

**Downley Parish Council**  
**Minutes of a meeting of the Parish Council**  
**Held in the Downley Community Centre 12<sup>th</sup> February 2019, 2018 at 19.45**

**1 Attendance**

Chairman Cllr C Burslem, Cllr Bowden, Cllr Egmore, Cllr Lazenby, Cllr P Loadman ,  
Cllr Monroe-West, Cllr Sapsford , Cllr W Steneskog, Cllr Srao

**Apologies** – Cllr Chandarana, Cllr Sapsford

County and District Councillors were present - Cllr Paul Turner, Cllr Wendy Mallen

10 members of the public present

**2) Declaration of interest in items on the agenda** (7888/02/19)

Cllr Burslem declared an interest in planning item 42 South View Rd

**3) Minutes of the Previous meeting** (7889/02/19)

The January minutes were agreed as correct and signed by the acting Chairman Cllr Loadman.

**4) Adjournment for Public Questions** (7890/02/19)

Members of the public expressed concern regarding the planning application for Burrows House. Residents are concerned that the road will be damaged during the build if the application is approved. There were questions raised about the size of the proposed dwellings and the number of units being built. The Council have noted residents concerns and will be submitting comments to the planning officer.

**5) Reports from County Councillor and District Councillor** (7891/02/19)

Cllr Mallen updated the Council on parking concerns on Hughenden Boulevard, the road is frequently blocked with parked cars and this is causing access issues for emergency vehicles.

There are numerous broken street lights owned by Bucks CC in the Village, Bucks CC are aware of an electrical issue and are working with the utility supplier to have the lights fixed.

The early help view is complete, the Disraeli children center will be used as a satellite center. The center on Hamilton Road will be used as a hub.

Cllr Mallen gave a brief update on the Unitary position and 2020 elections.

Councillor Turner gave the Council an update on the Local Plan, the final consultation is online.

HMOs- A closure order has been issued in High Wycombe for an unlicensed property. Action is being taken against landlords who are not adhering to HMO regulations.

**6) Website Update (7892/02/19)**

Cllr Bowden asked Councillors to delete any emails that they do not need to refer back to in order to manage the Parish Council data allowance.

Cllr Bowden had prepared a budget analysis that he proposed submitting to the website. It was agreed that this document would be circulated to the Council for comment before a decision is made to upload it to the website.

**7) Parish Plan update (7893/02/19)**

Cllr Loadman updated the Council on a document he is working on which details the current projects of the Council. The document will be an agenda item in March for full Council consideration. Comments from other Councillors were welcome.

**8) Parking issues in the Village (7894/02/19)**

The Clerk has received numerous complaints this month regarding parking in the Village and damaged verges. The Positive Parking leaflet that was issued through the Village news last year will be uploaded to the website as an information resource for members of the public.

**9) The Downley School (7895/02/19)**

The Clerk attended at meeting at the School in January and was informed by the Chair of Governors and the Head Teacher that there has been abusive correspondence received and abusive behavior towards school staff by parents. The school will not tolerate such behavior and have taken advice from the Police. The School ask for the Parish Councils support with the matter.

**10) Speed Indicator Device (7896/02/19)**

A summary of data was tabled for Councillors. Cllr Egmore gave the Council an overview of the most recent data. Cllr Burslem thanked Clive and David for their help with moving the devices and thanks to Cllr Egmore for his analysis of the data.

**11) Street Lighting Project (7897/02/19)**

The Clerk gave the Council an update on a recent meeting with contractors and showed them an example of an LED light that Bucks CC are currently using. The Clerk will arrange for a Street Light Committee meeting to go through the options available to the Council in order to move this forward.

**12) Community Library redecoration (7898/02/19)**

Final plans have been proposed to the library Committee. A working party meeting will take place in March. Dosca will then arrange for the redecoration to take place.

**13) Planning applications (7899/02/19)**

**A) 19/05134/FUL- 68 Gosling Grove** - Householder application for construction of two storey side and single storey front extension and erection of 2 gates-Objection- The property is situated on a corner plot that is adjacent to the access for neighbouring plots. Downley Parish Council believe that the proposal to extend the property so close to the boundary increasing the density of the built form on the locality, and so will be out of keeping with scale of the area. Furthermore, the plans show two, rather than the required three parking spaces (refer Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance) so DPC believe it fails to provide required parking space

**B) 19/05157/MINAMD- 59 Hithercroft Road** -Proposed non-material amendment to permission for erection of first floor side extension, single storey rear & single storey front extension incorporating new front porch & conversion of garage to habitable room granted under planning ref: 15/06154/FUL- Objection- No supporting documents online.

**C) 19/05109/FUL-40 Middlebrook Road**- Householder application for two storey rear extension, alterations to ground levels to front driveway and rear patio and fenestration alterations- Objection- No supporting documents online.

**D) 18/08163/FUL -42 South View**- Erection of detached 2 bed dwelling, new dropped kerb & crossover and associated external alterations- Objection - Downley Parish Council believe that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in that it creates an unacceptably high density of dwelling that is not in line with the existing pattern of development. Furthermore, it is felt that the proposed parking arrangements for the existing property are unsatisfactory and do not meet the minimum dimensions required by standards. (Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance, Sept 2015). The proposed parking to the front of the existing property will also be visually incongruent with the existing street scene and overshadow the neighbouring property, resulting in a loss of privacy. Should the Council be minded to approve, DPC ask that provision be made to ensure that works do not impinge upon the public right of way (DOW/10/1) that runs adjacent to the property boundary

**E) 18/07538/FUL- Downley Lodge** Plomer Green Lane- Householder application for reconfiguration of front entrance gates to improved visibility by removing part of the —

front entrance wall- Objection - A previous planning application for the same property (17/06516/FUL) was rejected, with the decision being upheld on appeal, citing poor visibility splays that left it unsuitable for a road with a 60mph limit. The splays have been improved with this proposal, but still fail to meet national standards. Furthermore, prior to installation of these gates (Mar 2016) the original entrance was smaller and more

discrete. The current and proposed entrance is excessively large, representing an unsuitable suburbanisation of Downley Conservation area. The proposed designs reflect what the Chilterns Conservation Board "Buildings Design Guide" refer to as an unfortunate trend of the dominant & large driveways

**F) 18/07913/FUL - 9 Cross Court-** Installation of a vending machine into the shop front and adaptation of existing shutters- DPC Support this application - Concern is expressed that work seems to have been commented on this site prior to application consideration/ approval - Support Downley Parish Council believe that the proposed facility will enhance the options on offer to Downley residents. Concerns over security exist following the recent thefts from local stores, so it would be beneficial to see the Design & Access statement enhanced to outline provisions to ensure safety of the store and local residents.

**G) 19/05079/ADV -9 Cross Court-** Display of externally illuminated fascia signage for vending machine - Concern is expressed that work seems to have been commented on this site prior to application consideration/ approval

Support Downley Parish Council believe that the proposed facility will enhance the options on offer to Downley residents

**H) 18/07981/FUL- 16 The Pastures-** Householder application for part two storey, part single storey front extension, single storey side/rear extension. Construction of boxed rear dormer and associated fenestration alterations in connection with loft conversion and new fencing- Objection - Downley Parish Council believe that the introduction of the boxed rear dormer will be a visual intrusion, neither unobtrusive or in harmony with the existing building (Wycombe District Local Plan, Appendix 4, refers) DPC are also of a view that the boxed dormer will result in an adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy and overshadowing.

The introduction of a boundary wall (the height and finish of which are unspecified) is unwelcome and will lead to a loss of the open aspect of the neighbourhood and will not enhance the location. Plans are also unclear on how parking provision will meet Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance September 2015.

18/07524/FUL (26 The Pastures, HP13 5LZ) included provisions that no further glazing be added to the flanks without express planning permission. Should this application be approved, similar provisions should be put in place for this property.

**I) 19/05023/FUL - 23 Plomer Green Lane-** Erection of replacement 5 bed detached dwelling- Objection - There are concerns that the access from the property onto Plomer Green Lane will not offer safe or sufficient sight lines given the curve on Plomer Green Lane to the south. Downley Parish Council ask that a site visit be undertaken to ensure that the visual obstructions arising from the boundary wall and hedges to 21 Plomer Green Lane are suitably considered. Furthermore, Downley Parish Council do not feel that the design of the proposed development blends with neighbouring housing stock and will be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. There additional concerns that the height of the proposed development are excessive, dominate neighbouring properties and would be an adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy and overshadowing. DPC have been advised by the Buckinghamshire Badger Group that there is an active sett to the rear of the property. A petition made to DPC from a parishioner gives testimony that the owners were unaware of this fact. Consequently DPC believe a full Environmental Impact

Assessment would benefit all parties and address conservation obligations to badgers & setts (Protection of Badgers Act, 1992).

**J)19/05042/FUL - 5 Plomer Hill** - Demolition of existing dwelling house and construction of 2 x 4 bed dwelling houses and a apartment block consisting of 2 x 2 bed and 2 x 1 bed flats – Objection - Recommendation/summary - Downley Parish Council objects to the proposed development for the following reasons: • The Highway Access Statement (Oct-19) supporting the application asserts that splays of 2.4 x 43m being available in both directions. Another supporting document, location plan ref 4934-10 A shows visibility splays of less than 2.4 x 43m will be achieved. Given that safe stopping distances cannot be guaranteed on Plomer Hill, Downley Parish Council object to the proposal. Furthermore, the splays of 2.4m x 43m ignore the factors of both the gradient to Plomer Hill (Manual for Streets, 7.5.9 refers) and the impact of high levels of surface water flooding. • Whilst it is not felt that the visibility spays are sufficient, should planning be minded to approve these plans, it is requested that work on access to the site (removal of hedgerows etc..) and a suitable turning circle be completed before work commences to allow neighbours and other highway users, safety from construction traffic. Given this, it is felt that the layout and density of the proposed development is inappropriate. • The intensification resulting from the proposed development will adversely affect the neighbouring properties of Pheasant Drive that are of significant architectural value. The Downley Village Design Statement highlights Pheasant Drive, recognising “well spaced housing and sweeping views” all of which will be lost should the neighbouring site by a development that will be over-bearing and dominate on properties of architectural significance. • Downley Parish Council also believe that the proposed development is not in keeping with the stylistic context or scale of the local area. As outlined in the Downley Village Design Statement, stating that when the area was developed “Care was taken, however, to ensure not only a relatively low density, but the retention of important mature trees and hedges combined with grassed open spaces. Vistas remained open and gave interest.” The intensification presented in the application will tear those principles apart and ignore the design principles behind that part of Pheasant Drive. • It is felt that the proposed development is harmful to the character of the area and would not blend well with the existing stock, as the development is not subordinate to properties on Pheasant Drive or the neighbouring property, 3 Plomer Hill. • It is also felt that the parking bays extend to almost all the width of the plot, leading to an over dominance of car parking on the site.

The Manual for Streets (table 7.1, p91) makes clear reference to a safe stopping distance (SSD) for a 30 mph zone as 43m. The gradient of Plomer Hill is 20% which would require a SSD higher than 43m. Furthermore the MyWycombe site also shows Environment Agency data identifying the length of Plomer Hill as subject to surface water flooding with the risk as “High”. This will further compound and increase the SSD. Without factoring in the impact of the gradient to Plomer Hill (north) and the effect arising from the high risk of surface water flooding, the visibility spays required to make

the junction safe would be 2.4m x 43m to both north & south, given a minimum car height of 1.05m. Given that the location plans shows visibility splays of less that 43m will be achieved, it un unclear how the HIGHWAY ACCESS STATEMENT - SCHEME B that supports the application states “3.4 The level of visibility at the site access will be

improved above current levels with splays of 2.4 x 43m being available in both directions” It is felt that the proposed development is harmful to the character of the area and would not blend well with the existing stock, as the development is: • It dominates and fails to enhance neighbouring properties of Pheasant Drive that are of significant architectural value and based on “well spaced housing and sweeping views” (Downley Village Design Statement) all of which will be lost should the neighbouring site be developed by a development that will be over-bearing and dominate on properties of architectural significance. • The intensification resulting from the proposed development will adversely affect the neighbouring properties of Pheasant Drive of which the Downley Village Design Statement recognises “well spaced housing and sweeping views” all of which will be lost should the neighbouring site be developed by a development that will be over-bearing and dominate on properties of architectural significance. • Downley Parish Council also believe that the proposed development is not in keeping with the stylistic context or scale of the local area, one of “...low density, but the retention of important mature trees and hedges combined with grassed open spaces. Vistas remained open and gave interest.”(Downley Village Design Statement) • Not subordinate to properties on Pheasant Drive • Not subordinate to neighbouring property, 3 Plomer Hill.

**K) 18/08086/FUL- 5 Plomer Hill-** Demolition of existing dwelling house and construction of 3 x 4 bed terraced dwelling houses with associated parking, landscaping, bin and cycle stores-Objection

Recommendation/summary - Downley Parish Council objects to the proposed development for the following reasons: • The Highway Access Statement (Oct-19) supporting the application asserts that splays of 2.4 x 43m being available in both directions. Another supporting document, location plan ref 4934-10 A shows visibility splays of less than 2.4 x 43m will be achieved. Given that safe stopping distances cannot be guaranteed on Plomer Hill, Downley Parish Council object to the proposal. Furthermore, the splays of 2.4m x 43m ignore the factors of both the gradient to Plomer Hill (Manual for Streets, 7.5.9 refers) and the impact of high levels of surface water flooding. • Whilst it is not felt that the visibility splays are sufficient, should planning be minded to approve these plans, it is requested that work on access to the site (removal of hedgerows etc..) and a suitable turning circle be completed before work commences to allow neighbours and other highway users, safety from construction traffic. Given this, it is felt that the layout and density of the proposed development is inappropriate. • The intensification resulting from the proposed development will adversely affect the neighbouring properties of Pheasant Drive that are of significant architectural value. The Downley Village Design Statement highlights Pheasant Drive, recognising “well spaced housing and sweeping views” all of which will be lost should the neighbouring site be developed by a development that will be over-bearing and dominate on properties of architectural significance. • Downley Parish Council also believe that the proposed development is not in keeping with the stylistic context or scale of the local area. As outlined in the Downley Village Design Statement, stating that when the area was developed “Care was taken, however, to ensure not only a relatively low density, but the retention of important mature trees and hedges combined with grassed open spaces. Vistas remained open and gave interest.” The intensification presented in the application will tear those principles apart and ignore the design principles behind that part of Pheasant Drive. • It is felt that the proposed development is harmful to the character of the area and would not blend

well with the existing stock, as the development is not subordinate to properties on Pheasant Drive or the neighbouring property, 3 Plomer Hill. • It is also felt that the parking bays extend to almost all the width of the plot, leading to an over dominance of car parking on the site.

The Manual for Streets (table 7.1, p91) makes clear reference to a safe stopping distance (SSD) for a 30 mph zone as 43m. The gradient of Plomer Hill is 20% which would require a SSD higher than 43m. Furthermore the MyWycombe site also shows Environment Agency data identifying the length of Plomer Hill as subject to surface water flooding with the risk as “High”. This will further compound and increase the SSD. Without factoring in the impact of the gradient to Plomer Hill (north) and the effect arising from the high risk of surface water flooding, the visibility spays required to make the junction safe would be 2.4m x 43m to both north & south, given a minimum car height of 1.05m. Given that the location plans shows visibility splays of less than 43m will be achieved, it is unclear how the HIGHWAY ACCESS STATEMENT - SCHEME B that supports the application states “3.4 The level of visibility at the site access will be improved above current levels with splays of 2.4 x 43m being available in both directions” It is felt that the proposed development is harmful to the character of the area and would not blend well with the existing stock, as the development is: • It dominates and fails to enhance neighbouring properties of Pheasant Drive that are of significant architectural value and based on “well spaced housing and sweeping views” (Downley Village Design Statement) all of which will be lost should the neighbouring site be developed by a development that will be over-bearing and dominate on properties of architectural significance. • The intensification resulting from the proposed development will adversely affect the neighbouring properties of Pheasant Drive of which the Downley Village Design Statement recognises “well spaced housing and sweeping views” all of which will be lost should the neighbouring site be developed by a development that will be over-bearing and dominate on properties of architectural significance. • Downley Parish Council also believe that the proposed development is not in keeping with the stylistic context or scale of the local area, one of “...low density, but the retention of important mature trees and hedges combined with grassed open spaces. Vistas remained open and gave interest.”(Downley Village Design Statement) • Not subordinate to properties on Pheasant Drive • Not subordinate to neighbouring property, 3 Plomer Hill.

**L) 18/08297/FUL - 5 Plomer Hill - Construction of 2 x 3 bed semi-detached dwelling houses with associated car and cycle parking and bin store- Objection –**

Recommendation/summary - Downley Parish Council objects to the proposed development for the following reasons: • The Highway Access Statement (Oct-19) supporting the application asserts that splays of 2.4 x 43m being available in both directions. Another supporting document, location plan ref 4934-10 A shows visibility splays of less than 2.4 x 43m will be achieved. Given that safe stopping distances cannot be guaranteed on Plomer Hill, Downley Parish Council object to the proposal.

Furthermore, the splays of 2.4m x 43m ignore the factors of both the gradient to Plomer Hill (Manual for Streets, 7.5.9 refers) and the impact of high levels of surface water flooding. • Whilst it is not felt that the visibility splays are sufficient, should planning be minded to approve these plans, it is requested that work on access to the site (removal of hedgerows etc..) and a suitable turning circle be completed before work commences to

allow neighbours and other highway users, safety from construction traffic. • The intensification resulting from the proposed development will adversely affect the neighbouring properties of Pheasant Drive that are of significant architectural value. The Downley Village Design Statement highlights Pheasant Drive, recognising “well spaced housing and sweeping views” all of which will be lost should the neighbouring site be developed that will be over-bearing and dominate on properties of architectural significance. • Downley Parish Council also believe that the proposed development is not in keeping with the stylistic context or scale of the local area. As outlined in the Downley Village Design Statement, stating that when the area was developed “Care was taken, however, to ensure not only a relatively low density, but the retention of important mature trees and hedges combined with grassed open spaces. Vistas remained open and gave interest.” The intensification presented in the application will tear those principles apart and ignore the design principles behind that part of Pheasant Drive. • It is felt that the proposed development is harmful to the character of the area and would not blend well with the existing stock, as the development is not subordinate to properties on Pheasant Drive or the neighbouring property, 3 Plomer Hill. • It is also felt that the parking bays extend to almost all the width of the plot, leading to an over dominance of car parking on the site.

The Manual for Streets (table 7.1, p91) makes clear reference to a safe stopping distance (SSD) for a 30 mph zone as 43m. The gradient of Plomer Hill is 20% which would require a SSD higher than 43m. Furthermore the MyWycombe site also shows Environment Agency data identifying the length of Plomer Hill as subject to surface water flooding with the risk as “High”. This will further compound and increase the SSD. Without factoring in the impact of the gradient to Plomer Hill (north) and the effect arising from the high risk of surface water flooding, the visibility spays required to make the junction safe would be 2.4m x 43m to both north & south, given a minimum car height of 1.05m. Given that the location plans (PROPOSED\_SITE\_PLAN\_--3612761) shows visibility splays of less than 43m will be achieved, it is unclear how the RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AT 5 PLOMER HILL, HIGH WYCOMBE PROPOSAL A (Sep 2018) that supports the application states “5.2....It is proposed that vegetation be removed between the site access and Pheasant Drive to ensure that the visibility splays of 43m can be achieved to the East. The existing visibility to the west is greater than the required 43m.” It is felt that the proposed development is harmful to the character of the area and would not blend well with the existing stock, as the development is: • Not subordinate to properties on Pheasant Drive • Not subordinate to neighbouring property, 3 Plomer Hill.

**M) 19/05061/FUL - 41 Hithercroft Road** - Householder application for two storey side extension, single storey side and rear extensions and associated internal alterations- No concerns from DPC.

**N) Burrows House, Jubilee Rd-** Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 16 residential units (Use Class C3) comprising two bed and three bed houses together with associated access, landscaping and surfacing works

17/06977/FUL | Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 16 residential units (Use Class C3) comprising two bed and three bed houses together with associated access, landscaping and surfacing works



The site has a long history and plans associated with 17/06977/FUL have been updated as of 17th Jan 2019.

The Parish Council objecting to this proposal on the following grounds.

1. Insufficient parking has been allocated to properties and to visitors, failing to meet standards set out in "Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance" (Sept 2015). Furthermore, insufficient cycle parking provision has been proposed, also failing to meet Buckinghamshire County guidelines. 2. The plot is too cramped and will impinge upon the existing properties in Selwood Way as the proposed designs fail to meet the privacy standards set out in WDC's "Residential Design Guidance" (Jun 17). 3. Access is too narrow to allow service vehicles access along the central access route. 4. The proposed elevations show uninspiring and 'anywhere' designs that fail to recognise Downley's character and common design cues. 5. Per the Downley Village Design Statement, three story properties are discouraged and no recognition of this has been made. 6. The document supporting this application are not clear whether the application is for 16 or 20 residential units. Such material contradictions are misleading.

As summarised above, Downley Parish Council would like the following points be taking into account:

1. The document contains material contradictions that are misleading 1.1. The details supporting this application and available online for public scrutiny are contradictory as despite the title of the application being updated to reference 14 plots, the Design and Access statements 1-13 (submitted 21 Jul 2017) still proposing 20 plots (D&A pt. 3). 1.2. It is not clear what is being proposed and Downley Parish Council believe that until the plans show a clear (and single) indication of what is being applied for, this application cannot proceed. 2. There is insufficient parking. 2.1. The Proposed Landscape Plan (15038(PA)109) shows that there would be 28 parking spaces allocated to properties with 4 unallocated. 2.2. This 14 unit scheme has a revised mix of 1 x 2b3p, 1 x 2b4p, 5 x 3b5p, 4 x 3b6p and 3 x 4b6p meaning that the following spaces are required to meet Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance (Sept 2015).

Accommodation Habitable rooms Spaces per plot

Qty. proposed

|                         |    |                   |          |     |       |    |    |                   |          |      |       |    |    |                   |          |     |       |    |                   |            |       |       |              |      |
|-------------------------|----|-------------------|----------|-----|-------|----|----|-------------------|----------|------|-------|----|----|-------------------|----------|-----|-------|----|-------------------|------------|-------|-------|--------------|------|
| Required parking spaces | 2B | 5 habitable rooms | 2 spaces | 2 4 | total | 3B | 5P | 6 habitable rooms | 2 spaces | 5 10 | total | 3B | 6P | 6 habitable rooms | 2 spaces | 4 8 | total | 4B | 7 habitable rooms | 2.5 spaces | 3 7.5 | total | TOTAL SPACES | 29.5 |
|-------------------------|----|-------------------|----------|-----|-------|----|----|-------------------|----------|------|-------|----|----|-------------------|----------|-----|-------|----|-------------------|------------|-------|-------|--------------|------|

Of specific note are plots 1, 13 & 14 that should have provision for 2.5 parking spaces, but have only been given two, in tandem. It would be a grace oversight were the additional 0.5 spaces would be accommodated by the unallocated parking adjacent to plot 14. 2.3. Furthermore, Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance (Sept 2015) states that the in 6.3.1 states that "20% extra unallocated/ visitor parking is required per development to provide for visitors." Given this, 6 additional parking spaces are – required to meet Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance, rather than the four unallocated spaces adjacent to plot 14. 2.4. Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance (Sept 2015) states that "Safe and secure cycle parking is an important component in encouraging cycling. For new developments, BCC aims to ensure that developers make efficient use of land and promote sustainable travel choices. Therefore, cycle parking must be considered early on in the planning process." Given that this is a

scheme with a mix of 1 x 2b3p, 1 x 2b4p, 5 x 3b5p, 4 x 3b6p and 3 x 4b6p meaning that space for 31 bicycles is required. The proposed plans (15038(PA)109) suggest that plots 12, 13 & 14 will only have room for two bikes each. 3. The proposed site is cramped with little space between proposed, and existing properties leading to privacy concerns. 3.1. WDC's "Residential Design Guidance" (Jun 17) is written to ensure that all new residential development we build is designed well, contributes positively to the area and is great to live in for years to come. It states in 5.3 that to "achieve privacy by maintaining a minimum gap of 25 metres between the backs of houses and flats." 3.2. The site's proposed layout fails to recognise or honour this as can be seen in the relationship between lower numbered plots and Selwood Way (gap of c21m) 3.3. Design & Access Statement (pt 4) that still forms part of this application states that "Separation distances between new and existing building elevations containing active main windows were to be 25m not the 22.5m as shown" but this is not borne out as shown above in measurement taken on the Proposed site plan, 15038(PA)100.

4. There are access concerns. 4.1. Residential Design Guidance (June 2017) proposes (M6) the "Use connected streets to minimise turning heads and optimise servicing" to use connected streets to allow servicing the development. 4.2. The Manual For Streets section 6.8.7 makes clear that waste collection vehicles fitted with rear-mounted compaction units recommends a minimum street width of 5 m, but smaller widths are acceptable where onstreet parking is discouraged (BS 5906: 200516, refers) 4.3. The street width proposed is less than 5m and, given that there is insufficient parking provision on site (see #2 above) DPC do not feel the proposed access is sufficient to accommodate service vehicles.

5. The designs for the properties are uninspiring and show no evidence of locally appropriate designs and materials that would reinforce and improve local distinctiveness. 5.1. WDC's "Residential Design Guidance" (Jun 17) highlights that traditional buildings in the Chilterns were of locally available materials, such as flint, clay and hardwood. 5.2. It recommends that reference to this tradition be made in new buildings by the use of good quality and locally appropriate materials. 5.3. The Design & Access statement (pt 3) p21 recognises that flint is an integral part of the design to properties in Downley, including in newer developments like School Close. 5.4. None of the proposals include brick and flint.

6. The designs ignores the recommendations of Downley Village Design Statement. 6.1. In WDC's "Residential Design Guidance" (Jun 17) reference is made to "Identifying character, 1.2" that clearly states as well as looking at the site and its surroundings, Village Design Statement can be used for character reference. 6.2. The Downley Village Design Statement has not been considered at all. It clearly states that three story dwellings are not recommended when developing Downley and two stories should be the maximum.

7. The access to the site, via Jubilee Road is substandard to accommodate upto 50 vehicles. 7.1. The capacity of the road to accommodate public service (refuse collection) vehicles is in doubt. 7.2. As noted above, the site has insufficient parking allocated to the properties and insufficient visitor parking. 7.3. This will lead to on street parking that will narrow access and restrict manoeuvrability.

8. It is not clear whether the current parking to 40 Jubilee Road is to be maintained. 8.1. The Planning & Access statement (pt 12) suggests that the pavement along the front of number 40 is inside the curtilage of Burrow House site as this is shown as part of the Adoptable Highway. 8.2. Whilst this has not been verified, it is not clear how the current parking provision for 40 Jubilee Road (to the north flank of the property) is to be maintained.

**14) Correspondence** (7900/02/19)

- Councillors are reminded to submit comments for the Rights of Way survey
- Clerk has received numerous complaints this month about street lights, hedges and parking
- The Downley School are looking for a new governor
- The Great British Spring Clean takes place on the 22 March to 23 April

**15) Reports and minutes of Committees** (7901/02/19)

Resilience working party are in the process of arranging a series of meetings with Venues in the Village that could potentially be of use if there was an emergency. A meeting for the public to attend will be held in March. Clerk to publicise.

The DCPS meetings will now take place on the third Thursday of the month, Cllr Egmore will attend these meetings as DCPS representative.

**16) To consider Resolutions and Items for discussion which have been notified**

(7902/02/19)

None

**17) Accounts (7903/02/19)**

**Accounts.**

Items approved in February 2019

| To whom paid  | Chq No | Amount   |
|---|--------|----------|
| Castle Water - Allotment water rates  | 1725   | 52.71    |
| TBS Hygiene Ltd - Dog bin collection Jan 19   | 1726   | 187.20   |
| KAD Garden Services - Grass maintenance Jan 19  | 1727   | 629.00   |
| C Masters - Clerk salary and expenses (phone, wifi, postage, signage cost inc staple gun, garden wire ) | 1728   | 1,663.40 |
| Total   |        | 2,712.31 |

Bank balance 1<sup>st</sup> February 2019 - £ 143,597.32

Balance includes £35,000 lighting reserve fund

**18) Date and Place of next Meeting (7904/02/19)**

12<sup>th</sup> March 2019 Downley War Memorial Hall

**19) Date and place of next meetings of Committees (7905/02/19)**

Dosca 19<sup>th</sup> Feb, CIA 29<sup>th</sup> January, DCPS 21<sup>st</sup> Feb

**20) Closure of the Meeting (7906/02/19)**

There being no other business the Chairman closed the meeting at 9.30pm and thanked everyone for attending.

Chairman \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_