

**18/05978/FUL**

## **Consultations and Notification Responses**

### **Ward Councillor Preliminary Comments**

#### **Councillor Tony Lee**

Comments: I have reviewed the revised and latest planning application and if the officer is minded to approve this application I would like it to be called to the Planning Committee.

Comments on amended plans: Having reviewed the amendments I am still of the opinion that this should be called to committee, on the basis that I have received an abnormal number of calls objecting to this application. In the circumstances, if the officer is minded to approve this application, I would like it to be considered by the Planning Committee.

### **Parish/Town Council Comments/Internal and External Consultees**

#### **Wooburn and Bourne End Parish Council**

Comments: No objections. We are mindful of Julian Smith's comments regarding landfill gases.

#### **County Highway Authority**

Comments: The application proposes the demolition of the existing dwelling on site and erection of a replacement seven bed detached dwelling with detached garage and associated driveway. Given the quantum of the proposed development I would not expect the proposals to significantly increase the expected vehicular movements associated with the site. The existing access will therefore not be significantly intensified, and the effect of the local highway network is capable of being accommodated.

The Highway Authority has no objection to alteration to accesses at points where they cross highway land. I note that any altered access will be required to be constructed in accordance with Buckinghamshire County Council's guide note "Private Vehicular Access Within Highway Limits" 2013 should any alterations be carried out upon highway land.

When assessed using the submitted plans and the Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance policy document, I consider the proposed development capable of accommodating the required parking provision within the site curtilage.

Considering the rural nature, restricted width, and the horizontal alignment and embankments of Harvest Hill, I consider a Construction Traffic Management Plan necessary in this location. This is required in order to ensure the safety of, and mitigate for any damage to the local highway network as well as to demonstrate that access is possible for all proposed construction vehicles. The recommended condition below sets out requirements of the Construction Traffic Management Plan.

Mindful of the above comments, I have no objection to the proposed application subject to conditions relating to provision access and parking and a construction management Plan.

#### **Control of Pollution Environmental Health**

Comments: In terms of environmental health issues there is very little to comment upon aside from the fact that the application site is located close to a former landfill site - an informative has been prepared for the benefit of the applicant. No objection subject to an informative on any consent Proximity to Landfill Sites. You are advised that the development lies within 250 metres of a known landfill site and you may wish to satisfy yourself that the details of the construction of the proposals take the necessary account of the possibility of landfill gas from that source. If your proposal requires Building Regulation Consent this issue will be dealt with by the Building Control Division when a formal submission is made. However, this may require you to engage the services of a consultant with expertise in these matters.

## **Buckinghamshire County Council (Non Major SuDS)**

Final Comments: Buckinghamshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority has reviewed the information provided in the following documents:

- Amended Drainage Plan (3165, October 2018, Infrastruct CS Ltd)
- BRE365 Test Results (September 2018, Infrastruct CS Ltd)
- Owner's Manual SuDS Maintenance Guide (3165-HILL-ICS-RP-C-07.001, October 2018, Infrastruct CS Ltd)

The LLFA has no objection to the proposed development subject to conditions.

The applicant is proposing to utilise infiltration methods to dispose of the surface water generated as a result of the development. A cellular soakaway will discharge of roof water and a permeable gravel system will be used for hardstanding areas, permeable paving provides benefits of water quality and quantity management and the LLFA strongly encourage their use.

The results of the BRE365 infiltration testing have been provided and they indicate that the geology in this location supports an infiltration based scheme. The applicant must provide details of the testing location in relation to the proposed components and provide a geological log in support of the testing. The LLFA request these details are provided in order to demonstrate the viability of the proposed components.

It is understood from the owner's manual that active rainwater harvesting will be incorporated into the design, the LLFA requests further details of this system including calculations to demonstrate the system complies with British Standard 8515, and details of what the rainwater will be used for.

## **Ecological Officer**

Comments: The bat report has identified roosting activity within the building from three species. The building provides multiple crevices and other features which are used by bats, it is likely that the full extent of the use is not known but the nature of the use as summer roosts for individuals is certain and it is unlikely to be used for maternity roosting or hibernation. The report is good in the most part but it does need strengthening. It makes recommendations for mitigation, and compensation but although it suggests that enhancements are also to be included they are not included. The mitigation measures are just 'recommendations' and are precluded by the word 'should', the compensation measures are minimal and would be in boxes external to the building which would not have a secure long term future. Therefore changes need to be made along the following lines: Mitigation, Compensation and Enhancement measures need to be definite, (will) rather than recommendations. The measures need to not only be shown in text but also on plan. Although bat boxes external to the building are acceptable for use during mitigation. They are not adequate for long term compensation. Compensation roosts need to be provided within the building. The compensation roosts are insufficient in terms of number, as there are many potential roosts within the current building. At least five new roosts should be provided in the new building to offer compensation and enhancement, the specification of these and the location needs to be shown on architects plans. Enhancements need to also be included into landscaping to include ecological enhancements, this would best be done through using nectar rich and native species. The improvements to the measures in the report must in the most part be done prior to a decision. The requirement for enhancements through landscaping can be dealt with through a condition requiring landscape details to be submitted.

## Representations

### **Hawks Hill/ Widmoor Residents Association**

Summarise comments:

- Access for site traffic will necessitate a loss of hedging or banks
- The proposal is too large for the size of the plot
- Will dominate views up Harvest Hill
- Overall height at odds with the contours of the hill

- Overdevelopment and urbanisation of the site contrary to C16

Summarised comments on amended plans:

We refer to the amended planning application and note the amendments to the previous application. There are no significant changes to the bulk and scale of this proposed development and we remain very concerned about the impact that this prominent building will have on the semi-rural area and those matters which directly contravene Planning Policy C16, which have not been addressed these are as follows:

- Access for site traffic will necessitate a loss of hedging or banks
- The proposal is too large for the size of the plot
- Will dominate views up Harvest Hill
- Overall height at odds with the contours of the hill
- Overdevelopment and urbanisation of the site contrary to C16

4 comments have been received objecting to the proposal:

Summarise comments:

- The new building will be considerably higher than the existing house and sited much closer to the road creating a detrimental visual impact on the way up Harvest Hill
- Over bearing and detrimental to the amenity of the properties either side of it
- The proposal is too large for the size of the plot
- Amenity space is too small because of the size of the dwelling
- The "building line" of the current houses follows the curves of the road and their vertical extent follows the contours of the hill
- Design out of keeping with the area
- Fails to respect established building line
- The proposed new access from Harvest Hill to the site on the south east boundary and the necessary vision splays would involve the complete destruction of the bank and hedgerow at this point. (Officer note: No new access is proposed in this application)
- Contrary to adopted policies C16, G3 and G8
- Loss of light (including sunlight to rear terrace), overbearing and visually intrusive impact on the neighbour at Bourne End House
- Overdevelopment of site

The following non-planning issues were raised:

- Impact of excavation on neighbouring properties.
- Potential disruption during construction period
- Boundary with Bourne End House not correctly shown (Officer note: Agent was asked to check boundary details and a revised red edge site plan was submitted showing no change to that originally submitted)

8 Comments received on the amended plans. The following new issues were raised:

Summarise comments:

- Additional traffic will seriously damage listed cottages at the bottom of Harvest Hill
- Will increase amount of water running down Harvest Hill due to lack of drains
- Will destroy Green Belt (Officer Note: the site is not in the Green Belt)