

19/07419/FUL

Consultations and Notification Responses

Ward Councillor Preliminary Comments

Councillor A D Collingwood

Comment: Having read Mr Putnam reason for refusal I support his request for refusal. If minded to approve please take this to committee.

Parish/Town Council Comments/Internal and External Consultees

Marlow Town Council

Comments: Objection ' the proposed parking would appear to conflict with manoeuvring of delivery vehicles and waste collection

County Highway Authority

Comments: You will recall that the Highway Authority commented upon a scheme to achieve a similar development at this site (application 19/06331/FUL) within a letter dated 12th June 2019. The following is an extract from that consultation response:

Having reviewed the proposals I note that the existing goods in entrance and loading area would be relocated to the adjacent outer wall of the retail unit in order to accommodate the proposed residential unit and private courtyard space. A parking space within the rear courtyard area is also proposed.

I have concerns regarding the revised layout of the rear courtyard having implications upon both the turning and manoeuvring requirements of refuse and delivery vehicles within the rear courtyard. 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. 20D (approximately 7.28m in length) in comparison to a larger vehicle demonstrated on the swept path analysis submitted for previous applications pertaining to the implemented development. Furthermore, having crossed referenced drawing no. 20D with the aforementioned tracking plans it is evident that the proposed private courtyard area and parking space would greatly reduce the amount of manoeuvring space and would impede a larger vehicle from turning. 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.

In addition, the parking space proposed at ground level within the courtyard falls short of the minimum standard for a residential parking space of 2.8m x 5m, in line with Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance (BCPG) and would take up further space within the internal courtyard/loading area. Providing a parking space in this area may also set a precedent for other vehicles to do the same and further limit the turning space available.

I also have concerns in regards to the revised basement parking. Whilst the layout would still provide 25 parking spaces, unlike the layout permitted as part of application no. 18/07247/FUL, the supporting pillars would protrude into a number of parking spaces.

The Highway Authority previously recognised that the dimensions of the basement parking did not meet current standards as contained within the BCPG but acknowledge that the original application was reviewed and determined prior to the publication of this policy document. However, the Highway Authority would not allow the size of the spaces to be further compromised by the currently proposed basement configuration.

It should be noted that the Highway Authority previously objected to the proposals for 6(no) residential units before a revised scheme was submitted proposing 5(no) units as part of application no. 18/07247/FUL. One of the primary reasons for this objection was due to the lack of turning and manoeuvring space caused as a result of proposed parking within the courtyard; the proposed alterations to the rear courtyard in this application pose the same problem and conflict with condition 4 of application no. 18/07247/FUL which was specifically included to prevent parking in

the courtyard area and stop any alterations to layout in order to afford optimum turning and manoeuvring space.

The response then went on to recommend refusal of the application on two grounds; one on the inadequate provision of space afforded within the site for the type of vehicle likely to service the residential flats and retail unit, and another based upon the inadequate dimensions of the car parking space in the service yard. Both reasons were eventually taken forward to refuse the application, as well as one formulated by the Local Planning Authority based upon the rear manoeuvring area limiting vehicle size and consequently limiting the attractiveness of the retail unit for future occupiers.

The current application demonstrates a 10m delivery vehicle entering the site, turning, manoeuvring parallel to the rear of the retail unit wall and then being in a position to exit the site in a forward gear. In order to facilitate this, the ground level parking spaces have since been reduced and there are now only three refuse/recycling stores.

Looking back to the original planning application for the redevelopment of the Windsor House site, a swept path analysis for a 10m rigid delivery vehicle was submitted, which showed ingress in to what is now designated as an amenity area for the proposed flat. However, this drawing shows two spaces adjacent to the site boundary with the rear of Cherry Tree House, which no longer feature in the current layout (and were not included as part of the site plan upon which the Local Planning Authority determined application 14/07003/FUL).

Looking at the current application, the car park space (which now meets the required 2.8m x 5m dimensions) has been relocated and the amount of bin stores in the courtyard have been reduced from 5(no) to 3(no), with two stores relocated to the rear of the site.

I fully realise that the manoeuvres required for 10m rigid delivery vehicles to enter the site, turn within the courtyard, unload/load and then re-enter the highway in a forward gear leave little room for error. Nonetheless the submissions before me demonstrate that, when driven in a correct manner, such a vehicle can physically conduct these activities and I am therefore not in a position to support or sustain an objection on highway grounds.

Finally, I would support any condition that the Local Planning Authority deem reasonable that would require the erection of signage demonstrating that the courtyard area was only for goods vehicle use, access to the basement car parking area and authorised parking within the singular designated space. This should support the condition I recommend is attached to any permission that you may issue.

Control of Pollution Environmental Health

Comments: I have no objection to this application.

Representations

Marlow Society

- Salami slicing approach of introducing integrative change unacceptable.
- Object to the Council's currently parking requirements being applied to the development approved at Windsor House. Should stick to parking levels agreed in the original approval.

2 comments have been received objecting to the proposal:

- Lack of on-site manoeuvring space for service vehicles
- Drivers will not be able to tell if there is adequate space to turn until already committed to entering the service yard
- Tracking plan ICENI drg 001 differs from approved plan ICENI drg 17B which is not explained
- Proposed parking space would leave no margin for error and presents an unacceptable obstacle to manoeuvring a vehicle encouraging reversing of vehicles.
- Sets unwelcome precedent for other vehicle to park within the courtyard.