

Consultation Responses and Representations

Councillor Comments

Councillor Wertheim: 'I wish to call in the above planning application regardless of the Officer's recommendation due to:

- Over-development
- Insufficient manoeuvring space in the parking area
- Insufficient space for visitor parking and delivery vehicles especially relevant due to double yellow lines on exterior road
- Lack of privacy on the three offset rear balconies being overlooked by the one above
- Infringement of privacy of amenity space of 100 Packhorse Road, from overlooking by the three rear balconies
- Overlooking/infringement of privacy of some apartments of 38 North park

Parish Council Comments

'Objection: overdevelopment of a narrow plot, parking is inadequate, difficult to manoeuvre in the parking area if all residents are present. Tradesman and visitors nowhere to park, third floor balconies overlook Aspin Lodge behind.'

Response to amended plans:

'Would also support the Historic Buildings Officer's report of 30.09.2020.'

Consultation Responses

Affinity Water:

'You should be aware that the proposed development site is located within an Environment Agency defined groundwater Source Protection Zone (GPZ) corresponding to Gerrards Cross Pumping Station. This is a public water supply, comprising a number of Chalk abstraction boreholes, operated by Affinity Water Ltd.

The construction works and operation of the proposed development site should be done in accordance with the relevant British Standards and Best Management Practices, thereby significantly reducing the groundwater pollution risk. It should be noted that the construction works may exacerbate any existing pollution. If any pollution is found at the site then the appropriate monitoring and remediation methods will need to be undertaken.'

Highways Officer:

'North Park is an unclassified, residential road subject to a 30mph speed limit. This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of five apartments with associated parking.

When considering trip generation, I would expect the proposals to generate in the region of 10- 20 vehicular movements (two-way) per day. I would expect the existing dwelling to generate in the region of 4-6 vehicular movements (two-way) per day. Therefore, the proposals have the potential to generate an additional 14 vehicular movements which I am satisfied can be safely accommodated onto the local highway network. As the site will be subject to an intensification in use, the access will need to be accessed to ensure it is safe and suitable for the additional vehicular movements.

In line with current guidance contained within Manual for Streets, visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m are applicable, commensurate with a 30mph speed limit. I am satisfied that full visibility splays can be achieved in both directions of the access.

I note that the existing access is to be retained which measures 6m in width. I am satisfied that this is of sufficient width to accommodate the proposed development.

Whilst I trust the Local Planning Authority will consider the level of parking proposed, I can confirm that the spaces proposed are of adequate dimensions and allow vehicles to park, manoeuvre and egress in a forward gear. I trust the tandem parking spaces will be allocated to the dwellings so to avoid neighbour disputes.

Mindful of the above, the Highway Authority has no objection to the proposed development.'

Second comments:

'It is noted that the level of housing has not changed when compared to the previous submissions and therefore I remain satisfied that the expected level of vehicular movements can be safely accommodated onto the local highway network.

It appears the existing access is to be closed off and a new access is proposed on the amended plans. As such, I have made an assessment of the safety of the new access. I can confirm that the proposed access is of sufficient width and full visibility splays can be achieved in line with requirements set out in Manual for Streets.

The proposed parking arrangements have also been amended. Whilst I trust you will consider the level of parking proposed, I am satisfied that the spaces are of adequate dimensions and would allow vehicles to park, manoeuvre and egress in a forward gear.

Mindful of the above, I have no objection to the proposed development.'

Environmental Health Officer:

'The historical maps show that the site was partially covered by trees during the 1874-1891 epoch, the site appears to be part of the grounds of Orchehill House, a building is shown overlapping the north west boundary of the site during the 1924-1925 epoch, the site appears to be vacant during the 1961-1971 epoch, the property is shown on the map for the 1960-1976 epoch.

The previous use of the site is unlikely to have given rise to anything more than diffuse anthropogenic contamination.

The proposals do not include any private gardens; a shared amenity space is proposed in the area where the existing residential garden is located. This area is likely to be managed. The risk to future occupants is reduced because occupants are unlikely to be exposed to contaminants of concern that may be present in the underlying soils. The footprint of the building and the hardstanding of the development will break the pathway linking any sources of contamination that may be present beneath the existing building and the receptor.

Based on this, the following condition is recommended on this and any subsequent applications for the site.'

Historic Buildings Officer:

'Located just off Packhorse Road, the main road to Gerrards Cross; Clavering is the second house on the south side of North Park lies on the boundaries of what were previously two local authorities and two conservation areas; designated heritage assets. Within the former Chiltern District Council area, the North Park and Kingsway conservation area boundary lies immediately to the east of the site and within the former South Bucks Councils area, the Gerrards Cross Centenary CA boundary lies to the south and east (on the far side of Packhorse Lane), and partly abutting the North Park CA boundary. The site also lies within the 'Established residential area of special character'; Policy H4 of the local Plan. The North Park and Kingsway Conservation area document identifies the character of the area and in para 3.2 and 3.3 and in North Park in particular, the domination of large mature trees and hedges between and fronting secluded front gardens, through which the early 20th century 'Metroland'; mainly vernacular style, large detached houses can be glimpsed. Details mentioned in the document include pebble dashed walls, black painted timber framed gables, steeply sloping roofs with substantial chimney stacks, windows with leaded lights or small rectangular panes, and often with dominant staircase windows. No 42 North Park; immediately to the east of this site and within the conservation is an individually designed house. It has a two timber framed front gables, including an unusual tall, narrow three storey front gable set close to the western boundary with this site.

Clavering, the existing house on the site dates from the latter half of the 20th century, it has two stories with a steeply pitched roof, set well back behind a large front garden and the two storey element is separated from the conservation area boundary and no 42 by a low flat roofed garage, which enables the vegetation on the boundary and the trees beyond to be viewed, providing an open, suburban feel on the approach to the conservation area. The scale and design of the house has a neutral impact on the setting of the conservation, but provides a good transition on the edge of the conservation area.

The proposal;

It is proposed to demolish Clavering and replace it with block of flats of two and a half stories, which will be of a similar height to the unique, tall narrow three storey gable of No 42 to the east due to the scale of the accommodation, and significantly taller than the Clavering. The huge new block would fill most of the width of the plot, blocking views of the trees beyond within the conservation area. The bulky building would have a large flat roof, and very deep flank walls with openings not matching those on the front elevation, and large flat roofed extensions and patios on three stories at the rear. The proposed front elevation would, apart from the scale of the development, be dominated by the huge patio door openings and balconies which emphasise the incongruity of the building in this sensitive setting. The proposed car ports, bin store, cycle store, hard surfacing and parking in the front garden would transform the green suburban space into a hard surfaced urban car park, dominated by paving, fenced enclosures and car ports. No scaled in situ elevations have been provided to show how the proposed new structure would fit into the streetscene. However, from the details provided, the proposed scale, mass and design of the new block of flats and the development in the front garden; all of which have none of the identified characteristics of the conservation area, would result in an alien development which would dominate the approach into to the conservation area, causing harm to the setting of the designated heritage asset.

Relevant legislation, policies and guidance;

The Council has had paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area, as required under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Furthermore, the application has been considered on the basis of the Chiltern District Council adopted local plan.

NPPF -Part 12 and Part 16 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment paras 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 196,

Historic England Guidance; Setting of Heritage Assets 2011, Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment- 2015, and Making Changes to Heritage Assets- 2016

CONCLUSION:

It is considered that the demolition and proposed new development cause 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of the designated heritage asset and its setting, and no public benefit to balance that harm has been identified; contrary to paragraphs 196 of the NPPF and policies LB1 and LB 2 of the Local Plan and the 1990 Act. I would support refusal of this application on these grounds.'

Second comments:

Amended plans have not overcome the previous concerns.

Natural England:

'It is Natural England's view that the planning authority will not be able to ascertain that this proposed development as it is currently submitted would not adversely affect the integrity of the SAC. In combination with other plans and projects, the development would be likely to contribute to a deterioration of the quality of the habitat by reason of increased access to the site including access for general recreation and dog-walking. There being alternative solutions to the proposal and there being no imperative reasons of overriding public interest to allow the proposal, despite a negative assessment, the proposal will not pass the tests of Regulation 62.'

Tree and Landscaping Officer:

'There are now further amended plans showing further changes to the proposed building and parking area.

The Site Plan Rev G now shows a central access point to the site with parking spaces on both sides. This shows the hardstanding areas no closer to the purple-leaved plum T2 and the cherry T3 than the existing drive and as the car ports have been removed there would no conflict with the canopy of the trees. Consequently, this arrangement should not increase any damage to these trees.

The positions of the bin store and the cycle store have been revised so that they are now adjacent to the side boundary adjacent to No 38 North Park and would require some hedge loss. This hedge has not been described in the tree survey but Bing Birdseye suggests it could consist of mixed shrubs about 2m in height.

The footprint of the proposed building is similar to the earlier proposals but it has now moved slightly further back closer to the retained trees in the rear garden. It appears that the building would now encroach slightly into the root protection area of T15, an Atlantic cedar about 15m in height that has been classified as Category B in the tree survey. This movement would increase the risk of damage to the tree during construction and also increase the pressure from future residents for tree work for safety, light and debris reasons. Furthermore, as the size of the amenity area behind the building decreases the proportion of the amenity area shaded by trees would increase.

It should also be noted that the sizes of the tree canopies and the heights of the trees shown on the Site Plan are considerably smaller than the measured sizes shown on the tree plans.

In addition, I note that there have been no revised versions of any of the tree reports that relate to the proposed changes. The Tree Protection Plan in particular would need to be revised.

Overall the proposed changes to the parking layout should result in slightly less impact on the purpleleaved plum T2 and the cherry T3 but other changes would involve some hedge loss and greater pressure on the rear garden trees. Nonetheless, I would not object to the application provided there is adequate protection for the retained trees including a revised Tree Protection Plan.'

Waste Officer:

'Waste services note the proposal for 5 apartments at Clavering, 40 North Park. We are satisfied with the bin store location, however the bin store may need to be extended to hold the following containers; 1x 1100L Refuse Bin, 1x 1100L Mix Recycling Bin, 1x 360L Paper Bin & 5x 23L Food Caddies. Collection teams will stop on North Park, empty the bins and will return them to their original location at the bin store. All collections to take place in accordance with council policies.'

Representations

Five comments have been received objecting to the proposal:

- Overdevelopment
- Increase in noise and traffic pollution
- Concern regarding increase in traffic
- Insufficient parking
- Increased congestion
- Undesirable frontage
- Out of keeping with Conservation Area
- Oversized dormers
- High and bulky roofline
- Loss of privacy
- Overlooking balconies
- No parking provision for visitors, tradesmen or delivery vehicles
- Increase in overshadowing

Seven comments have been received objecting to the proposal, in relation to the original plans:

- Overdevelopment
- Overshadowing of neighbouring buildings
- Disruption to front facing bedrooms at No. 42 North Park
- Loss of light
- Loss of sunlight and incremental weather affecting parking at Aspin Lodge
- Balconies will look into Aspin Lodge
- Size of proposed windows is intrusive
- Limited landscaping
- Inadequate parking
- Insufficient manoeuvrability within the site
- Insufficient visitor parking space
- Concern regarding highway safety

- Concern regarding increase in overspill parking onto already congested roads
- Concerns regarding access of waste and recycling vehicles

APPENDIX B: Site Location Plan



Do not scale – this map is indicative only

Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office © Crown Copyright 2012. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Buckinghamshire Council, PSMA Licence Number 100023578