

17/07846/OUT

Consultations and Notification Responses

Ward Councillor Preliminary Comments

Councillor Etholen

If Officers are minded to approve this application please may this be called to Planning Committee for determination. I have received a number of objections to this from local residents.

Parish/Town Council Comments/Internal and External Consultees

Bledlow cum Saunderton Parish Council

First Comment: OBJECTION. In principle BcSPC welcome the above application however the Council has several concerns about the proposed development that we feel need to be addressed prior to outline permission being granted.

1. Lack of detail about the nature and scale of the development:

- a. There are inconsistencies within the planning statement. Paragraph 4.11 of the planning statement states that "The application proposes 5 dwellings with details of scale and siting applied for at this stage. It is proposed to provide a variety of dwelling sizes, which will likely range from 2 to 4 bedrooms". This contradicts paragraph 4.12 and the application form which lists 3x 3-bed and 2x 4+ bed. Given that the site is relatively small and not withstanding concerns regarding the proposed layout outlined below BcSPC see no reason why this information cannot be provided at this stage.
- b. There are only vague details of scale as no elevations are provided. Whilst we acknowledge this is only an outline application an indication of maximum eaves and roof heights would be useful particularly given the proximity of the development to the grade 2 listed Mill House.

2. Concerns over layout and design and impact on the environment and registered heritage assets.

- a. Paragraph 4.14 of the planning statement states that "the design approach is to open up a currently inaccessible parcel of land in the village, and in doing so to create a spacious and leafy layout, typical of the character of Bledlow". However this application is for a site in Pitch Green not Bledlow and therefore the design approach should be based on that typical of Pitch Green as outlined in Appendix B of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- b. Paragraph 4.16 of the planning statement states that "The scheme in particular seeks to preserve the setting of the adjacent listed building, The Mill House, by building to single storey adjacent to the footpath, and thereby ensuring views of and the setting are not compromised." However bungalows are not part of the local vernacular in Pitch Green or Bledlow, would appear out of place in this context, detract from the setting of The Mill House and be contrary to Policy 2, Policy 4 and Policy 6 of the Neighbourhood Plan. Given the elevated ground level of the site when compared to that of Mill House we feel that the proposed layout should be revised to avoid any significant built development within the listed building buffer zone. Any revision should still respect the pattern and density of development of neighbouring plots.
- c. The council are also concerned about the proximity of proposed areas of parking/hard standing to the watercourse and the lack of detail provided on how run-off into The Lyde chalk stream will be avoided given the proposed layout.

3. Shortcomings in the Planning Statement

- a. Paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3 of the planning statement ignore the caveat within Policy 1 that development within the settlement still has to accord with the other policies of the plan (in particular Policies 2, 4 and 6) in order to be compliant with Policy 1.
- b. Within Paragraph 4.6 vii the statement, "The design, although not set at this stage, will

accord with the character of the area and be appropriate for the village context”, is insufficient in our opinion. The design will need to accord with Policies 4 and 6 and this should be explicit in the planning statement.

- c. The wording of paragraph 4.7 is misleading. Pitch Green has no schools, only one village hall, no churches, no pub and no shop. It's should also be acknowledged that the application site does not lie within the catchment of Bledlow Ridge School but in fact within the Longwick catchment.
- d. Further re. paragraph 4.7 we feel that relying on the car to access facilities in Princes Risborough is not a sustainable approach to planning and possible future expansion of services there has no bearing on the sustainability of this site.

Given that any development fronting the B4009 adjacent to the junction with Perry Lane and Sandpit Lane is in a prominent location within the settlement the design will need to be of the highest possible quality with very considerable consideration given to the character of the area. In this regards BcSPC feel the development has the potential to make a positive impact in terms of the sense of place for those passing along the B4009. Improving and increasing this sense of place for users of the B4009 presents the opportunity to reduce traffic speeds along Chinnor Road though the village. Given this we hope that the applicant will address the issues raised above positively and seek to work with local residents and the Parish Council to address their concerns and seek to deliver a development that provides a positive contribution to the settlement.

Second Comment: OBJECTION. Whilst we acknowledge that the revisions submitted by the applicant address some of the concerns outlined in our previous response Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council continue to have significant concerns about the proposed development that need to be addressed prior to outline permission being granted.

1. Lack of detail about the nature and scale of the development:

There continues to be a significant lack of detail in the application. There is no revised planning statement in the submissions and no information on the number of bedrooms proposed for the properties. There continue to be scant details of scale as no elevations are provided. Whilst we acknowledge this is only an outline application an indication of maximum eaves and roof heights would be useful particularly given prominent nature of the plot and the proximity of the development to the grade 2 listed Mill House and its prominent location within the Pitch Green settlement area.

2. Concerns over layout and design and impact on the environment and registered heritage assets.

The revisions to the layout address some of our concerns we expressed about setting of the listed building however the appropriateness of what is proposed is still impossible to judge because of the lack of detail with regards scale and design and we are concerned that the massing of the 4 terraced units will appear out of keeping with the pattern of built-form in the settlement area. The council remain concerned about the impact of the development on the Lyde stream, an environmentally sensitive chalk stream. We note Bucks County Council Environment services objection on the basis of the drainage scheme proposed but are very concerned that as an alternative has recommended that run off be directed directly in to the existing watercourse as this will result in pollution and contamination of the watercourse.

3. Shortcomings in the Planning Statement

Given that no revised statement has been submitted all our pre-existing concerns remain.

Ecological Officer

First Comment: The Preliminary Ecological Appraisal covers most of the important aspects of the site. However it does not cover how a net gain in biodiversity will be achieved. When this is considered it is important to take account the fact that the site was until recently, partially covered in scrub. This scrub would have provided important bird nesting habitat as well as habitat for other species and other associated ecosystem services. In section 5.2 of the report a Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy sets out recommendations to ensure that some ecological value is retained. However it has a number of serious flaws: 1) No attempt has been made to show how a

net gain in biodiversity will be achieved. It seems highly unlikely that a net gain will be achievable whilst accommodating the number of dwellings suggested.2) The chalk streams which run down either side of the site are suggested as only needing 5m buffers, this is clearly unacceptable as policy DM15 requires that it need to be at least 10m. Given the constraints presented by the streams and the requirement to achieve a biodiversity net gain, insufficient information has been presented to show how 5 houses can be accommodated without negatively impacting wildlife.

Second Comment: As discussed more fully in my previous comments. There are two main issues with the proposals:

1 - The site had a high biodiversity value until very recently including known priority habitat in the form of hedgerows and chalk streams just outside the boundaries. On this point policy DM13 comes into play. For development on this site to be policy compliant it is necessary for it to be demonstrated that the impacts can be mitigated and that a net gain in biodiversity to be achieved. This has not occurred despite the fact that my previous comments pointed to how this could be demonstrated through Biodiversity Accounting.

2 - The chalk streams is a water course which is recognised by policy DM15 which runs down either side of the site. These watercourses require 10m buffers from bank top, to ensure that they are not adversely effected. The new layout presented is actually worse than the previous layout with the bike/bin store directly adjacent to the stream on the south corner and the driveway to the detached house being directly adjacent to the stream on the north east side. These are the most extreme examples but a significant amount of the rest of the buildings and hard surfacing would also be within the buffer.

The proposal is unacceptable in ecological terms in its current layout. Significant amendments are required and additional information submitted for it to be demonstrated that it can be compliant with policies DM13 and DM15.

Third Comment. Verbally advised that the amended scheme is acceptable subject to condition.

Buckinghamshire County Council (Non Major SuDS)

Final Comment: No objection subject to conditions.

Rights of Way And Access

Comments: No objection subject to trees not being planted in the public right of way.

County Highway Authority

Final comment: No objection subject to conditions

Arboricultural Officer

Comments: No objection as all vegetation has been removed

Conservation Officer

Comments: The application is in outline with initial details of the access and layout and all other matters being reserved. The layout demonstrates that the number of dwellings proposed can be accommodated on the site in a manner that mitigates the impact on setting of the adjacent listed buildings.

Control of Pollution Environmental Health

Comments: I have no objection to the application the noise impacts from the nearby infrastructure is not likely to negatively impact the development.

The applicant has not specified the exact method of foul drainage. Should a connection to the main sewer not be practical then the applicant will need to follow the guidance in 'Planning Practice Guidance - water supply, wastewater and water quality' which sets out a hierarchy of preferred non-mains foul drainage options - in order of preference - package treatment plant, septic tank, and, as a last resort, cess pit. Condition ' Non-Mains Foul Drainage No foul drainage scheme shall be installed unless it is in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance - water supply, wastewater and water quality. Details of the scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local

Planning Authority. Such details must follow the hierarchy of package treatment plant, septic tank, cess pit as set out in the Practice Guidance. Reason ' in the interests of residential amenity & environmental protection.

In terms of environmental health, there are two issues: potential contaminated land and non-mains foul drainage. Contaminated Land The site is currently undeveloped and is entirely covered in mature trees. Historical use comprised of domestic hamlet dwellings and open undeveloped fields. Potential contamination is therefore unlikely. However, a site investigation has been undertaken and results suggest that no significant source-pathway-receptor linkage exists at the site and an additional human health risk assessment is not considered necessary. A watching brief during the construction phase is, however, recommended. Should any previously undiscovered contamination (including visual or olfactory evidence) be encountered during development, it must be reported in writing within seven days to the Local Planning Authority. Once the Local Planning Authority has identified the part of the site affected by the unexpected contamination, development must be halted on that part of the site. Before development recommences on the area where contamination has been identified, a scheme outlining appropriate measures to prevent the pollution of the water environment to safeguard the health of intended site users and to ensure that the site will not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation, and approved conclusions shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall not be implemented otherwise than in accordance with the approved remediation scheme. Reason - to ensure that any potential contamination of this site is properly investigated and its implication for the development approved fully taken into account. Non-mains foul drainage Selection of the most appropriate method of non-mains foul drainage had not been identified in the original application. This has since been addressed with the preferred option of a package treatment plant. This must be installed in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance.

BCC Archaeology

Comments: No objection subject to conditions

Representations

27 comments have been received objecting to the proposal:

- Is there adequate refuse collection?
- Is there enough room for oil tankers to get in and out?
- There have been previous refusals on the site.
- Granting permission will open the door to challenge on the agreed village boundary
- Who is responsible for the maintenance for the trees?
- Work has started some time ago when the access was formed.
- A number of trees and bushes have been removed
- Proposed trees will shade gardens and properties
- Materials should be reflective of the local area and listed buildings.
- What are the details for foul water drainage?
- Flood risk. Culvert has been installed restricting the flow.
- Ecological appraisal should have been done before the vehicular access.
- Large dwellings not reflective of area.
- Habitats have been destroyed.
- Access to Perry Lane dangerous.
- No affordable housing mentioned.
- The land levels are higher so will tower over Mill House.
- Overdevelopment of the site.
- The road is more like an A road rather than a B road.
- The noise levels will increase. Background noise from road also due to removal of trees and hedge.
- Mains drainage connection will not be possible.
- Increase in traffic incidents due to proximity to junction.
- Proximity to listed buildings

- Detrimental to the character of the Pitch Green hamlet.
- Detrimental to the setting of the listed buildings
- Pedestrian footway is not safe.
- Insufficient details on drainage.
- Loss of view