

19/07233/FUL

Consultations and Notification Responses

Ward Councillor Preliminary Comments

Councillor Marten Clarke

Comments:

This development, increasing the site from 14 to 18 units, is, in my view, an over intensification of the site which was previously two bungalows.

There is insufficient parking with no provision for visitors. There is significant parking stress in the area with on-street parking to deal with overflows from surrounding properties, many of which have no on-site parking.

This development is based on structural and excavation work contrary to the current permission and a subsequently declined retrospective application which is currently subject to approval. The current application should not determine until the outcome of the appeal is known which will advise the determination of this application.

Councillor Ray Farmer

Comments:

If you are minded to approve please bring to committee for determination after a site visit.

Parish/Town Council Comments/Internal and External Consultees

High Wycombe Town Unparished – Ryemead Ward

Control of Pollution Environmental Health

Comments:

Identified Environmental Services issues relevant to Planning:

- Noise from Kingsmead Road effecting future residents
- Air Quality from additional vehicle movements effecting the health of local residents in Air Quality Management Areas within the district and in neighbouring areas.

Conclusion

A noise assessment has been provided with the application that makes adequate recommendations to mitigate any noise impacts on future residents of the development.

With regards to air quality Wycombe District Council declared a new Air Quality Management Area on 22.12.17 that covers the main arterial roads into High Wycombe town centre, Marlow and the M40. This includes the A40 London Road which lies approximately 300m from the proposed development. The majority of vehicle movements from the development are likely to pass through the High Wycombe Air Quality Management Area as the A40 London Road is the nearest arterial road to the development. It has been identified that the proposed development intends to introduce an additional 16 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. 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, 16 parking spaces should be provided with an electric vehicle charging point.

Recommendation

Objection, unless condition imposed.

Buckinghamshire County Council (Major SuDS)

Latest Comments:

The LLFA has no objection to the above proposals subject to the planning conditions recommended below.

I request conditions be placed on the approval of the application, should this be granted by the LPA.

County Highway Authority

Latest comments:

Kingsmead Road is an unclassified residential road that is subject to a 30mph speed restriction with no parking or waiting restriction in place. The road benefits from pedestrian footways and street lighting.

This current application is an alternative scheme to a previous application, reference: 18/07114/FUL. The Highway Authority provided two responses in letters dated 15th October and 29th October 2018. Initially it was considered that insufficient information had been submitted for the Highway Authority to provide a substantive response to the application, additional information was therefore requested. Subsequent to this, the required information was submitted by the applicant, and the Highway Authority had no objections to the proposal, subject to conditions and informative points.

A previous alternative (19/05916/FUL) to the permitted scheme (18/07114/FUL) has also been commented on by the Highway Authority in a letter dated 24th May 2019. The Highway Authority requested amended plans and additional information to be provided in the form of a rearranged bicycle and motorcycle parking provision, and the submission of the previously approved Construction Traffic Management Plan as it was considered to be suitable for the alternative scheme and could therefore be secured by condition at that point in time.

Having assessed the submitted information, I consider the primary differences to planning approval 18/07114/FUL to be:

- A slightly higher quantum of development
- Consequently elevated vehicle trip generation
- Demonstrated parking provision
- The removal of parking provision to the rear of the development (therefore no longer requiring access to and from the rear of the development)

I would expect a dwelling in this location to generate between four to six vehicular movements per day. Therefore the proposals are expected to generate between sixteen and twenty four additional vehicular movements per day compared to the permitted development. The total site trip generation is considered to fall between 72(no) and 108(no) per day.

Additional parking spaces have been demonstrated in the undercroft car parking area. Four parking spaces have been removed from the rear of the development. The trip generation of the additional flats would therefore intensify the use of the access onto Kingsmead Road, which the Highway Authority has previously stated can operate without an unacceptable safety impact upon the public highway. Mindful of the available visibility splays from the site access of at least 2.4 x 43m, and the width of the proposed access, I consider the proposed access capable of safely and conveniently

accommodating these additional vehicular movements.

The amended proposals will result in a lower trip generation from the access onto the public highway onto Spring Lane.

When assessed using the "Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance" policy document for a site within Residential Zone A, the proposed development requires one parking space per unit (in accordance for dwellings with four or less habitable rooms each), which results in a total of 18(no) spaces. The lower ground floor parking area accommodates 19(no) spaces, which is a slight overprovision. However, this total is only acceptable in highway terms should all spaces remain unallocated. Therefore I will recommend the inclusion of a condition that secures this arrangement. It should be noted that, if more than 50% of spaces were to be allocated, the total provision would rise to 22(no) spaces.

Having assessed the amended plans, I can confirm that the currently proposed arrangement also provides sufficient manoeuvring space to the rear of each space to allow vehicles to access each space and to turn within the site.

Mindful of the above, I have no objections to the proposed development, subject to conditions and informative points.

Representations

Comments have been received from 4 interested parties objecting to the proposal:

- Overdevelopment
- Insufficient parking
- Landscaping over the concrete is not sustainable or viable in the long term
- We should wait for decision from Planning Inspector
- Overlooking and overshadowing of properties opposite
- Concerned about rear landscaping
- Will cause further parking problems along Kingsmead Road
- No useable amenity space provided
- Exiting basement would be dangerous with vehicle parked either side
- Developer not complying with Construction Traffic Management Plan