

16/07347/FUL

Consultations and Notification Responses

Ward Councillor Preliminary Comments

Councillor Mike Appleyard

Comments: The residents and I are prepared to relax our objection to the development here, but only if Grassy Lane is safeguarded from vehicle access in perpetuity. This is an important route that has already been hacked away by developers so far. We could not accept further development on an ancient bridleway. Without this restriction we will always resist development that ruins a well-liked feature of this area. Perhaps you would give this some thought and confirm WDC agreement to this condition. I hope that this concession will help regularise relationships with the Council regarding development in the area.

Councillor Tony Lee

Comments: I wish to object to this planning application on the grounds that it is an over development of a site which has experienced sustained development over a relatively short period. It is also in a semi-rural area which is seen across the valley and is changing the character of this particular part of Hedsor. If the officers are minded to grant planning permission, I would like this brought to the Planning Committee.

Amended plans: I have viewed the amended plans and am still of the opinion that this still appears to be an over development of this site. In the circumstances, I would still like this application to be brought to the Planning Committee for consideration.

Parish/Town Council Comments/Internal and External Consultees

Wooburn and Bourne End Parish Council

Comments: Strongly object on the grounds of overdevelopment on an inappropriate site with limited and hazardous access. We fully support the representations and the comments of the Environmental Officer.

Amended plans: Comments are the same as previously logged: Strongly object on the grounds of overdevelopment on an inappropriate site with limited and hazardous access. We fully support the representations and the comments of the Environmental Officer.

Arboricultural Officer

Comments: Plots 2 and 3 are the closed to the trees along the Eastern boundary however they appear to be just outside the root protection area (RPA). Changes in the levels are apparent however these are also just outside the RPA. The crown canopies extend beyond the RPA so some pressure for trimming back may be a future issue. Currently these trees are not protected but are on land owned by WDC and managed by the Parish Council. Preference for more trees planting along the Kiln Lane boundary. Possible condition that any tree works within the first five years is subject a condition seeking consent from WDC/WBEPC

Ecological Officer

Comments: The only ecological report submitted in this instance is for the small proportion of the site covered by the bungalow. The rest of the site has not been assessed in this instance, it was not assessed in 2013 (13/05046/FUL) and so the last ecological survey information provided for the greater part of the site was with the application in 2009 which included both a Phase 1 survey and a subsequent reptile survey. The surveys recognised the general ecological value of the site but no Protected Species were found at the time of survey. Ecological survey information is deemed sufficiently up to date if it not more than 1 -2 years old (depending on site and species). Considering that previous surveys were carried out in 2009 updated ecological survey information is required. There is a requirement for permissions to not result in a net loss in biodiversity,

considering the extent of the current proposals it is considered to be difficult to show that this won't occur. Certainly it will be a requirement for this to be proved and the starting point is new ecological surveys, including reptile surveys and use of the site by bats. Given the time of year, it is unlikely that surveys undertaken now will result in a sufficiently accurate record of ecological value of the site.

Further Comments: Despite reptiles not being found during previous surveys, it still remains the case that the habitat is suitable and a resurvey is necessary to ascertain presence/absence and numbers if present. This can only be undertaken during suitable conditions within between April and September. A Red Kite and breeding bird survey is also necessary as a lot of habitat used by them would be destroyed. The extent of habitat to be destroyed is quite significant and there are very limited opportunities to provide ecological enhancements. Therefore I am concerned that this site would not achieve a net gain in biodiversity as required by the NPPF. I therefore think that it would be appropriate to require a biodiversity accounting exercise to be undertaken (I suggest the use of the Environment Bank's metric), to address this concern. An ecological mitigation and management plan will then be necessary. This all needs to be done prior to a decision.

Comments on additional survey information: The latest ecology report by Applied Ecology includes the reports of recent updated survey reports which I said were required in my previous comments. A single record of a slow worm has now been found on the site, this is not considered to raise a serious problem to development of the site as mitigation measures can manage this. Red Kites are not nesting on site (although they did try and fail to nest in the vicinity), mitigation measures can ensure that harm is avoided. Breeding birds do use the site but the destruction of their habitat can be timed so as to not cause an offence. Badgers and bats are also a consideration but they can also be dealt with through mitigation measures. The report fails to address the requirement for a biodiversity accounting exercise to be undertaken and so although it is known that the development of the site will result in the loss of habitat, this has not been quantified and nor have the ecological enhancement measures suggested. It is necessary for a biodiversity accounting exercise to be undertaken and for enhancement measures to be designed to address the loss created through quantified enhancement to ensure that there is a biodiversity net gain. It is possible that enhancements could require alterations to the proposals and so it is necessary for this to be dealt with prior to a decision.

Final Comments: The AEL Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan includes calculations which quantify the value of the habitats on site and the net situation after construction. There will be a net loss in biodiversity with regards to the calculations of 1.07 credits even after the proposed enhancements are included. A loss of this extent would often be dealt with through offsetting on to another site, however the costs of such an approach could be substantial and until local system has been put in place for Bucks, it is acceptable to find other ways to deal with this situation. In this instance the proposal is to include bird and bat boxes (which are not included in the metric) in to the scheme to help compensate for the loss. This approach is considered appropriate considering the circumstances. It will be necessary for further details to be supplied, however it is acceptable for this to be dealt with by condition. The following further information is necessary: Details of where all the mitigation (e.g. hedgehog holes in fences) compensation (e.g. new habitat creation) and enhancement (e.g. bird and bat boxes) measures will be located and specification for them including plans and illustration to make it clear. Details for how retained habitat will be protected through the development (e.g. simple construction environmental management plan). Details for how ecological features will be managed, maintained and monitored in the long term and how this will be funded.

Control of Pollution Environmental Health

Comments: As the applicant has not specified the method of foul sewerage disposal, development cannot commence unless further details are submitted, as required by national guidance 'Planning Practice Guidance - water supply, wastewater and water quality' requires that, should a connection to the mains sewer not be practical, then a strict hierarchy of non-mains foul drainage methods must be followed, in order of preference - package treatment plant, septic tank, and cess

pit. Also the applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that the application site is adjacent to a closed landfill site ' see informative below.

No objection subject to the following condition and informative: 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.

Informative - 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.

County Highway Authority

Comments: It is noted that the visibility splays for the development are at the extent of acceptability due to the profiling between the edge of the Kiln Lane carriageway and the site. Nonetheless, even when taking into account both horizontal and vertical alignment of the highway in this location, the splays are achievable.

I also recognise that the speed surveys undertaken in order to establish the existing 85%ile speeds on Kiln Lane took place during the school summer holidays. However, I am confident that the nature and alignment of this road is the significantly prominent factor in determining these speeds rather than term-time flows. Therefore, I do not consider that the aforementioned time period would have a material impact in terms of the production of reliable data.

Whilst the submitted Highways Statement and proposed plans indicate that refuse collection will take place in the form of kerbside collection, the bin store location for the development is located further than resident haul distances as recommended within the Approved Document to Part H of the Building Regulations (2000). That said, the development also features a Type B turning head, which would allow refuse and delivery vehicles to both access and egress the site in a forward gear.

Ergo, in consideration of the achievable visibility splays, proposed width improvements to the existing access point, internal manoeuvrability, parking provision and closure of Formoso access on Grassy Lane, I do not have any objections to this application with regard to highway issues subject to the following conditions:

Details of surface water drainage from the access road to be agreed; removing permitted development rights for gates; restricting means of enclosure along Kiln Lane; construction traffic management plan to be agreed.

Representations

One comments have been received supporting the proposal:

- No objection as an immediate neighbour of the site.
- A balanced design with individual houses in individual plots.
- Welcome the closure of access onto Grassy Lane.
- Disagree with the Parish Council that the access is hazardous. Have used the access for 10 years without feeling it is dangerous. We have never had an accident and do not know of any at the entrance.

Three Neutral Comments – not objecting or supporting but making observations, one of which on behalf of HHWRG:

- This amounts to two additional houses to the approved and existing properties.
- Welcome the closure of access onto Grassy Lane.
- Concerned that the house designs are very similar which would conflict with Policy C16.
- There should be no alterations to the banks and hedges of Kiln Lane permitted in any approval, both during and after construction.
- A comprehensive transport management plan is needed to protect the character of Kiln Lane and users of the busy narrow lane during construction.
- Reinstatement of the hedges and trees previously removed along Kiln Lane should be required.
- The gate between plot 3 and Grassy Lane should be removed.
- There should be no access permitted at any time for construction traffic via Grassy Lane, including workers vehicles, and parking.
- Future development rights should be removed, particularly for plot 3.
- There is a weight restriction at Cores End roundabout so all heavy construction vehicles should approach from the top of Kiln Lane.

One objection making the following comments:

- Object to more development in Hedsor.
- Permission has recently been granted in the vicinity for the Millgate development so there may be two sets of construction traffic at the same time.
- The roads are in an unsuitable condition to carry heavily laden lorries due to poor surfaces and extremely narrow widths.
- Concern over highway safety from additional construction and residential traffic.
- There have been no improvements to services to the existing houses from the developments so far. Concerned about the impact on water pressure.