

## Haddenham Parish Council – Planning Committee 15<sup>th</sup> February 2021 – Briefing

### 21/00215/ADP – HADDENHAM

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”

#### Context

- Outline planning application submitted 2017 ref 17/02280/AOP covering access and general layout and housing nos only – all other details reserved
- Conditional planning permission granted for 273 homes on 9<sup>th</sup> October 2020 together with a concurrent S106 legal agreement between Bucks Council and the land owners
- This is a “Reserved Matters” application for the details including appearance, landscaping, layout and scale
- BUT relates only to Phase 1 on the eastern (Churchway) part of the site for 153 homes.
- Applicant is Redrow Homes; the Agent is shown as David Coles Architects Ltd. There has been a change of architect from the outline application (Coleman Hicks).
- Redrow Homes sent a letter dated 29<sup>th</sup> January to all adjoining properties advising that Redrow took legal ownership of the land in December 2020.

#### Planning Conditions

The full Conditions and Informatives in the outline planning permission can be read here:

[https://publicaccess.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/online-applications/files/F727127847E8AB687F2957836880E68C/pdf/17\\_02280\\_AOP-AOP1E\\_-\\_OUTLINE\\_PERMISSION-2184369.pdf](https://publicaccess.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/online-applications/files/F727127847E8AB687F2957836880E68C/pdf/17_02280_AOP-AOP1E_-_OUTLINE_PERMISSION-2184369.pdf)

These include inter alia:

- Condition 8: A Design Code with 11 matters to be covered
- Condition 13: A surface water drainage scheme (SuDS) with a series of specific requirements
- Condition 18: A Construction Transport Management Plan
- Condition 19: New pedestrian/cycle links to Platers Rd and to the former airfield site
- Condition 20: An Ecological Mitigation & Enhancement Plan with 9 matters to be covered (Google Ecological Mitigation & Enhancement Plan to see some examples)
- Condition 22: An acoustic assessment to determine the impact of noise from adjoining industry per standards
- Condition 23: Upgrade HAD/19/2 to bridleway through the site
- Informatives 1 and 2 say which Conditions are to be met pre-commencement and which pre-occupation
- Informative 8 confirms no right to obstruct HAD/19/2 which is to be shall be kept open

#### S106 Agreement

The full Agreement can be read here:

[https://publicaccess.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/online-applications/files/CC84F108D5FF7DD0E2D18DE5378EFEA1/pdf/17\\_02280\\_AOP-FINAL\\_S106\\_AGREEMENT-2185513.pdf](https://publicaccess.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/online-applications/files/CC84F108D5FF7DD0E2D18DE5378EFEA1/pdf/17_02280_AOP-FINAL_S106_AGREEMENT-2185513.pdf)

This includes (inter alia):

- The Affordable Housing Contribution
- Education Contribution
- Sport & Leisure Contribution (per HPC requests at outline stage – includes Village Hall)
- SuDS – repeats and amplifies the Condition 13 requirement
- Bus Shelter Contribution at Churchway - £15,000
- Churchway Feasibility Study Contribution - to extend 30mph limit - £15,000
- Haddenham-Aylesbury Cycleway Contribution £119,500
- Haddenham & Thame Parkway Parking Contribution £30,000
- Stanbridge Rd/Woodways crossing Signage contribution £20,000
- Farmland Bird Conservation Contribution £20,000
- Travel Plan – prepared by developer for new residents

NB – the PC is **not** a party to the S106 Agreement, but has advised on the Sport & Leisure Contribution

### **Pre-Meeting with the Developer**

The Planning Statement refers at para 3.7 to a pre-meeting with Parish Council 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 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's proposal that a landscape buffer be provided on the western boundary between the factory and the new development. The developer advised that an acoustic assessment would be carried out: see below.
- Concern 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. The developer advised that this would be addressed, but this area will now be 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 so far.
- 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 safeguarding these heritage assets. Interest was expressed in the idea, but is not mentioned in the plans now submitted.
- 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.

## **Parish Council Comments [DRAFT]**

The Parish Council objects as follows:

### **Presentation**

1. The application is difficult to assess because several documents required under the outline permission conditions or 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. The arboricultural survey is headed "Langdon Hills Golf & Country Club".
2. 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 surface water drainage, connectivity and noise impact, resolution of which 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 developer should be obliged to provide more detail about Phase 2.
3. 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 agreement includes an undertaking not to carry out any work in advance of planning permission.

### **Design Code**

4. 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 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".
5. What we do have is an "anywhere" development populated by a volume 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, 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.
6. The PC strongly supports the comments of the Heritage Officer in relation to layout and materials. When the PC met the developer in November 2020, we proposed that the developer consider approaching the residents responsible for the walls about offering a

contribution towards a specialist contractor repairing and restoring them in order to safeguard this heritage asset, enhance their landscaping contribution to the new scheme, and to foster relations with existing residents. There appeared to be interest at the time, and the PC regrets that no proposal is included.

7. In relation to the requirements of the Design Code, the PC notes:
  - no coloured street elevations or visuals showing how this proposal will look in terms of streetscapes.
  - no lighting plan, which we would expect to be appropriate to a rural edge of a village with low level output, minimal light pollution, 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.
  - no information on surfacing materials.
  - no cycling provision apart from a reference to storage in back gardens: 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.
  - nothing on bio-diversity as required in Condition 8.
  - nothing acknowledging the zero carbon and climate change agendas of the Government, Buckinghamshire Council or Haddenham Parish Council, or the desirability of future-proofing in relation to future energy. The proposals are silent about: electric 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 regarding the open space and play provision: the PC supports the comments by Parks & Recreation.
  - 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.
8. 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**

9. 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 rain water saturation of the site and flooding affecting properties at The Clays, together with the collapse of two sections of witchert 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 water-logging to the proposed dwellings on the northern edge of the site which will form the new boundary with open fields. The PC notes the objection of the LLFA.

10. 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; 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**

11. 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, and this link should be made available to Phase 1 residents prior to first occupation.
12. The PC notes that the link to Platers Road also falls within Phase 2, but draws Bucks Council's attention that the link enters Platers Road at a point where it is unadopted and under a management company. Does this present any problem? Again, the PC would like this to be made available to Phase 1 residents prior to first occupation.
13. 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**

14. 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, possibly including the play areas, which was ignored.
15. 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 on Phase 1 land?
- 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 reinforces the need to look at the site as a whole.

16. 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/or smells from this pumping station, and whether this could affect the amenity and "quiet enjoyment" rights of the adjoining neighbour.

### **Ecology**

17. 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 a walking/cycling connection to the railway station via Plot N, so this route needs to be fixed, and should be provided before first occupation.

David Truesdale  
Chair HPC

Sue Gilbert  
Clerk HPC