

MINUTES PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday 15th February 2021, 7.00pm
Held remotely by Zoom

Present: Cllrs Mr. Hoare, Mr. O’Hanlon, Ms. Poole Mr. Sharp, Mr. Truesdale Chair and Mr Young.
Bucks Cllrs: Mrs Brandis and Mr. Foster
Clerk: Ms. Gilbert
Deputy Clerk: Mrs. Marsden
Assistant Clerk: Ms. Griffiths
Members of the public: 40 including Cllr Thawley as a member of public.

P21 90 APOLOGIES

No apologies were received from Ms. Poole who joined the meeting late.

P21 91 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

4 members of public expressed concerns about the Land West of Churchway application.

1. A query was raised about the impact of the application on the sewage system within the village. A residents of Stokes Lane has recently experienced issues with sewage drainage for the first time in 30 years.

Mr Truesdale explained that Thames Water submitted comments on 12th February in response to the application regarding the inability of the existing foul water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs for this development proposal.

2. A representative from Haddenham Village Society thanked Mr Truesdale for his report on the application. The Society will also be submitting comments highlighting similar concerns. The Society is particularly concerned that the plans don’t take steps to address climate change. Additionally, the planned upgrade for a bridle path is situated between two footpaths, therefore making it inaccessible to bridle path users unable to use a footpath.
Mr Truesdale explained that the Parish Council’s response includes comments on energy efficiency and the absence of measures in the proposed plan to support the net-zero agendas of the Parish Council, Buckinghamshire Council and the Government.
3. Concern was raised about the proposed location of the sewage pumping station been placed on the boundary with Rosemary Lane. Concerns were also raised about the links between the site and the rest of the village.

Mr Truesdale confirmed that concerns about the location of the pumping station will be included within the Parish Council’s response and it has requested an impact assessment. It was also explained that two footpath connections should be included with the site, however are currently not included in the first phase. The Parish Council will be pushing for the footpath links to be considered within the current application.

4. Thanks were expressed to Mr Truesdale for his work on the Parish Council's report and for listening to residents' concerns. Concerns were expressed that the application fails to meet conditions listed in the outline planning permission and regarding the impact of the development on flooding within the village. It was asked which of the issues with the application will carry most weight with Buckinghamshire Council.

Mr Truesdale explained that in his view the issues that would carry most weight would be the issues with the design code, water drainage, flooding and sewage, the impact of noise and the connectivity of the site with the village.

Mrs Brandis explained that she has written to Redrow regarding the witchert walls. Mrs Brandis has also written to planning officers regarding many of the concerns highlighted by the Parish Council, including measures to mitigate carbon emissions and footpaths. Mrs Brandis considers the main issues with the site are flooding and the poor quality of design.

P21 92 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 25th January 2021 were AGREED as a true record and signed.

P21 93 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

To consider the Council's response to the consultations on the following planning applications:

- (i) 21/00215/ADP Land West Of Churchway Haddenham Buckinghamshire
Approval of reserved matters (external appearance, layout and scale for phase 1) for the erection of 273 pursuant to outline planning permission 17/02280/AOP

The Parish Council objects as follows:

Presentation

1. The application is difficult to assess because several documents required under the outline permission conditions and in the S106 agreement are not present. Some of the submitted documents provide limited information. The Planning Statement and The Design & Access Statement (DAS) do not cohere and contain errors suggesting a lack of care at odds with the "Redrow 8" principles on their web-site. The arboricultural survey when opened in the browser is headed "Langdon Hills Golf & Country Club". Para 9.5 in the DAS about the pumping station simply does not make sense.
2. The developer's first action on taking ownership of the site was to remove the hedge and a tree on the Churchway boundary, notwithstanding in their DAS quoting AVDC's planning brief stating that all existing hedgerows and trees are to be retained; and indeed are shown as retained on the drawings and photographs presented. Moreover, the S.106 legal agreement includes an undertaking not to carry out any work in advance of planning permission (the outline permission having covered only access and quantum of homes).
3. Commenting is hindered because of the division of the overall site into phases with no details about Phase 2 except the statement that density will be higher because of the alleged "over-provision" of open space in Phase 1. Key issues for this site are overall layout, surface water drainage, connectivity and noise impact. Resolution of any of these could have a material impact on the planning of both phases, with inevitable knock-on

problems if Phase 1 is fixed and approved without reference to Phase 2. The site should be considered as a whole, even if construction proceeds in phases.

Pre-Meeting with the Developer

4. The Planning Statement refers at para 3.7 to a pre-meeting with Parish Council (PC) in November 2020 and states that various questions raised by PC have been incorporated in the submission. This is not the case. At the meeting the PC raised the following matters:
 - Concern was raised by the PC at outline stage about noise problems from the adjoining factory being experienced by new residents at Platers Road, and in the surrounding area generally, and the PC proposed that a landscape buffer be provided on the western boundary between the factory and the new development, which could include the play area. The developer advised that an acoustic assessment would be carried out: see below.
 - Concern was expressed by the PC at outline stage about the inappropriate design, density and car-dominated housing layout with blocks of flats in the south-west corner of full site. AVDC's Strategic Development Control Committee on 8th January 2020 undertook that this matter would be looked at again at reserved matters stage. The developer advised that this would be addressed, but this area is now in Phase 2.
 - Concern that the proposed footpath/cycle link to the airfield site shown at outline as exiting at the north-west corner of the site does not match up with the reserved path line shown on the approved drawings for Plot N of the Business Park (19/01084/ADP), so re-alignment of the HAD007 will be needed. This has not been addressed: see below.
 - Concern that the footpath link to Platers Rd will join non-adopted highway which may require discussion with Bucks Council. This has not been addressed.
 - Concern about the condition of the wicket walls which will form the southern boundary of the site. The PC proposed that a specialist contractor be approached to work with the home-owners responsible for the walls about a repair scheme with a possible funding contribution from the developer to safeguard these heritage assets. Interest was expressed in the idea but is not mentioned in the plans now submitted; see below.
 - Concern about future proofing the energy needs of the new homes to meet Zero Carbon objectives of the PC, Bucks Council, and the Government. The PC was informed that the new homes would have gas central heating: see below.

Design Code

5. Condition 8 requires a Design Code and sets out 11 specific matters to be covered. This condition has not been met. This is a surprising omission in view of the findings of the "Building Better, Building Beautiful" Commission, MHCLG's recent publication of the new National Model Design Code, and proposed follow-on changes to NPPF. These introduce a new test that development should be well-designed (paragraph 133), stating that "development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents which use visual tools such as design guides and codes".

6. What we do have is an “anywhere” development populated by a volume of house-builder’s standard house types, with only black and white elevations of each individual type, grouped into clusters and given local names. The overall layout is a significant departure from that approved at outline stage, which itself was amended four times before approval; and the architects have since changed. This layout is largely rectilinear and lacking interest. There is a lot of red brick, no rendered witchert-style walls, and little use of render on elevations to reflect Haddenham’s best known building style. The view when approaching the site from the north is a hard-edged straight building line. The view from Churchway into the Conservation Area and its historic witchert walls will be obscured by a new pumping station not in the outline application, and for which there are no drawings. The PC strongly supports the comments of the Heritage Officer in relation to layout and materials.

7. Specifically, on heritage, when the PC met the developer in November 2020, we proposed that the developer consider approaching the residents responsible for the witchert walls on the southern boundary of the site about offering a contribution towards a specialist contractor repairing and restoring them in order to: safeguard this heritage asset; enhance their landscape contribution to the scheme; and foster relations with existing residents. There appeared to be interest in doing this at the meeting, and the PC regrets that no proposal is included.

8. In relation to the requirements of the Design Code, the PC notes:
 - There are no coloured street elevations or visuals showing how this proposal will look in terms of streetscapes.
 - There is no lighting plan, which we would expect to be appropriate to a rural edge of a village with low level output, minimal light pollution and capable of automatic dimming at night. The PC would not entirely support TVP’s observations in this rural location; in particular, bollard lighting in car park areas works well in other developments in the village.
 - There is no information on surfacing materials.
 - There is no cycling provision apart from a reference to storage in back gardens which is self-evident. D-rings at the playground would be particularly welcome; see also Connectivity below.
 - The NEAP/LEAP drawing shows a tarmac kick-about area by the NEAP/LEAP and informal green open space by the fitness trail; the site layout plan shows the latter space as a kick-about area.
 - There is no information on bio-diversity as required in Condition 8.
 - There is nothing acknowledging the zero carbon and climate change agendas of the Government, Buckinghamshire Council or Haddenham Parish Council. There is no reference to the desirability, if only in marketing terms, of future-proofing in relation to future energy needs. The proposals are silent about: electric vehicle charge points, sustainable design & construction, or the ending of gas boilers in 2025. The opportunity should be taken to install ground and air source heat pumps and pv/solar panels from the outset rather than obliging residents to retro-fit well within the lifetime of these homes, and of most of their occupiers. The passing references to water butts and homes being aligned for (but not provided with) solar panels are not sufficient.

- Insufficient information has been provided regarding the open space and play provision: the PC supports the comments by Parks & Recreation.
 - There is an incorrect number of affordable units, with a clustered rather than dispersed distribution of property sizes.
 - A small verge area does not constitute a community orchard.
9. In relation to the layout the PC notes:
- Plots 78 and 79 are essentially back-land development, requiring disproportionate road space, and surrounded and overlooked by neighbouring gardens. We suggest these plots be omitted and incorporated within the adjoining gardens with a tree belt.
 - Several plots have small gardens not much larger than a back yard; several plots have L-shaped or similarly awkward gardens (eg Plots 95 and 96).
 - The PC would prefer a more even distribution of house sizes rather than the uniformity suggested by the cluster in the south-western corner, which also raises concerns about how the higher density adjoining Phase 2 will look.

Surface Water Drainage, Flooding & Sewerage

10. Condition 13 and the S.106 agreement contain detailed requirements for a detailed surface water drainage scheme. This has not been provided. This is particularly unfortunate given the recent (January 21) episode of rainwater saturation of the site and flooding affecting properties at The Clays, together with the collapse of two sections of wicket walls. Residents in the area, and of the new homes, require confidence that these issues will be effectively addressed, but no such confidence will come from failing to provide the necessary details. Perhaps the biggest future risk will be displacement of waterlogging to the proposed dwellings on the northern edge of the site which will form the new boundary with open fields. The PC notes the objections of both the LLFA and Thames Water; neither response gives any comfort to villagers.
11. The PC has a particular concern that mitigation includes run-off via an existing drain into Rudds Pond, and thence down the north-south watercourse (main river) through Haddenham to Banks Pond and on to Manor Farm. The PC has assumed default responsibility for the publicly accessible Rudds and Banks Ponds; however, parts of the watercourse are culverted and inaccessible; other parts run within private gardens, including the inaccessible Tacks Pond; yet other sections run between properties, are choked with weeds, and with no obvious riparian responsibilities for maintenance. The PC regularly clears Banks Pond of accumulated vegetation to prevent water build-up at Rudds Pond. Use of this watercourse is not a satisfactory mitigation strategy. The PC requests an urgent meeting with the LLFA team to discuss.

Connectivity

12. Condition 19 requires details of the pedestrian/cycleway links to Platers Road and to the airfield development. These have not been provided. At the VALP public inquiry AVDC assured the Inspector that a link would be provided from HAD007 to the airfield development. The PC intervened with the planning application for Plot N on the Business Park (19/01084/ADP) to ensure that a path line would be reserved connecting HAD007 with Plot N, and thence to Pegasus Way. The outcome is that a path line has been reserved in the transfer deeds of Plot N, but the connection point is some metres to the south of the north-west corner of HAD007 as shown in the outline approval and as shown

on the “Landscape Strategy” drawing L20007.07.0. The PC appreciates that this will now be in Phase 2, but there is an implication for the Phase 2 site layout. Furthermore, this link should be made available to Phase 1 residents prior to first occupation to provide an easy pedestrian link to the station without the need to take the car.

13. The PC notes that the link to Platers Road also falls within Phase 2, but draws Bucks Council’s attention to the point that the link enters Platers Road at a place where it is un-adopted and under a management company. Does this present any problem? This link, which provides a pedestrian route to Banks Park shops, should also be made available to Phase 1 residents prior to first occupation.
14. The PC is unsure whether Bucks Council will provide a footpath link from the south-east corner of HAD007 to Rosemary Lane southwards along the western side of Churchway; currently there are narrow grass verges, possibly privately owned. Is this an omission, and if so, will a footpath link be provided?

Noise

15. Condition 22 requires a full acoustic assessment before occupation of any phase of the development. A partial report has been submitted saying that more will follow. For several years the PC has repeatedly objected to siting residential developments in this area next to general (B2) industry which, by definition, is likely to cause problems. At outline stage, the PC proposed a landscape buffer on the western part of the overall site, including a tree belt and the play areas, but was ignored.
16. Pre-Covid, the PC and Environmental Health, received several complaints from Platers Road residents and from the wider area about noise from the GGR factory. We note that no measurements have been taken on the Phase 1 part of the site. We also note Spectrum’s comment that “When present, industrial activity dominates the acoustic environment in the western part of the development”. There is also a brief reference to possible mitigation like triple glazing. This all raises concerns:
 - surely acoustic assessments should be done across the entire site (both phases)?
 - does this imply an expectation that Phase 2 properties won’t be able to open their windows or enjoy their gardens free of noise?
 - potentially this issue impacts on the layout, design and density of Phase 2, and may, therefore, potentially change the approach to Phase1, so reinforcing the need to look at the site as a whole.
17. The proposal introduces a sewerage pumping station in the south-east corner immediately adjacent to Downley Lodge. Besides interrupting the view into the Conservation Area from Churchway (see above), an impact assessment should be carried out on the potential for noise and smells from this pumping station, and whether this could affect the amenity and “quiet enjoyment” rights of the adjoining neighbour.

Ecology

Condition 20 requires an Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (EMEP). None has been submitted.

Construction Transport Management Plan

18. Condition 18 requires a Construction Transport Management Plan. None has been submitted.

Travel Plan

19. The S.106 agreement requires a Travel Plan, also not submitted. This should refer to the possibility of walking/cycling to the railway station, the new Co-op and nursery via Plot N and Pegasus Way, and of walking to Banks Park shops and schools via Platers Road and/or Rosemary Lane and/or Churchway, so these links all need to be provided before first occupation.

(ii) 21/00200/APP Abbey Barn Roundhill Court Aylesbury Road Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8TR

Garage conversion and new front gate

The Parish Council has no objection, subject to securing alternative parking arrangements per the recent garage approval ref 19/02490/APP, or alternative arrangement.

(iii) 21/00255/ALB 11 Rudds Lane Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8JP

Conversion of existing outbuilding with new doors and windows

The Parish Council has no objection.

P21 94 DECISIONS

20/03949/ALB 41 High Street Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8ET

First floor rear extension and alterations of existing dwelling including conversion of the attached barn and pitch roof to barn

Bucks Council – Listed Building Consent

20/04284/APP 10 Dovecote Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8BP

Proposed single storey rear extension, conversion of existing integral external store, and external roof, material and fenestration alterations to existing house

Bucks Council – householder approved

P21 95 UPDATES ON MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS

Airfield site

The land transfer has been completed and the Parish Council has taken over responsibility for the playing fields and the playground. The Parish Council can now move forward with plans for a pavilion at the playing fields.

The bus shelter contribution is being used to fund 2 replacement bus shelters on Thame Road, installation date to be confirmed, and a new shelter outside the Medical Centre on Stanbridge Road which will be installed 26th Feb – 2nd March. The bus shelters will be Parish Council assets.

Aston Road Glebe Site – Dandara

Mr Truesdale, the Clerk and Deputy Clerk met remotely with Dandara representatives on 2nd February. The main discussion was the transfer of amenity land to the Parish Council, which will be in stages. It is anticipated that the burial ground land will be completed in the summer and can be handed over if the Parish Council is willing to waive the maintenance period. The remaining highway work to deliver the footway on Aston Road to St. Mary's School and the new access for the pavilion and burial ground will be done this year, the land to build the pavilion can then be transferred to allow building work to start. The inspection for the issue of the provisional

certificate on the country park and LEAP still hasn't taken place but is hoped to be done this month. Provided all is well and the certificate is issued, this will trigger the start of the 2 years' maintenance period prior to hand over to Parish Council. The NEAP and cricket pitch will be the last areas for hand over on completion of the site as the land will be used as the yard. The footpath behind Willis Road, through to Churchway will remain closed until April. Tree work is currently being carried out and then surfacing will be done. The diverted path across to Aston Road through the new burial ground will be opened once the burial ground has been laid out. A meeting with the Parish Council's solicitor has been arranged to hopefully finalise the deed of transfer that Dandara have requested. There are still a few outstanding queries / concerns. The Clerk has asked the Passenger Transport Officer at Bucks Council for an update on the bus service contribution made by Dandara to Bucks Council under the S106 agreement, for the bus to serve the Aston Road site and the station. The initial work has been done, but work has been put on hold due to the significant drop in commuters from Haddenham during the pandemic, which has been confirmed by Chiltern Railways.

Land West of Churchway (HAD007)

An application for approval of phase 1 reserved matters is on the agenda.

Mr Truesdale and the Clerk held an informal meeting via zoom with representatives of the Rosemary Lane Action Group, who expressed many concerns with the application.

The concerns about flooding on the site have increased during the recent heavy rainfall. Some residents with boundary witchert walls have had walls collapse and flooding to their properties. The PC has been copied in on correspondence between residents and Buckinghamshire Council. Cllr Harriss has arranged for the culvert on Churchway to be cleared but a blockage was discovered that requires further work. It is thought that this blockage is responsible, at least in part, for the extent of the flooding of the field. The culvert empties into Rudds Pond, which is already very full so there are additional concerns about where the water will go once the culvert is cleared. The Parish Council is being strongly urged to ensure these flooding issues are fully addressed by the relevant authorities in the planning process, both on site and for potential displacement into the stream that runs through the village.

Land South of Lower Road

Nothing to update.

P21 96 CORRESPONDENCE AND ITEMS FOR THE NEXT AGENDA

The Parish Council has received several emails and letters from residents concerned about the reserved matters application for land west of Churchway.

The council has forwarded on concerns from residents on Willis Road, about the Aston Road site, to Dandara, who have responded.

P21 97 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Monday 8th March 2021.

CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

The meeting closed at 7.56pm.

Signed: _____
Chair

Date: 8th March 2021