

**19/06544/FUL**

## **Consultations and Notification Responses**

### **Ward Councillor Preliminary Comments**

#### **Councillor Steve Broadbent**

Given the proposed change of use, the implications this would potentially have and the significant concern this application has raised locally I would like to request that the case be referred to planning committee should you be minded to approve.

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

#### **Hughenden Parish Council**

The parish council strongly objects to this application because it is totally inappropriate development in Green Belt AONB (GB2). This may set a dangerous precedent in the immediate area for inappropriate development. The parish council insist that this application is considered by the WDC Planning Committee and not decided by delegated authority.

#### **County Highway Authority**

In line with the policy objectives of the NPPF, the Highway Authority is looking to limit developments that are largely or solely reliant on the private car. Mindful of the aforementioned decision by the Planning Inspectorate, I recommend that the application is refused on highway grounds for the following reason:

**Reason 1:** The location of the site is such that it has only limited access by non-car modes of travel. The absence of adequate infrastructure and the sites remoteness from major built up areas is such that it is likely to be reliant on the use of the private car contrary to local and national transport policy. The development is contrary to Policy CS20 (Transport and Infrastructure) of the Wycombe Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted July 2008), the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) and the Buckinghamshire County Council Highways Development Management Guidance document (adopted July 2018).

#### **Arboriculture Spatial Planning**

No arb details have been submitted therefore comments may need revising. Proposed plans appear to show that the scale and levels of the area proposed for bedroom 1 remain unchanged. If this is correct, there is no need for specialist foundations to ensure the long term retention of the TPO'd beech. However, existing underground services have been shown for removal on the proposed plans. This may have an impact on the TPO'd tree, as may any changes to the surface of the hardstanding. If the hardstanding is being changed, it should be designed with the tree in mind. It should be permeable and designed to minimise compaction. It is not known whether any additional underground services are planned within the RPA. If any crown lifting is required to allow access for construction vehicles, this should be set out in an AMS.AIA, TPP and AMS recommended.

### **Representations** 10 received

Many concerns were received.

- Its inappropriate development
- It sets a precedent for development
- The application does not include any information on the TPO's tree
- What is the field adjacent to the site proposed to be used for?
- Concerns that further development will be carried out on the field
- This seems like a piecemeal application
- The site is adjacent to a footpath
- There is no regular bus service to the area.