

**18/08264/FUL**

## **Consultations and Notification Responses**

### **Ward Councillor Preliminary Comments**

**Councillor Alan Turner:** Due to local unease, the extensive levelling works proposed and proposed change to materials, if officers are minded to approve, this application should be referred to the Planning Committee

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

#### **Princes Risborough Town Council**

Comments: The Princes Risborough Town Council objects strongly to this application as it considers the proposal to be a vast overdevelopment in an AONB and Greenbelt area and not in keeping with the existing properties in the area.

#### **County Highway Authority**

Comments: Upper Icknield Way is an unclassified residential road with a 30mph speed limit and no parking or waiting restrictions. Within the vicinity of the site there are no pedestrian walkways and no street lighting. The current site is withdrawn from the road and gains access to Upper Icknield Way through two long accesses around a neighbouring property which fronts the street.

The proposed development will not create a material intensification of these accesses which are proposed to serve one property each. Both properties also provide optimal parking requirement and manoeuvring within the site curtilage. As such the development will not have a detrimental impact upon highway safety and convenience.

I note that the garages do not meet the required dimensions of 6 x 3 metres per space due to their length, and therefore are not considered to contribute towards the parking provision within the site curtilage.

Mindful of the above, I have no objections to the proposed application subject to the following conditions:

**Condition 1:** Prior to occupation of the development space shall be laid out within the site for parking for four cars and manoeuvring per plot, in accordance with the approved plans. This area shall be permanently maintained for this purpose.

**Reason:** To enable vehicles to draw off, park and turn clear of the highway to minimise danger, obstruction and inconvenience to users of the adjoining highway.

#### **Informative Point:**

- It is an offence under S151 of the Highways Act 1980 for vehicles leaving the development site to carry mud onto the public highway. Facilities should therefore be provided and used on the development site for cleaning the wheels of vehicles before they leave the site.

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

Comments: The County LLFA objects to this proposal on the grounds that a detailed surface water drainage scheme has not been submitted.

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

Comments: No objection

### **County Archaeological Service**

Comments: No objection subject to a planning condition requiring a programme of archaeological investigations.

### **Arboriculture Spatial Planning**

Comments: The previously permitted scheme included a condition that an AMS be submitted. As this does not appear to have been done and so we do not know if the scheme included the removal of trees. The current scheme shows the removal of 5 category B trees, including a section of a prominent pine group along the north boundary. It is not clear why the trees need to be removed. Erosion of this prominent feature to facilitate development is not supported. TPO considered. The area of hardstanding that sits within the RPA of retained trees will likely require a no-dig construction. The submitted arb details give a preliminary methodology but requesting greater detail is recommended.

### **Conservation Officer Spatial Planning**

Comments: I query why render and Cotswold stone dressing have been proposed for these dwellings as they are not locally-distinctive and increase the prominence of the dwellings. I recommend that a local Bucks red multi is substituted for the render which would help ensure the buildings blend better in this rural context.

### Representations

Objections have been received from neighbouring residents and the Whiteleaf Golf Club. The grounds of objection include:

- Inappropriate use of Cotswold stone in the AONB
- Removal of trees, which provide protection from stray golf balls
- Inappropriate development in the Green Belt. No very special circumstances have been produced for this application.
- Undesirable precedent for other similar developments – such as development now proposed at Beechcroft
- If existing house is retained, application site could have three dwellings on it.
- Level changes across site could result in water run-off onto neighbouring property at Compton
- Adverse effect upon archaeological assets
- Increase number of windows will result in overlooking and loss of privacy to Compton.
- Proposed chimney for wood burning stove could adversely affect Compton.
- Residents at Long Fortin have a legal right of access over driveway
- Comments made regarding a different planning application (are irrelevant to the consideration of this application)