

17/08265/FUL

## **Consultations and Notification Responses**

### **Ward Councillor Preliminary Comments**

#### **Councillor Asif**

Comments: if you are minded to approve I would like this application to come to committee due to the fact this former garage site has a lot of houses going onto it and I would consider this to be over development. There are also a lot of issues the residents are facing.

#### **Councillor Hanif**

Comments: As the ward councillor I was contacted by the local residents who have expressed many concerns on this over development very close to their back gardens.

- The site between Chiltern Avenue and Rutland Avenue is just a narrow strip of land located very close to peoples back gardens. It is deemed as unsuitable for such a large housing development.
- lack of parking space for the new residents
- loss of privacy for the residents on Chiltern Avenue and Rutland Avenue
- traffic congestion on a normally quiet residential area
- concerns about crime and antisocial behaviour in the area
- HSE -smells and rodents from waste bins stored at the end of peoples gardens
- Schooling
- personal security
- Noise from the bin lorries when collecting the area waste "this was just to name a few"
- This area has been the crime hotbed for many years until gates were installed and local residents were beginning to enjoy the peace and tranquillity in this area.
- This proposed housing scheme will also create additional problems when the housing development proposed on Pettifer Way, Longland Way and Chairborough Road is given a go ahead. We are talking about another 186 or so dwellings and this area will truly become an over development. Issues related to densely populated areas are well known and documented and local residents wish to live in a quiet and peaceful neighbourhood.

I am with the local residents on this and will not be supporting the proposed housing development.

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

#### **High Wycombe Town - unparished**

##### **County Highway Authority**

Comments: The proposed development is the erection of 11 dwellings on a former garage site off Chiltern Road and Rutland Avenue, both unclassified roads subject to 30mph speed limits. It is noted that this application follows the previously approved application ref. 09/06369/R9FUL for the erection of 10 dwellings on the site. The Highway Authority commented on this previous application and recommended approval subject to conditions.

The highway impact of this development is not materially different to the previous application and the existing access points are proposed to be retained and modified. I have assessed the proposed traffic impact and am satisfied that the traffic associated with the site can be safely accommodated on the local highway network. The proposed accesses off both Chiltern Avenue and Rutland Avenue benefit from adequate visibility and despite the accesses falling below the preferable width of 4.8m for shared space roads, given the historical use of

the site and the expected decrease in vehicle movements generated as a result of the proposed scheme, I do believe I can insist of the widening of these accesses.

Regarding parking; Wycombe District Council has adopted the County Council's 'Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance' (BCPG) policy document and identifies Chiltern Avenue and Rutland Avenue as being located within Zone A. I am satisfied that there are a sufficient number of parking spaces proposed within the site. BCPG also states that each parking space should be a minimum of 2.8 x 5m wide and I note that all of the parking spaces are of sufficient size.

Mindful of these comments, I have no objections to this application with regard to highway issues, subject to the following conditions:

### **Arboriculture Spatial Planning**

Comments: No objection in principle No Arb details in regards to proximity of trees in neighbouring land for parking bays 1, 10 and 11 and dwelling plot 2 Arbs Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan including any No dig surfaces will be required

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

Comments: Buckinghamshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority has reviewed the information provided in the Sustainable Drainage Strategy (133292-R1(0), June 18<sup>th</sup> 2018, RSK) and ground investigations (EM/em/52727A/8539, 31<sup>st</sup> May 2018, Ian Farmer Associates). The LLFA objects to the proposed development due to insufficient evidence that the proposed surface water drainage scheme is viable.

The proposed surface water drainage scheme will utilise infiltration to dispose of surface water runoff. The site has been split into two catchments; however the applicant is intending to manage surface water in each catchment the same way. The drainage scheme proposed to attenuate runoff within permeable paving and attenuation tanks, with a discharge to a deep borehole soakaway.

There appears to be contradictory information regarding the infiltration rate, the ground investigations calculated infiltration rates at between  $1.04 \times 10^{-6}$  m/s and  $5.72 \times 10^{-6}$  m/s and have concluded that the geology has poor infiltration characteristics. However, within the Drainage Strategy (section 5.3) a rate of  $1.2 \times 10^{-5}$  m/s has been used for indicative design purposes. We are concerned that this rate is not in line with the rate calculated by the permeability testing. It also stated that tests were extrapolated and that the borehole collapsed twice, we cannot find any evidence of extrapolation or collapse on the permeability test result sheets. We would like to make the applicant aware that if the infiltration rates have been extrapolated results suggests that infiltration potential is low.

We are also concerned that only one location was tested, permeability testing should be completed in the locations of both proposed deep borehole soakaways. It should also be noted that deep borehole soakaways should be no deeper than necessary.

The LLFA query the requirement for two deep borehole soakaways for a site with an area of 0.4ha. The deep borehole soakaways will be discharging directly into the chalk and it is unclear if the risk of solution features has been accessed and if the number of deep borehole soakaways proposed would increase this risk. The applicant is required to provide justification for the number of soakaways proposed.

For the reasons outlined above LLFA is of the opinion that infiltration techniques are not feasible and an alternative method of surface water must be investigated. We would encourage the applicant to investigate active rainwater harvesting; this will allow surface water runoff to be used for example in toilet flushing and washing machines. It is likely that

due to the size of the development demand will be greater than yield meaning that the overflow will only be required for extreme rainfall events. The use of active rainwater harvesting would decrease the attenuation required as it would only be required during those extreme rainfall events.

We require calculations to demonstrate that the proposed drainage system can contain up to the 1 in 30 storm event without flooding. Any onsite flooding between the 1 in 30 and the 1 in 100 plus climate change storm event should be safely contained on site. These calculations must include details of critical storm durations, and demonstrate how the proposed system as a whole will function during different storm events. If any flooding occurs for the 1 in 100 year plus climate change event, then we require details of where this flooding will occur and the volume of the flooding.

### **Control Of Pollution Environmental Health**

Comments: With regards to air quality Wycombe District Council declared a new Air Quality Management Area on 22.12.17 that covers the main arterial roads into High Wycombe town centre. This includes the A40 West Wycombe Road, Marlow Hill and M40 which provides access into the area of the proposed development. The majority of vehicle movements from the development are likely to pass through the High Wycombe Air Quality Management Area as the A40 West Wycombe Road and Marlow Hill are the nearest arterial roads to the development or will pass onto the M40 Air Quality Management Area. It has been identified that the proposed development intends to introduce an additional 22 parking spaces, which also appear to be specifically allocated to the new property. As such the potential introduction of additional vehicles into the AQMA will negatively impact local air quality and its harmful health impacts upon local residents. Wycombe District Council has a duty to ensure that nitrogen dioxide levels from road traffic within the AQMA are reduced to safer levels in line with the national air quality objectives. It is currently estimated that 144 excess deaths each year within Wycombe District area are caused by poor air quality, with the expectation that the majority of those deaths will be caused along the main arterial roads into High Wycombe and Marlow town centres. With this in mind Wycombe District Council now applies the following principle to all residential developments that are within the AQMA or that the majority of vehicle movements from the development will be by road through the AQMA- the active provision of 1 electric vehicle charging unit for each new home with a dedicated parking space and at least 1 charging point per 10 unallocated spaces. All other spaces should have appropriate cable provision to prepare for increased demand in future years. Due to the spaces appearing to be specifically allocated to the new property, 11 parking spaces, one for each property, should be provided with an electric vehicle charging point.

Objection, unless condition imposed relating to electric vehicle charging points.

### **Community Housing**

Comments: I note the proposal is for 100% affordable housing, a mix of 5 houses for rent and 6 houses for shared ownership.

There is a need for affordable housing in the district and if the proposal meets all of the planning requirements then I am in support.

### Representations

A petition with 50 signatures has been received objecting to the proposal on grounds of:

- Will create congestion in an already overdeveloped area
- Stretch limited services in the area
- Infringe privacy of neighbours

- Create more traffic and parking issues
- Block light
- Noise impact from further families

In addition, objection letters have been received from 14 parties, objecting on the grounds of:

- Lots of objections to the previously approved scheme
- Inadequate parking
- Difficult to get local school places
- Construction work will impact on health of surrounding people including children
- Too close to existing gardens- may cause tensions
- Bins located at rear of existing houses will be smelly, result in rat infestations and be a security risk
- Cause parking problems in the area
- Will result in public access to the rear of existing homes- security risk
- Other suitable sites around
- Site not suitable for housing
- Inappropriate to have parking at the end of existing gardens
- Will spoil the community
- Block sunlight.
- Impact on views
- Devalue property
- Overdevelopment of site
- Would impact on privacy of existing residents
- Red Kite have served notice on those with licences to access the land. Will be seeking legal advice on this matter.
- Effectively being evicted from own garage
- Site could better be used for parking
- Out of character
- Will attract anti-social behaviour
- Consultation event was a farce and held in a different Ward where it was difficult to get to.
- Tight access for emergency vehicles and refuse trucks
- Access too close to existing homes
- Police presences/ community support should be increased in area as a result
- Community right of way runs across the land which has not been shown in the plans
- Bungalows would be more acceptable
- Query whether application form has been correctly completed and therefore validity of application
- Significant neighbour objections
- No benefit to the community