

Precis of general issues raised in public consultation exercise to discuss redevelopment in the area of The Whaddons and Thongsley

1. Car parking 1 - any re-development of the land currently occupied by the bungalows at 23-51 (odds) The Whaddons will generate a demand for extra car parking. A potential solution to help mitigate for this is to knock down the garage court behind 53-61 The Whaddons to create a more open landscaped car parking area that should provide a more efficient and attractive car parking area in this location.
2. Car parking 2 - the opportunity also exists to remove garage court areas elsewhere and replace with more attractive landscaped car parking areas to sort out existing parking issues elsewhere in Thongsley and Whaddons if this will help parking provision for any new development.
3. Car parking 3 - the preference has been expressed by the residents of those houses facing onto Butts Grove Way is to keep the existing green spaces close to the front of these existing houses.
4. Butts Grove Way - parking should be allowed along Butts Grove Way. Cars will park here anyway (as double yellow lines will be impractical), so we must allow for this and design accordingly. The road may have to be widened a bit and the visibility splays will need to be safeguarded. Parking along Butts Grove Way will also help to reduce the speed of traffic, and this doesn't seem to be an issue along California Road.
5. Existing properties - the bungalow at 2 Thongsley (closest to the school) is privately owned. It is appreciated that luckily the plot is at the edge of the site and would not prejudice any other proposals.
6. Open space - there is a general concern over the loss of open space, although the point was made to residents that some of the open space is not of a high standard and some of it, particularly to the front of the bungalows that face onto Butts Grove Way, are very much examples of 'space left over'. Ideas to improve the quality of any new or retained open space could include improving the quality of the landscaping, planting trees, keeping the space close to residents, using estate railings to fence in space for small children to play in, and involving the residents in any designs.
7. Scale – there was no wish to see any 3 storeys, and a wish to see more bungalows, although the housing mix is an issue for HDC housing to discuss with Luminus in discussing the housing need. I think that there is the potential to have a single well designed slightly higher building close to the Lord Protector, and I think that there is an opportunity to have some 1 ½ storey instead of 2 storey houses, particularly where new houses are proposed close to existing houses. This will help to mitigate against any perceived loss of amenity for existing residents.
8. Character – a simple but modern character was generally accepted as the architectural style for redevelopment. Although people were overwhelmingly negative about the new houses across from the Lord Protector, I did state that on a mono architecture estate like Oxmoor, the introduction of a variety of architectural styles was a good thing and helped to diversify the area, helping to show how the area was growing and

changing. Extracts in the draft urban design framework showing what general architectural character could be applied were positively received.

9. There was support for the demolition of Suffolk House, although this is not on the agenda for action by Luminus at this time .
10. There was some support for improving the public realm and increasing the amount of green space in the area between Suffolk House, the Church and the rear of the shops and the Lord Protector, and removing the truck parking facility, although it was made clear that any improvements in this area would follow on later than the redevelopment in The Whaddons and Thongsley.

MH
23 December 2008