

CHEPPING WYCOMBE PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING MEETING

Report of the Planning Meeting held on **12 July 2022** at **10.00am** via Microsoft Teams

The meeting is open to members of the public and press

Cllr C Dodds acted as chairman of the meeting.

Attendees: Cllr C Jordan, Cllr R Wilks, Cllr K Wood, Cllr S Herron, Cllr A Barron, Cllr H Darch

1. **Apologies for Absence**
Cllr I Forbes, Cllr J Herschel, Cllr S Digby
2. **Declarations of Interest and Code of Conduct**
none
3. **Applications for consideration**

WDC Reference	Property Address	Proposal	Comment
22/05868	13 River View Flackwell Heath Bucks HP10 9AT	Householder application for raising of roof and roof alterations to create first floor living accommodation with external openings and construction of single storey detached outbuilding for use as office, gym and shed	CWPC has no objection but we request that the outbuilding is no closer than 1.8m from the boundary with 14 River View.
22/06409	1 Bracken Way Flackwell Heath Bucks HP10 9JX	Householder application for erection of single storey front and single storey rear extensions	No comment
22/06449	8 Chilterns Close Flackwell Heath Bucks HP10 9BB	Householder application for construction of front porch, single storey side extension and conversion of garage to living accommodation	CWPC has no objection but we note that a tree is being removed to the side of the property. We request that a replacement is planted elsewhere.
22/06485	Gomm Valley, Ashwells Reserve Site & Pimms Grove Cock Lane High Wycombe Bucks	Hybrid planning application for phased delivery consisting of detailed planning application for construction of 110 dwellings including associated vehicular access, areas of open space, ecological enhancements, hard and soft landscaping, and associated infrastructure. Outline application for access for 5 self-build dwellings within Parcel 1 and up to 489 dwellings, a 1 form-entry primary school and early years provision, up to 1.4 hectares of employment land to provide flexible floorspace of Class E(g), B2 and B8 uses and up to 201sqm of community floorspace (Class F2) within Parcels 2-8 together with ecological enhancements, green open spaces, hard and soft landscaping and associated highways and drainage infrastructure (with matters of appearance, layout, landscaping and scale reserved)	see end of report
22/06470	16 Chapman Lane Flackwell Heath Bucks HP10 9AZ	Householder application for construction of part two/part single storey side/rear extension with fenestration and internal alterations following demolition of existing garage	No comment other than the parking arrangement needs to be reviewed in relation to the visual splays.
22/06576	The Old Rectory Church Road Tylers Green Bucks HP10 8EG	Reduce top by 3-4 metres x 1 Scots Pine (T1)	Any works to be carried out only with the full approval of the Bucks Council Wycombe Area's tree consultant.

22/06679	Widmer Pond Cottage Bank Road Tylers Green Bucks HP10 8LA	Reduce height of 1 x Hawthorn and 1 x Hazel to fence line height	Any works to be carried out only with the full approval of the Bucks Council Wycombe Area's tree consultant.
22/06510	31 Kings Ride Tylers Green Bucks HP10 8BJ	Householder application for construction of single storey rear extension and internal alterations	No comment
22/06498	Land At Burleighfield House London Road Loudwater Bucks HP10 9RF	Residential development comprising 3 dwellings with bin/cycle stores and associated hard and soft landscaping	No comment
22/06517	13 - 27 Thanstead Copse Loudwater Bucks HP10 9YH	Cut back lower branches up to a height of 3m above ground level to the Willows along footpath between numbers 13-27 Thanstead Copse	Any works to be carried out only with the full approval of the Bucks Council Wycombe Area's tree consultant.

The chairman thanked members for their attendance and closed the meeting at 10.30.

Gomm Valley Hybrid Planning Application Ref 22/06485/OUTEA/FUL

CWPC objects to this application

We would like to put on record that we invited the applicant to meet with us to present their application but they only wished us to initially forward any questions we had which they would provide answers to as they could not bring the whole team to a meeting. As they prevaricated so long and we considered that any presentation would in itself produce the questions, this never happened. Not only because of this but in response to local concerns we consider that insufficient local consultation has taken place on this application which is contrary to the NPPF.

Having reviewed and discussed this application we share the concerns of local residents and groups regarding this application wholeheartedly. This application should comply, but does not, with policies set out in the Local Plan (LP Policy HW6) and the Development Brief (DB) which is of 'material' consideration. The DB is the result of an extensive process over several years by the Liaison Group which comprised local groups, Councillors and residents and officers of the Council and also represents what Councillors at the former Wycombe District Cabinet approved. It therefore carries considerable weight and should not be ignored. The application must also take account of the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and other SPD's, together with other national policy documents, i.e. the National Design Guide (NDG) and the National Model Design Code (NMDC).

We were very disappointed to see a hybrid application which we consider to be against the DB's requirements for "any planning application to provide a comprehensive strategy for all developed and undeveloped areas, which must include a phased delivery plan and full management costs for a minimum of 25 years" (DB P48).

We are against approving Phase 1 in isolation as it is totally against the requirements of the DB and will set a precedent which will impact on the entire development and is more likely to lead to a repetition of the poor design and quality of this phase rather than an improvement.

The application in Phase 1 falls far short of design standards set by national guidance and should be refused without further information regarding the rest of the site and how it fits in with the whole development.

The lack of the road connection from Phase 1 with the rest of the development is a concern and against the DB. However even if this were remedied as we believe may be the intention, the extra access onto Hammersley Lane is a dangerous proposal for road and site users. We are already aware of issues with traffic along this area and difficulties of exiting Hammersley Lane onto the A40 in peak hours and having this as the only option for Phase 1 will exacerbate this enormously. Traffic from the site will be trying to turn right onto a busy road.

The access roads indicated on the Phase 1 layout are not connected to the southern end of the Spine Road and serve only the Parcel 1 development and is in breach of DFO 2. With no vehicle connection through to the Spine Road, all the traffic generated by Parcel 1 will have to exit on to Hammersley Lane. We are greatly concerned about safety and congestion this will cause both in the building phase and once built and adding an extra exit for the planned cul-de-sac will only serve to exacerbate this and should not be allowed. In addition, it will affect the green shoulders of this site which the DB states should be preserved. "A lower access point closer to the railway line would be preferable to avoid the prominent eastern valley shoulder" (DB p 15).

We understand the intention may be to join up this phase at the lower end with the spine road but even if this were to happen the extra entrance into Hammersley from the cul-de-sac will be extremely dangerous to road users and against the DB. If it is the intention to connect Phase 1 to the spine road then this should be done first before any other building is started to remove construction traffic from trying to traverse the steepness of Hammersley Lane.

Furthermore we maintain the following issues need to be addressed and remedied:

- The application contains fundamental deviations from the DB, in the amount of land taken up for development and the number of houses in total far exceeds the agreed number in the LP plan and the DB;
- The Phase 1 full application site area is too large as it is nearly 3 times that defined by the DB;
- The parcel closest to Tylers Green is also much larger than that defined by the DB;
- We acknowledge that Parcel 9 has been removed but the gap with TG boundary to avoid coalescence is much less than the required 200m. The 200m gap defined in the DB was to be measured from the boundary of Tylers Green - taking the boundary of Chepping Wycombe Parish as the start point.
- The proposals for Phase 1 fail to recognise the 'shoulder' areas of the site which are detailed in the DB and must be preserved as "discernible features of the site and contribute positively to the green backdrop setting of the town" (DB p 23) and also to preserve coalescence with and outlook from existing properties on Hammersley Lane.

The application uses the housing layouts of the adjacent residential areas as its reference point. This contradicts the DB which states that to "avoid perpetuating this unsatisfactory response" development needs to minimise and mitigate impact on townscape and views (DBP53). Furthermore, housing built in this N-S pattern results in E-W facing houses, contrary to solar design principles (DB 5.4.1). The DB also states that front doors and active frontages should go onto the spine road and other streets.

There is little recognition in this application of national government guidelines on design quality and the requirements of the DB. Design proposals for apartment buildings fail to respond to DB for the adoption of contemporary architectural construction methods and forms to reduce building heights and impact on views.

This application shows no commitment to provide a development which is committed to climate change provisions and to be 'net-zero ready', based on the Climate Emergency Design Guide. The DB provisions for green roofs and unobtrusive solar panels is ignored and also requires development to deliver a minimum 15% reduction on site through the use of decentralised and renewable or low carbon sources (DB P 74). There is no provision for photovoltaics, and high insulation should be provided. We strongly object to the use of Gas Boilers. This should be a development to take account of climate change not totally ignore it.

There is a complete failure to commit to the requirements of the LP and the DB to provide a management framework for long-term stewardship of the management of the undeveloped areas, in perpetuity under the creation of a trust.

This application completely misses the opportunity to create a high quality, sensitive development fit for the future. The design and layout is not imaginative, does not respond to the challenging topography of the site and does not achieve a bespoke architectural response. It does not deliver the opportunities for exceptional architecture and completely misses providing a sense of place or community. All requirements from The Vision in the development brief. The clear strategy of the development brief has been ignored and the Parish because of that and all the other reasons in this response therefore request that this application is refused to enable an application more in accordance with the DB to be put forward.