#### 18/05597/OUT

### **Consultations and Notification Responses**

# Ward Councillor Preliminary Comments

# **Councillor Julia Adey**

In light of the many concerns of residents I should like the planning application (ref: 18/05597/OUT) for Slate Meadow to be brought to the Planning Committee.

### Councillor Julia Langley – no comments received

Clir Mike Appleyard (Bourne End cum Hedsor Ward)

I would like to support this referral.

# Parish/Town Council Comments/Internal and External Consultees

# **Wooburn and Bourne End Parish Council**

Comments: Strongly object. There is nothing in this outline application regarding any aspect of infrastructure that would reassure anyone living in this Parish that this development should go ahead. We strongly oppose this application at this time because it is premature being submitted before the Independent Examiner has reviewed the Local Plan. This application makes a nonsense of the consultation process and we therefore request that this application is rejected.

# **County Archaeological Service**

#### Comments:

We welcome the inclusion of the archaeological desk based assessment produced by the Canterbury Archaeological Trust with the additional plans. We concur with this and recommend that a number of conditions are attached to any consent.

### **County Highway Authority**

Although all matters are now reserved for future consideration, the transport implications of this development have been treated as principle matters. To this end, no issues have presented themselves from a highways perspective that would result in a principle objection. Nevertheless, the site that will come forward as part of one or several Reserved Matters applications will need to address several matters in order to mitigate its impact on the local area, protect the safe and convenient use of the existing highway, provide improved access to sustainable transport and deliver sufficient walking and cycling links.

Therefore I do not have any objections to this application with regard to highway issues subject to suggested conditions:

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

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 in High Wycombe, Marlow and the M40. The majority of vehicle movements from the development are likely to pass through one of the three Air Quality Management Areas. It is therefore recommended that at least 1 charging point per 10 unallocated car parking spaces are provided. All other spaces should have appropriate cable provision to prepare for increased demand in future years.

Noise from the A4094 is likely to cause disturbance to future residents living at that side of the proposed development. The applicant should therefore implement a scheme that ensures that all habitable rooms comply with BS8233:2014.

Recognising the limitations arising from an initial ground investigation undertaken in March 2017, a condition requiring further investigation is recommended.

### **Objection**, unless following conditions imposed;

- Condition Electric Vehicle Charging Points
- Condition Noise mitigation scheme to protect future residents from traffic noise
- Condition Contaminated Land
- Informative: Construction/Demolition Noise

### **Environment Agency (south-east)**

Initial Comments: (the full response is available on the website)

The site lies with Flood Zones 1, 2 and 3 in accordance with our flood risk mapping.

Flood Zone 3 is defined as having a high probability of flooding in accordance with table1 'Flood Risk' of the Planning Practice Guidance. The River Wye runs along the southern boundary of the site. We have two objections to the proposed development. One objection is about the ecological buffer zone and the other objection is about flood risk.

**Final response**: Following a meeting to discuss the scope of the current application the EA have indicated that they now withdraw their objections. Written response to follow.

# **Bucks County Council Education Department**

Comments: None received

# Rights of Way and Access

Comments: No objection subject to conditions to secure the proposed contributions to footpaths and cycleways.

### **Crime Prevention Design Advisor**

Comments: None received

### **Natural England**

Comments: None Received

# **Arboriculture Spatial Planning**

Comments: It will be necessary for details to be submitted with regards to the timings of works relating to retained trees. So conditions should be applied requiring: Timing and supervision of works relating to retained trees. Details of tree planting specification including incorporation with the SuDS system.

#### **Landscape Officers Planning Policy**

Comments: The LVIA (Landscape Partnership, March 2018) accepts that the development will have some adverse effects on both landscape character and on views as would any sizeable development on a green field, however this is counterbalanced to some extent by the benefits in relation to additional planting and to watercourses/wetlands. The Concept Masterplan CMP-01 Rev H shows a illustrative layout which forms a logical outcome of the negotiations had over the past two years and reflects the landscape principles established by the Development Brief. The Design and Access Statement (March 2018) demonstrates that views through and out of the site to the surrounding valley landscape are achievable with the proposed road layout. This will have to be checked again at the reserved matters stage when the design details and layout of buildings are submitted.

### **Ecological Officer**

Comments: I am happy with the level of detail submitted relating to existing ecological constraints on site. From a Green Infrastructure perspective the network of green spaces and paths works well. Details need to be submitted by condition with regards to: ecological mitigation through a CEMP. Ecological Enhancement through landscape detail and details of what is incorporated into buildings. Lighting details will need to be submitted, these will need to include a short section explaining how the lighting has been designed to avoid impacting of wildlife.

### **Conservation Officer Spatial Planning**

Comments: The Heart in Hand is a grade II listed building which backs onto the slate meadow site. The masterplan illustrates a substantial area of landscaping along this boundary. The development proposals will consequently have a neutral impact on the significance of the setting of the building and is acceptable in heritage terms.

### **Urban Design**

Comments: Proposal is as expected, however there are outstanding issues relating to vehicular access, servicing, and parking that need to be resolved at this stage if access through the site is to be approved. Alternatively the application could be amended to include access as a reserved matter. This would allow minor design issues to be dealt with at the reserved matters stage.

June 2018 addendum - the applicant has amended the application and all matters are now reserved. There are no outstanding design issues.

#### **Thames Water Utilities Ltd**

#### Comments:

- Foul Water Prior to the submission of this planning application the Utility Company raised no objection to the Development Brief and have confirmed to the applicant that there is no issue with foul water connection. In response to a consultation on this application they initially request for a condition to prevent any properties from being occupied until either all wastewater network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed or a housing and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with Thames Water to allow additional properties to be occupied. This was because the development may lead to sewage flooding and network reinforcement works are anticipated to be necessary to ensure that sufficient capacity is made available.
  - The case officer has sought clarification of the current capacity and the additional number of dwellings that can be safely added to the current system. It has been confirmed that that the site is still being modelled. Until this is complete the exact nature of upgrades required cannot be determined and we are unable to advice of a specific number. This could impact phasing and so will need to be clarified before a permission is issued.
- Clean Water Capacity I have reviewed the capacity with the modelling manager and can confirm we do have sufficient capacity.
- Surface Water no objections
- Water Mains Thames Water do not permit construction over water mains

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

#### Comments:

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

- Flood Risk Assessment (MAM7613-RT003-R01-00, March 2018, HR Wallingford)
- FRA Responses to LLFA Comments (ref. MAM7613-RT004-R02-00, June 2018, HR Wallingford)
- Foul and Surface Water Statement (FSWDS) (AMc/18/0134/5683 Rev. B, June 2018, MJA Consulting).
- Fould & Surface water Statement (ref. AMc/18/0513/5683, 1st August 2018, MJA Consulting)
- Email correspondence from HR Wallingford dated 30th July 2018.

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

# **Representations:**

Bourne End Residents Association Objects on the following grounds

- The lack of information contained within the Outline application, full drainage details should be provided.
- The application should not be determined until development of the site (and the council's policy) has been considered by the Inspector at the Examination in Public of the Local Plan
- The association disagrees with the developers Transport Assessment which they claim is not in line comments given by the Council's own transport consultants (Jacobs) to the Slate Meadow Liaison Group.

Slate Meadow Liaison Group Objects on the following grounds

- This is an Outline Application and therefore the major issues are not addressed in detail with respect to the deliverability of the measures required to ensure that the flood risks are managed.
- The application should not be determined until the impact of the development of this site and that at Holland's Farm have been considered by the Inspector at the Examination in Public of the Local Plan
- That the application is being rushed through to avoid the consideration referred to above
- Concerns that the conclusions of the Transport Assessment commissioned by the developers contradict those of that commissioned by KBEG on the same junctions and highways issues raised by the Council's own consultants.
- Strongly oppose this application at this time because it is premature and weak on detail and we would request that this application is rejected.

# The Chiltern Society

 while recognising that the application is in outline objects to the footpath/cycleway and mown grass strip within the buffer to the river on the indicative masterplan for the site

### Original proposal

There have been over 300 separate objections to the proposal, these raise the following concerns:-

- An in principle objection to building upon greenfield sites when, in the opinion of the objectors, there are plenty of brownfield sites, including former office and industrial units, that could be converted to a residential use.
- Concern that the application is only in outline and therefore there is not enough detail to be able to fully consider the impact of 150 units upon the site and the local area.
- Concern that development here has already been refused by WDC and if anything the local infrastructure has deteriorated since that time so WDC should not be going against their previous decision now.
- Concern that Wooburn Green and Bourne End are separate villages and should remain so.
   That the proposal would mean they would be merged together with minimal greenery separating them.

- Concern that 150 houses could not fit on the site and flats would be out of character with the area.
- Concern that the application is premature and should not be considered prior to the Inspector's report on the New Local Plan so that the inspector's views can be taken into consideration by the Council.
- Concern that the aged base data for alternate housing sites combined with an out of date housing target that were jointly employed in the sequential test at Slate Meadow (by WDC for the new local plan) provides an unsound basis for decision-taking.
- Concern that the impact of the possible future redevelopment of Holland's Farm in Bourne End has not been taking into consideration.
- Requests to put Slate Meadow back into the Green Belt and take the meadow by Spade Oak out of the Green Belt to build on instead.

# Highways, traffic and access

- The bridge into Stratford Drive has insufficient strength to cope with the increased traffic.
- The entrance of the estate is unsuitable for an additional 300+ cars as twice a day it comes to a standstill with the school traffic for up to half an hour at a time.
- Concern over the ability of emergency services to access the site and Stratford Drive if the development goes ahead.
- Concern that the estate is already extremely dangerous for the school children and residents to walk, with cars parking on every pavement and grass verge and the expected 300+ cars will make the situation worse.
- The impact of additional vehicles on the site and the impact upon safety for parents and children using St Paul's School.
- Concern that the proposed additional on-street parking for the school will not work.
- Stratford Drive already regularly suffers with flooding, heavy cracking and potholes.
- Concern that Town Lane is already an extremely dangerous road with at least four accidents in recent years. A request for traffic lights and increased safety measures to improve this situation.
- Concern that there will be underground parking
- Concern that the developers Transport Assessment comes to different conclusions than those of other professionals that have assessed the impact upon the road network.
- Safety concerns have been expressed particularly during the construction phase of ant development with a school so close to the entrance of the site.
- Concern over the effect the extra traffic would have on Cookham bridge
- Concerns that car parking in the local area is already oversubscribed leading to indiscriminate parking and this will only make the situation worse
- Concern that there is no realistic opportunity for a cycle path the Bourne End as the disused railway is not available.

### Flooding and drainage

- Concern that the developers and WDC have not sequentially tested the site and it should not therefore be developed.
- Concern that there is insufficient drainage system to cope.
- Concern that Slate Meadow is a recognised flood plain and the green land helps with drainage
- Concern that the drainage system is already unable to cope and this proposal will make that situation worse.
- Concern that parts of Cores End Road, Brookbank and Town Lane flood when rains, that at times it becomes so serious it is affected by sewage overflow which has resulted in home

- evacuation. Thames Water drainage fails to cope and Thames Water have confirmed that any improvement is not possible till 2020 to 2025.
- Concern that underground parking will have a flooding impact and should not be allowed in an area that potentially floods.
- Concern regarding runoff from the site resulting in pollution to the adjacent river Wye.

#### Wildlife and ecology

- The site is a home to vast wildlife i.e. badgers, deer, owls, kite, birds, slow worm; to name but a few. Also the horses which would have to be removed and the children clearly love watching and feeding them daily.
- Concern over the impact upon field mice, stag beetles and rats from the development.
- Concern that Slate Meadow is a habitat for many protected and endangered species and that the unlicensed relocation of some of the species is illegal
- Concern that the bird survey does not mention Barn Owls that are regularly seen flying over the site
- Concerns over the impact of artificial light upon the local bat population
- Concerns that development by its very nature destroys habitats for wildlife

# Amenity and landscape issues

- I presuming they are planning to build flats/apartments, these are unacceptable if they overlook
  the current residents homes and are not in keeping with the village scene the developers are
  trying to create.
- The proposal of a phased development will impact greatly on the lives of the local residents, in the form of noise, dust and dirt, for a considerable amount of time. The poorer air quality will be detrimental to health.
- Concern that the proposal is to build on the Village Green
- Concern that the whole of Slate Meadow is public green space and this will be lost due to the development.
- Concern that the proposal seems to include potential for 3-storey development and provision for trees to the boundaries of new housing that will affect sunlight into many of my neighbours and their families gardens
- this is a quiet area and people have chosen to live here for this very reason. This development will bring noise and disruption.
- Slate Meadow offers uninterrupted views through to the surrounding hillside to the north of the site. Concern that the proposed development will be severely detrimental to the look of the immediate and surrounding areas of Bourne End and Wooburn.
- Concern that the construction of such a large, modern development is not in keeping with the character of the local community; in particular, such a large, concentrated mass of modern housing, the design of which will not be in alignment with the other homes in the area.
- Concern over the impact upon air quality
- Concerns over density and building heights
- Concern that this is an area of outstanding natural beauty and should be protected as such
- Concern that the houses are too close to the river and will block important views.
- Concerns that the village green will be tidied up and not left to nature as it currently is.

#### Infrastructure issues

- Concern that local facilities including Doctors, Dentists and schools are already overstretched (with unacceptable 3 week waits at Doctors) and would be unable to cope.
- Concern that Local schools cannot be expanded to take the additional population.

- Concern over the general wellbeing of the local population due to the extra pressure on existing infrastructure
- Concerns over interruption to gas supply due to replacement of pipes
- The affordable housing will not be affordable to most people

#### Archaeology

• Concern that the hill may be the site of a rare ancient feature, a banjo enclosure and Slate Meadow might have important archaeological features because of this.

### Amended scheme

A reiteration of the comments above

- Additional concerns that the proposed change in ground levels will impact upon views into and across the site.
- Concern that the issues raised by the consultation responses from Thames Water, County Archaeology and others will not be dealt with
- Concerns that the proposal will be approved without sorting out serious matters on the site such as ecology and environmental impact.
- Additional requests that the application be deferred until after the examination in public of the new Local Plan so that the impact of all development proposed in Bourne End can be considered together.

### Support for the proposal

There has been one letter of support which made the following point

• It is no use objecting unless you can suggest an available alternative site and, like the Hollands Farm site, this is more suitable than other more important areas of the Green Belt.

#### Other matters

- Concern that the development will decrease the value of surrounding property
- Concern expressed by members of the Slate Meadow Liaison Group that their comments on the draft development brief for the site were ignored by the Council and its officers
- Concerns over being able to secure insurance on properties due to flooding
- The interests of existing residents should be prioritised over those of developers or potential incomers
- Questions have been raised regarding the integrity of the officers of the council that are dealing
  with this site, particularly by the secretary of 'The Future of Our Village Bourne End' who
  claims that officers are seeking to push the application through the Planning Committee before
  it can be considered by the Local Plan Inspector.