

**18/06642/FUL**

## **Consultations and Notification Responses**

### **Ward Councillor Preliminary Comments**

#### **Councillor Tony Lee**

Due to the considerable number of residents wishing to see this fully discussed at committee and also the fact that the new plan does not resolve the reasons for the last application being refused, I would request that this matter be brought to the Planning Committee for consideration. This would only be necessary if the Officer decided to approve the decision.

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

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

Comment: This appears to be overdevelopment on a massive scale. This is totally overbearing to all surrounding buildings including Chiltern Park. The road is completely inadequate for its present traffic load being unmade and un-adopted. It is difficult to see how this road could support site traffic and the extra traffic that will be generated by a much larger care home on this site. We are not satisfied with the given information regarding all forms of waste disposal including sanitation, effluent and hazardous waste. They are increasing from twenty two to sixty four rooms and doubling the staff and only proposing six additional parking spaces which are inadequate. We understand staff and visitors are parking in the road which will impede emergency vehicles. The grounds for Wycombe District Councils previous refusal are unchanged.

#### **County Highway Authority**

Comment: I note that this application is similar to that of application 17/05526/FUL, which, in a response dated the 16<sup>th</sup> May 2017; the Highway Authority had no objections and no conditions. This application does not materially differ from that of the previous application in highway terms and as such I reiterate my colleagues' previous response below.

The proposed works are located off Northern Heights which is not maintained by Buckinghamshire County Council. Furthermore, this application is not considered to result in adverse implications upon the safety and convenience of the highway network'.

Mindful of the above, I do not have any objections or conditions to add with regard to highway issues.

#### **Arboricultural Officer**

Comment: Arb Comments significant extension within the site. In principle it may be acceptable concern as to future pressures in regards to the trees to the western boundary and that the proposed development will encroach in to the root protection areas to those trees numbered T13, T14 and T17. If minded to approve that the development is in accordance with the Merewood report .and a separate condition for arb supervision to be submitted to ensure tree protection measure

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

Comment: No objection

#### **Ecological Officer**

Comment: My second set of comments made on the 2017 application still apply as the same bat survey has been submitted. The comments are copied below:

The report clearly shows that the roof is used as a bat roost by a low number of Common Pipestrelles. The report also identifies the need to carry out the third survey as per the guidance to confirm these

findings and to inform an EPS licence from Natural England. This needs to be undertaken prior to a decision being made.

### Representations

20 Letters of objection received including Bourne End Residents Association. Summary of comments made:-

- To confirm that the work has legally commenced, it must conform to the agreed plans. If the work failed to conform and no other work has been undertaken the planning permission should be considered lapsed.
- Insufficient parking, visitors and staff park on Northern Heights. Service vehicles have difficulty turning and block driveways.
- Overdevelopment of the site effecting character of the area.
- Road is unadopted, unmade with no pavements. The road suffers pot holes.
- Orchard House put in multiple applications but were refused due to overdevelopment.
- Overlooking to Glenmore.
- The TPO'd trees shouldn't be removed and the development does not outweigh the TPO.
- The location is not ideal for elderly people.
- Minor alterations to the refused application do not overcome the reason of refusal.
- Overbearing impact.
- Difficult access for emergency vehicles.
- Poor design and not reflective of the local identity.
- There is a lack of information submitted in relation to waste disposal.
- Impact on root protection areas.
- Consultation insufficient
- Noise disturbance
- Access insufficient
- Condition 8 of the previous application can never be implemented as the land does not belong to the applicants.
- Summary of previous concerns was bland.
- Insufficient staff parking