by pass planned in connection with HS2.

The link road must be dual carriageway immediately or it will never be completed.

This is planned on a current bottleneck of the A41. Extra traffic going onto the site will worsen traffic in the area during building and after completion. The proposed new link road will be single lane traffic and will not assist traffic issues as most traffic heads through Aylesbury.

Scheme design suggestions

Please provide a good cycle route (2 mentions)

A park and ride scheme (2 mentions)

Movement across the road MUST be by pedestrian bridges (1 mention)

Keep traffic lights to a minimum (1 mention)

Ensure ample smaller housing for older people and first time buyers, newlyweds etc. (1 mention)

In development of sports facilities please consider cycle paths and an open-air swimming pool (1 mention)

Other suggestions

There is no evidence of any benefit to Aston Clinton – there needs to be

Consult directly with local business / community directly affected.

Bring the development masterplan back before it is submitted to AVDC showing what support it has. The LEP should be working within AVDCs area development plan and should, because of its constitution, ensure public amenity and infrastructure; social infrastructure etc. is PROPERLY catered for.

Maintain green areas for dog walkers, put in doctors' surgery.

Prefer it to be as close to Arla as possible so a separate entity and not a continuation of Aylesbury.

Stop the Council Backhanders

Delay proposals until AVDC produce acceptable development plans which are approved by the community.

Have local representatives (Parish Council etc.) on the planning group or to inform local needs.

Combining the green corridor with the need for flood water storage would restrict recreational activities. Aylesbury is lacking in opportunities for outdoor recreation.

Await results from the last census to gain correct and up to date data.

Questions

What about jobs, schools hospitals and doctors?

Also, if the Hampden Fields development goes ahead then what does that mean for the future of the area?

I have seen no mention of the fact that this development will put considerable strain on the area's already overflowing schools, doctor's surgeries, dentists and hospitals. What are the propositions to counterbalance this?

Why do we have to join up all the villages?

Can the area in general cope with the extra weight of traffic?

What sort of businesses are you looking to attract?

A strategic plan for growth around Aylesbury is currently being developed. Why are AVDC and BCC bringing forward this proposal which is outside of the planning process?

As AVDC and BCC are part of Aylesbury Vale Advantage, how can this proposal be judged objectively? To say that other local authorities do this still means this process is extremely undemocratic and flawed, as the public is then only allowed to have a say on the details of the proposal.

I understand that new housing has to go somewhere, but why does it have to go on a known flood plain with important wildlife and hedgerows?

Surely PBA have had initial discussion with AVDC planning to discuss proposals so why are these master planning ideas not here?
