

16/06375/FUL

Consultations and Notification Responses

Ward Councillor

Councillor Clive Harriss

Comments in respect of original submission: If minded to approve please bring to committee or at least allow this to be dealt with by "delch" as the neighbour has serious concerns as to the impact of a house of this scale on their amenity and the increase in traffic over a makeshift access unsuited to multiple vehicle movements.

No comments received in respect of amended scheme.

Parish/Town Council Comments/Internal and External Consultees

Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council:

Comments received on latest scheme: The Longwick-cum-Ilmer Parish Council recommends refusal of this application as it considers the proposal to be an overdevelopment of the site and has concerns that the dwelling is too large for the size of the plot. The plot does not sit within the building line. The proposed development is considered to be overbearing to the surrounding properties, particularly those at the rear. The Parish Council considers the proposal to be detrimental to the wildlife and unenvironmentally friendly if the trees are removed.

County Highway Authority

Comments (latest response received albeit in relation to the original scheme considered by Committee): You will recall that my initial response recommended refusal based upon insufficient internal parking/manoeuvring space and the intensification of an access with substandard visibility. Then my letter dated 19th July 2016 removed the former due to an amended site plan. Nonetheless, the issue of a third party boundary feature still appeared to obscure visibility to the right on exit from the site.

The applicant has now submitted photographs of the current access, demonstrating the work carried out to the hedgerow at No.1 Elm Cottages. I also note correspondence from Transport for Buckinghamshire's Local Area Maintenance Technician who confirms that the verge upon which the visibility splay in this direction falls is actually highway maintained at public expense.

As a result, the Highway Authority could potentially serve a notice upon the owner/occupier of No.1 under Section 154 of the Highways Act 1980 that would secure the pruning or clearance of the boundary feature on highway safety grounds. Therefore, even though the hedge is on third party land, the occlusion it causes over the public highway and the aforementioned visibility splay can be controlled by an extant legal provision.

Mindful of these comments, I hereby remove my remaining objection to the development and respectfully request that the following condition is attached to any permission granted (condition regarding parking and manoeuvring).

Arboricultural Officer

Comments (latest response received albeit in relation to the original scheme considered by Committee): No objections subject to appropriate tree protection before and during construction.

Representations

Original Scheme considered by Committee:

Comments received from 5 x neighbours and interested parties (3 x objecting, 1 x neutral and 1 x supporting scheme) summarised as follows:

- Impact on privacy of neighbours
- Letter from no. 1 Elm Cottages stating that they plan to reinstate damaged hedging
- Concern about noise given increase intensity of use of stone access track
- Notification that parties are held in rear garden of neighbour which could impact amenities of future residents
- Will provide accommodation for a local family
- Crosses neighbour's land
- Insufficient turning space along access especially for large vehicles
- Access driveway is very narrow and not wide enough for 2 vehicles to pass each other
- Visibility hazard onto Thame Road
- New property will dominate area
- Will impact on light levels to neighbour
- Fear wooded area could be cleared overtime, changing character
- Land to rear referred to as playing fields is not so and is within ownership of Mill Barn
- There is a drainage ditch through the site
- Would cause inconvenience to neighbour as fencing to enclose pet would now be required.
- Insufficient space on site for parking and turning of 4 cars.
- Insufficient numbers of parking spaces
- Concern that trees to be removed may damage neighbour's property
- Cramped development/ over-development

Latest Scheme

Two additional letters received in relation to latest amended scheme, one objecting on the following grounds:

- the property is too large for the plot
- Inadequate manoeuvring space
- Inadequate single driveway, not suitable for increased usage, would result in dangerous manoeuvres and parking
- Would impact on privacy of neighbour at Mill Barn due to increased traffic
- Would cause inconvenience to neighbour as fencing to enclose pet would now be required.
- Fear wooded area in time would be cleared, impacting on character of area and exposing neighbouring property.