

18/07247/FUL

Consultations and Notification Responses

Ward Councillor Preliminary Comments

Councillor A D Collingwood

Comments: this application should be refused on the grounds outlined by Mr Putnam.

In addition we have had the recent case of 7 High Street where there was an application for additional residential behind commercial which was refused on loss of commercial parking and inadequate parking for the new residential.

The new guidelines and local plan make it very clear any development has to provide and meet all parking standards within its own site.

Parish/Town Council Comments/Internal and External Consultees

Marlow Town Council

Comments: Objection: Insufficient parking, concerns over the amenities space and conflict with the inner courtyard and retail unit.

Comments on Amended Plans: Objection: Insufficient parking, concerns over the amenities space and conflict with the inner courtyard and retail unit.

County Highway Authority

Comments: The property is situated along Dean Street, an A-class road subject to a 30 mph speed limit. The proposal seeks planning consent for the change of use of the rear of the building from shop use (A1) to residential use (C3).

When considering trip generation, the overall development has the potential to generate between 24-36 daily vehicular movements (two-way) into the local highway network. Whilst I note that no customer trip generation would be expected to be associated with the (A1) retail unit via this access, the site as currently implemented would receive deliveries via the existing access to the rear courtyard area, thus contributing to the daily trip generation of the site. However, the proposed residential units are likely to generate a greater number of vehicular trips in comparison to the current implementation and I would therefore regard this proposal to result in an intensification of the site. Nonetheless, I am satisfied that these additional vehicular movements could be safely accommodated.

It must be noted that from the submitted plans (drawing no. 02T), there does not appear to be any access from the rear courtyard area into the retail unit itself. Furthermore the proposal does not demonstrate an alternative servicing arrangement and therefore it is not clear how the retail unit would be serviced. I have concerns that this would lead to delivery vehicles servicing the retail unit via Spittal Street to unload/load which would be an unacceptable arrangement given the width of Spittal Street, the proximity of the site to the roundabout and classification/function of Spittal Street as an A-class district distributor road.

To summarise this issue, the proposed development in this instance would result in the loss of A1 retail space which currently allows for delivery vehicles to use the rear courtyard as originally intended and the Highway Authority would have a principle objection to any vehicle associated with the retail space stopping and unloading on the highway.

When considering the parking provision on the site, I can confirm that the proposed number of residential units sought under this application would require 6(no) parking spaces, in line with Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Standards (BCPG). The 11(no) flats already implemented utilise parking facilities within the basement, at one space per flat and an option of purchasing a second parking space. Mindful of this, the applicant has provided 3(no) additional parking spaces

at ground level within the courtyard to serve the additional dwellings. However, these spaces would make it difficult for larger vehicles to manoeuvre. In addition, the 3(no) spaces proposed at ground level within the courtyard fall short of the minimum standard for a residential parking space of 2.8m x 5m, in line with BCPG, and would take further space within the internal courtyard/loading area.

As mentioned previously, I have concerns regarding a lack of access to the A1 retail unit via the courtyard and the proposed layout both having implications upon the turning and manoeuvring requirements of refuse and delivery vehicles. A swept path analysis has been submitted in support of the application, but it must be noted that a smaller vehicle has been used within drawing no. 20B (approximately 7.90m in length) in comparison to a larger vehicle demonstrated on the swept path analysis submitted for previous applications pertaining to the implemented development. The Highway Authority would object to any proposal that would result in a vehicle reversing into or out of the current access point onto the highway. Further to this, the space closest to the bin store would greatly impede access to the bins positioned towards the corner of the courtyard.

Mindful of the above, I must recommend this application be refusal for reasons of public and highway safety.

Comments on amended plans: I write further to my comments dated the 2nd November 2018. Since my last response, the applicant has submitted amended plans of the ground floor and rear courtyard area as well as providing additional information via email to support the application.

My comments are given in reference to these plans (drawing no. 02V and 08N) and the further information provided and should be read in conjunction with my aforementioned previous comments for this application.

From assessing the submitted plans it is clear that the applicant has overcome the Highway Authority's previous concerns. Drawing no. 02V demonstrates that the A1 retail unit could now be serviced from the rear courtyard area as originally permitted. This means that delivery vehicles would not need to stop and unload on the highway. Further to this the drawing shows that the 3(no) parking spaces originally proposed have been removed, keeping the courtyard area free from obstruction. This would allow larger vehicles to manoeuvre and allow full access to the bin store.

In regards to the parking provision proposed, the applicant has stated that the 5(no) parking spaces required to serve the 5(no) flats would be accommodated in the basement. Since my first comments dated 11th October, the applicant has clarified that no bays have been formally allocated and that the 24 existing spaces are available to the residents of the 11(no) existing flats. The previous application originally permitted for the 11 flats (14/07003/FUL) provided 24(no) parking spaces when 20(no) were required. Therefore, taking this into consideration I am satisfied that the 4(no) spare spaces and the 1(no) additional space proposed in drawing no. 01G, would be sufficient to serve the 5(no) flats. I would not consider the proposed development to be a highway safety concern as the site is unlikely to displace any parking. Notwithstanding this, the Local Planning Authority may want to consider whether there is amenity issue.

The Highway Authority has no objections to this application.

Conservation Officer

Comments: No objection to the proposed change of use in heritage terms subject to approval of joinery details.

Control of Pollution Environmental Health

Comments: Noise readings have been taken alongside Dean Street, and levels have shown that the site falls within an area exposed to traffic noise.

The internal noise levels should adhere to the levels as stated in BS8233:2014 and all habitable rooms fronting, or that have direct exposure to Dean Street, Chapel Street and Spittal Street will need to include acoustic glazing and mechanical ventilation.

With regards to air quality Wycombe District Council declared new Air Quality Management Areas on 22.12.17 that covers the main arterial roads into High Wycombe town centre, Marlow and the M40. The majority of vehicle movements from the development are likely to pass through the Marlow Air Quality Management Area, being only 10 metres from the edge of such, as Chapel Street and Spittall Street are the nearest arterial roads to the development. It has been identified that the proposed development intends to introduce an additional 4 parking spaces, which also appear to be specifically allocated to the individual flats. 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 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, 4 parking spaces should be provided with an electric vehicle charging point.

County Archaeological Service

Comments: No objection

Representations

The Marlow Society

Comments: The Marlow Society wishes to endorse the response of Mr Putnam.

The planning officer is asked to make it quite clear in the report exactly how the WDC policy for the provision of electric charging points applies to this new application for Windsor House. The parking plan for the basement now differs from the approved layout so must surely require a new approval that is subject to current policies. Bearing in mind that each parking space is to be allocated to a specific flat should not each flat that has an allocated underground space now be provided with one charging point as is currently required under current parking/ planning policy?

Marlow Methodist Church

The finance and property committee has met to discuss the application and wish to advise that we have a key concern relating to the plans submitted and, as such, wish to lodge our objection to the application on the following grounds:

From our interpretation of the planning documents, it would appear that the newly proposed balconies (we understand there is to two) would potentially overlook the church straight into the main hall windows plus also into the meeting room to the rear of the hall. This would represent a safeguarding issue in relation to those using the facilities, many of whom are children.

Whilst not an area to object against, the quantity of parking available seems insufficient for business use. The demands on parking for flat occupants is likely to be greater still. This should be addressed as parking in Marlow is already at a premium.

6 other comments have been received objecting to the proposal:

- Overdevelopment of a site that is already overdeveloped.
- Pedestrian/flat tenants will conflict with early morning and late night deliveries.
- Increased use of access will cause even more danger to other highway users and pedestrians than the approved development.
- Insufficient parking.

- Loss of privacy for neighbouring residents due to increased overlooking.
- Inadequate vehicle manoeuvring space within service yard with car parked there (Officer Note: parking in the service yard has been omitted from the scheme).
- Proposed cycle store should remain as such and not be changed to a bin store, will cause loss of amenity to 8 Kondyke.
- The flats would have a poor living environment exposed to noise from service yard.
- Car parking and site access for delivery and bin collecting vehicles are further contentious issues.
- WDC should require the applicant to resubmit a complete scheme, to enable the revision to be fully understood, and to remove the continuing uncertainty regarding the way the entire building is to be occupied.
- Some support for finding a more suitable use for the first floor space with the potential it provides for much needed under-croft parking.