

## **Appendix A – Consultation Responses and Representations**

**18/06915/FUL**

### **Consultation Responses and Representations**

#### **Councillor Comments**

##### **Councillor Miss Katrina Wood**

Comments: There are many local concerns that this would be an overdevelopment of this site and the entrance is too narrow to support 2 properties especially with the bus stop located at this entrance and concerns for emergency vehicle access. If officers are minded to approve this application then I would request it be brought before the planning committee for a full discussion

Further Comments: I still have concerns regarding this application and would still request that if officers are minded to approve that it be brought before the planning committee for a decision

#### **Parish/Town Council Comments**

##### **Chepping Wycombe Parish Council**

Comments: We have considerable concerns regarding this application particularly as the documentation appears to have a number of inconsistencies. On first reading the application appears to be for a backland development of 2 x 3 bed detached houses however when looking at the documentation, Drawing Nos: GR/002/18 and GR/003/18 show the first floor with 4 habitable rooms albeit one being labelled as a study with a built in wardrobe.

In our opinion any habitable room on the first floor would normally be considered for use as a bedroom and it would be impossible to enforce otherwise. Furthermore the Design and Access Statement on page 2 states that the housing mix is 2 x 4-bed detached dwellings confirming this opinion. The current adopted parking standards clearly state that 4 bed properties require the provision of 3 parking spaces hence there is a deficit of parking provision shown on the Site Plan Drawing No GR/001/18. Also on page 2 of the Design and Access statement we notice in brackets 'including provision for future construction of two garages' but we can not see any positioning for these in the documentation provided.

We would point out that as there appears to be no provision for cycles or other residential paraphernalia such as gardening equipment that these would be stored in any garages provided and hence these would not be used for the parking of vehicles. We also note the absence of such storage for Rosalie itself within this scheme. With the bus stop outside Rosalie any overspill parking on this stretch of Kingsmead Road would be highly undesirable and indeed dangerous.

The Application Form Point 7 states that the plans do not incorporate areas to facilitate the storage and collection of waste and recyclable waste although the Design and Access Statement on page 6 under Access clearly states a bin collection point will be provided at the entrance to the site but this does not appear to be shown in the documentation. Given the number of waste/recycling bins provided for use in this area for 3 properties, as Rosalie would also require this facility, the space required is of some significance and should be shown especially as it is stated that this is necessary to eliminate the need for a turning head for vehicles such as those used for waste collection on site.

Clearly as a turning head is not being provided emergency service vehicles also would not be able to enter the site and would have to operate from Kingsmead Road as the access would not be sufficiently wide to allow entrance. It is proposed to use the existing access, driveway and space alongside the existing dwelling as the access route to the proposed backland development, presumably the existing garage being removed.

We would comment that the occupants of Rosalie would be subjected to vehicular noise and fumes 24/7 right up to the side wall of the dwelling and also light pollution during the hours of darkness. We should appreciate the Highway Authority looking carefully to ascertain the suitability of the access and whether it meets required standards especially due to the bus stop being in such close proximity.

The built form of the backland development almost fills the width of the site and this would be visible from Kingsmead Road due to it being 2 storey and the retained dwelling single, also the topography of the site will contribute to this as it slopes up from Kingsmead Road.

This would be out of character for the area giving a cramped appearance. Also we would be concerned that a precedent could be established with other properties applying for backland developments as in the past, although these have been refused at local and appeal levels.

Due to the topography of the site the rear gardens of the proposed dwellings would be terraced as shown by the retaining wall on the Site Plan. This would make these more difficult to maintain and reduce their value as amenity space.

Also the hardstanding in front of the proposed dwellings is very sterile and with only vehicles to look out on very unattractive, we would have wished to see some form of landscaping. In conclusion from the points we have raised we consider this development would give a cramped appearance behind the retained dwelling and also given the lack of parking provision and onsite storage facilities this is clearly an overdevelopment of the site.

### Consultation Responses

#### **Highway Authority**

Comments: The proposed dwellings (and rearranged parking provision for the existing dwelling) will be served via the site's existing access point. I note that the private access way is just short of 4m in width, which will require the existing access within the highway to be widened and upgraded to 4.1m and feature radii respectively. However, this can be controlled by condition (in addition to the relocation of the speed cushions on Kingsmead Road).

Given the quantum of development, refuse and recycling collection will take place via kerbside collection. Although this would result in haul distances for residents being slightly beyond those recommended by Schedule 1 of Part H of the Building Regulations (2000), it would appear that this would not be too far removed from the existing bin storage location for Rosalie.

In terms of parking, the site lies within Zone B (as defined by the County Council's *Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance* policy document) and the proposed dwellings feature six habitable rooms each. As a result, the optimum parking provision for each dwelling is two spaces, which have been provided and benefit from an excess of forward manoeuvring provision.

Mindful of these comments, I do not have any objections to recommend for this application with regard to highway issues subject to conditions.

### **Lead Local Flood Authority**

Initial Comments: Based on the information provided, the Strategic Flood Management Team at Buckinghamshire County Council **objects** to the proposed development.

### Flood risk

The groundwater level in the location of the proposed development is shown to be less than 0.025m the ground surface for a 1 in 100 year return period (Jeremy Benn Associates, 2016).

### Surface water drainage

The above application requires further detail regarding surface water management. From the information provided within the planning application documents submitted online, we consider that this is not sufficient in meeting our requirements to complete a SuDS Appraisal.

We request that the applicant visit our [website](#), where our requirements are clearly stated. Useful documents which can be found there are our Developer Pack and [SuDS checklist](#), as well as links to other guidance documents and websites. Our website also contains our Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (LFRMS) and Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA) which are strategically important documents that should be reviewed.

Please take this letter as a formal request for information regarding management of surface water in the form of a comprehensive Drainage Strategy and accompanying Drainage Statement.

### Further Comments:

Buckinghamshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) has reviewed the information provided in the following documents listed below:

- Soakaway Report (IMW230235m 2nd January 2020, RainWater Harvesting)
- Email Correspondence from applicant containing supporting photographs (7th January 2020)
- Percolation Test Results sheet (28th December 2019)
- Updated drainage layout (Proposed position approx.)
- Additional supporting photographs
- Test pit location

The LLFA **has no objection** to the proposed development **subject to the following condition listed below**.

The following matters were highlighted as outstanding within the LLFA's previous consultee letter (3rd December 2019):

Ground investigations including:

- Indication of groundwater levels
- Infiltration rate testing in accordance with Building Regulations 2010 Part H2
- Provision of a separate drainage system for each property,
- Updated calculations based on the infiltration rate derived during infiltration rate testing

### *Ground investigations*

Ground investigations have been conducted and detail has been provided to demonstrate that an infiltration based approach to surface water management is viable for the proposed development.

### *Calculations*

The proposed drainage scheme has been designed to contain the 1 in 100 year +40% climate change storm event. The LLFA would like to note that within the MicroDrainage calculations for the soakaways, the 'Infiltration Coefficient Base' has been assigned a value of 0.58442m/hr. It should be noted that this value should be set as 0.00 m/hr to account for the silting up of the infiltration device over time (section 25.4 CIRIA SuDS Manual, 2015). The applicant is required to provide updated calculations to be reflective of this change.

### *Drainage Layout*

The applicant has revised the drainage layout to provide a separate drainage system for each property, the LLFA request that the applicant demonstrates that there is at least a 5m buffer distance between the proposed soakaways, this is in accordance with best practice (The Kent Design Guide Making it Happen – Sustainability) .

At the detailed design stage of the planning process the applicant is required to provide an updated drainage layout which is inclusive of pipe sizes and gradients along with the storage volumes and sizes of all SuDS components. If the soakaway volumes are to change following the updated calculations, the layout must be updated accordingly. Details of the proposed overland flood flow routes in the event of system exceedance or failure as also required; this can be shown in the form of directional arrows on a site layout based upon the topographical site levels.

The LLFA would like to note that further information is required in regards to how surface water runoff generated by the proposed "parking spaces for Rosalie" will be managed. We would advise that all hardstanding areas of the proposed development are designed to be permeable.

### **Maintenance**

The applicant is required to provide a maintenance schedule for the proposed drainage system, this must include the maintenance activities required and the frequency in which these will be undertaken. The applicant must also provide details of who will be responsible for carrying out these maintenance activities.

### **Construction Details**

The applicant is required to provide construction details of all SuDS and drainage components, this should include cross-sectional detail.

We would request the following condition be placed on the approval of the application, should this be granted by the LPA:

### **Condition 1**

Development shall not begin until a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme shall also include:

- Drainage layout detailing the connectivity between the dwellings and the drainage components, showing pipe numbers, gradients and sizes, complete together with storage volumes of all SuDS components.
- This drawing should include flow direction for exceedance routes
- Demonstration of a 5m buffer distance between the two soakaways
- Further detail on how surface water runoff generated by the proposed “parking spaces for Rosalie” will be managed,
- Updated calculations to set the “infiltration coefficient base” to 0.00m/hr,
- Construction details of all SuDS components,
- Details of how and when the full drainage system will be maintained, this should also include details of who will be responsible for the maintenance,

#### Reason

The reason for this pre-start condition is to ensure that a sustainable drainage strategy has been agreed prior to construction in accordance with Paragraph 163 of the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that there is a satisfactory solution to managing flood risk

#### Representations

Seven objections received raising the following concerns:

- Overdevelopment of the site, to the detriment of the character of the area.
- Buildings not in keeping with existing properties.
- Frontage dominated by hardstanding.
- Inadequate parking provision will lead to displaced parking on Kingsmead Road.
- Access too narrow for deliveries, emergency vehicles etc.
- Dangerous location of access due to bus stop.
- Overlooking of neighbouring properties.
- Storage of waster has not been satisfactorily addressed.
- Loss of boundary hedge and damage to wildlife.
- Loss of mature trees at top of site.
- Damage to neighbouring boundary.
- Increased risk of flooding.
- Building to be removed has asbestos roof.
- Introduction of soakaways could undermine neighbouring properties