HAD007 Land West of Churchway, Haddenham

Application 21/00215/ADP Redrow Homes Limited for "Approval of reserved matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale for phase 1 of outline planning permission 17/02280/AOP comprising 153 dwellings (including affordable housing) along with public open space, LEAP/NEAP, car parking, drainage, infrastructure and associated works."

Haddenham Village Society Response to Buckinghamshire Council – Aylesbury Vale Area

Introduction

1. Haddenham Village Society, founded in 1965, seeks to preserve the village's heritage, ethos and community spirit as Haddenham expands and develops with the addition of new households as part of its significant expansion as a "strategic settlement".

2. Membership of the Society represents over 300 households in the village, approximately 15% of the current village population.

3. The Society objects strongly to the reserved matters application as drafted. Redrow appear to have paid only cursory attention to many of the significant challenges that this site brings for a developer and certainly have made no effort to engage with the local community to address their legitimate concerns as the site is brought forwards for development. There are significant omissions in the information provided with the application and this makes some concerns difficult to comment upon e.g. some details of Phase 2 works are required at this stage to confirm that the conditions of the outline permission will be met.

4. Our objections can be summarized under the following headings. Where reference is made to a planning condition the number is that used in Outline Planning Permission ref 17/02280/AOP

Sustainability

5. All layers of government in the UK from Haddenham Parish Council to the current administration in Downing Street are focused upon achieving a Zero Carbon economy. A significant part of this is adapting our homes and building new homes which contribute to this long term aim. Redrow appear to be unaware of this. The development as shown has no green energy provisions:

- Gas boilers will provide heating despite the fact that they will no longer be permitted in 2025.
- No solar panels
- No electric car charging points,
- No thought to future adaptation of housing for heat pumps.

- No cycle storage (other than back gardens/garage).
- No rainwater recycling is proposed other than a few water butts in gardens.
- No proposed recycled building materials

Insulation of housing alone and orientating houses to allow "solar access" is not good enough and the housing specification must be completely re-thought with sustainability at the core of the design.

6. Despite the provisions of Condition 19 no details are given of the cycle/ pedestrian links with Platers Road/Airfield Development. Without good links in the direction of the station, Co-op convenience store and sports facilities many will get into their cars and drive the quickest route via Rosemary/Rudds Lane and Dollicott which is for the most part a narrow lane with no footpath and with a dangerous blind corner. This is not acceptable and designs must be brought forward now to show how these links will be provided for residents of Phase 1 before occupation and how they will be maintained whilst Phase 2 is constructed.

7. No details are given of the footpath to provide a safe link from the site to the Post Office and rest of the village via Churchway. This must be secured to ensure that there is a non-car alternative for new residents to access the rest of the village safely and feel that they are part of our community.

Design

8. No Design Code has been produced by Redrow despite the provisions of Condition 8 and the emphasis within the planning system on "Building Better, Building Beautiful". In the information that is provided there are significant omissions (e.g. no coloured elevation/street scene, no lighting plan and no surfacing details), which make it difficult properly to assess the proposals. A further period of public consultation should be required once full information has been provided for consideration.

9. Although the Design, Access and Justification statement refers to the proposed housing reflecting different areas of the village, this is just not the case. What Redrow propose are the same designs used in their schemes all over the country and certainly in no way reflect the NPPF requirement to be "sympathetic to the local character and history including the built environment and landscape setting". There is a lot of brick, some of it yellow which is completely inappropriate and there is no reflection of the key aspects of vernacular architecture of this wychert village i.e. rendered walls and linking footpaths between houses. We agree wholeheartedly with the comments by the Heritage Officer in relation to layout and materials.

10. The Affordable housing provision is particularly ill thought out. All these houses are in terraced form, distinct from the majority of the rest of the development and tucked away. Particularly awful is the grouping in the south west corner of 16 houses (in contravention of the requirement for no more

than 15 houses in any affordable group) in what look like Victorian back to backs in Birmingham/Manchester and cut off from the rest of the development in a hidden backwater. These also lie unacceptably close the boundary of the existing settlement with little landscaping between.

11. Although a noise assessment has been carried out from the Phase 2 land, no such analysis has been made for the site as a whole as required under Condition 22. The noise from the adjoining B2 industrial area is a known problem in the area and the partial assessment undertaken acknowledges that industrial noise dominates the land in Phase 2. A full assessment must be made and a scheme presented to mitigate noise across the whole site and not just the use of triple glazing in Phase 2 which appears to be the only concrete proposal to deal with this issue. Are the residents not going to be able to open their windows or enjoy their gardens because of unattenuated noise pollution?

12. The proposed location of the substation and pumping station immediately adjoining an existing residential property and the boundary of the Conservation Area as you enter the village is completely unacceptable. It will detract from the landscape setting of the main approach to the village and the noise generation will be constant nuisance for the residents of adjoining properties.

Open Space/Landscaping

13. The first act of the developer on acquiring the site was to unilaterally remove the hedgerow and an existing tree from the Churchway frontage when only part of this needed to be removed to allow the new accessway to be formed. This speaks volumes of the developer's attitude to the site.

14. The landscaping along Churchway was designed under the outline scheme to allow the historic view of the village boundary wall made of traditional wychert which has stood for hundreds of years. The scheme as now proposed has reduced this vista and chosen to site an electricity sub-station and pumping station immediately adjoining the existing residential and Conservation Area boundary.

15. The scheme as drawn has little useable amenity space other than the NEAP/LEAP and kick about area and this is clearly inadequate for this size of development, particularly if this is intended to serve Phase 2 which the statement from the developer clearly intimates.

16. Much of the green landscape areas/buffers are actually the attenuation pits/ drainage ditches which form part of the SuDS scheme and should therefore be excluded from any calculations along with hedgerows, footpaths and narrow verges.

17. There are no detailed proposals about how the developer intends to protect and preserve the important wychert boundary wall during construction other than a set of photographs of the current trees along this boundary, most of which they appear to wish to remove. The developer should be required to agree a programme to ensure that this heritage asset is protected throughout the construction phase (includ-

ing the significant work to dig the attenuation pits) and repaired as part of the landscaping scheme.

18. There is no Ecological Mitigation and Enhancement Plan as required under Condition 20.

Water and Sewage Services

19. We note that Thames Water has re-iterated the fact that water and sewage services in this location are at capacity and cannot cope with the additional housing proposed. We understand that there are already a problem with sewage in the Stokes Croft area and we continue to be very concerned about the real possibility of sewage flooding in adjoining properties, particularly historic properties in the Conservation Areas. A scheme with sufficient provision guaranteed must be presented and details agreed with Thames Water before any construction on the site is allowed.

20. Surface water flooding is a significant issue on this site, even before the introduction of housing and associated driveways and roads which will massively increase the amount of run off. The area adjoining the historic wychert wall has flooded twice in recent months and resulted in the undermining and collapse of the wall in places. The developer has not made any proposals as to how it intends to protect this important heritage asset and not produced a comprehensive scheme despite this being a requirement of condition 13 and the s106 Agreement.

21. The partial proposals which are put forward include the use of an existing drain for excess run off into Rudds Pond and then via the Haddenham Stream. This watercourse passes through the entire village and has this year caused flooding in a number of places. There can be no question of the developer being allowed to link into this existing watercourse.

Safety

22. The scheme proposes a public footpath around the perimeter of the site which in places passes very close to the boundary of existing residential properties of Rosemary Lane and is an unacceptable threat to their privacy and is a potential safety issue.

23. No details are given of the lighting to be used around the site and although we do not support inappropriate light levels in what is rural village community there are areas of the site, in particular the large runs of parking spaces which may attract anti-social behavior to this new part of our community. Appropriate lighting should also be given to the new footpath/cycle connections between this development and the adjoining land to encourage their use to access amenities in the village.

Summary

24. In summary, Haddenham Village Society believes that this planning application should not be further considered without:

a. A Design Code being produced for the development as a whole that properly reflects the local vernacular architecture and truly sustainable housing design including provision of significant green energy.
b. Details of the footpath/cycleway through to the railway station and airfield site which should be provided before occupation of any houses to ensure that the impact of traffic generated from the site is minimised. This should be included in a Travel Plan as required by the s106 Agreement.
c. Improved provision of open amenity space and play facilities within the site and revision of the landscaping scheme to better preserve the historic approach to the village
d. An Ecological Mitigations and Enhancement Plan
e. Firm details in respect of water and sewerage provision to ensure that there is no adverse impact upon existing residents in adjoining areas
f. A fully developed SuDS scheme that does not rely upon excess run-off being directed through the village and its ponds.
g. A detailed lighting scheme.
h. A Noise Assessment for the site as a whole together with a scheme to minimize the impact for new residents both within their houses and when in their gardens
i. Proper consideration of the safety issues around the site to ensure a public environment that effectively addresses the potential for crime and anti-social behaviour.

In fact there are so many significant omissions to the information that has been provided that the application should be withdrawn and re-submitted with all the missing elements, including overall details for Phase 2 so that the development of the site as a whole can be properly addressed. As the proposals stand the planning permission should be refused.

Roz Owens
On behalf of Haddenham Village Society - Planning sub-committee