**Parish Council Response to the latest Miller Homes Proposals**

Collingham with Linton Parish Council object to the latest proposals. Like many residents who have already placed objections on the portal, we are completely dismayed at the lack of attention to our reasonable requests to improve the design. Not with standing our major concerns with regards to density, lack of green space, absence of bungalows, no agreement with Environment Agency with regards flood protection works, the need to provide a temporary bridge for access and removal of associated vegetation, how hard can it be to move a bin store for example? How hard can it be to provide a schedule of materials? We have attended meetings in the spring 2018 in good faith to share our concerns and proactively work together to provide suggestions that might lead to an acceptable design. I have to ask why did we bother? Do the owners of Bellway Homes and Miller Homes realise they are paying for employees and consultants to attend meetings and then pay lip service to public consultation?

The performance of Miller Homes and Bellway Homes is simply pathetic and the application should be refused without further delay. Should this lead to an appeal, so be it. We have faith an Inspector would see the proposal is poorly created and madness.

For completeness we reiterate our previous object below, with occasional additional comments in bold italics (the portal doesn’t accept colour font).

**Density**

The proposal remains at 147 dwellings (***now increased to 148***). This is significantly too many. The overall density is over and above that of the surrounding areas as recorded in the characteristic area assessments included in the Collingham Neighbourhood Plan.

The developers have chosen a lower density around the west and south of the site to achieve what they believe to be an acceptable transition with the surrounding Green Belt, but there has been completely inadequate consideration of the impact their design would have on the amenity of existing residents. (***see many well-argued points raised by the residents directly effected***)

**Greenspace**

LCC landscaping Team asked the developers to start again with the outline masterplan. The revised information now covers the whole site including the flood compensation basin which is a step forward. However, the other issues raised by the LCC Landscaping team remain to be addressed:

* The existing hedgerows running North / South along the existing field boundaries do not appear on the Landscape Masterplan and should be retained as approved in the Outline Permission.
* The hedgerow over the Drainage Easement should be retained
* The other existing field boundary to the West of the one above should be retained
* The landscaping mentioned in the Design and Access statement is enhanced planting down the Millbeck Green boundary. No sign of this.

The Landscape Plan confirms that the flood compensation area and the on-line storage area are Emorsgate 8 meadow mixture for wetlands. Is this consistent with the idea that this represents the developments contribution to public amenity space? The basin is completely flat and will remain boggy in all but exceptional weather conditions.

The proportion of amenity space is significantly below that being claimed by the developers.

**Bungalows**

The Inspector notes (Para 8.6.5) that “the Council would retain control over the details when submitted. The report to Committee notes that bungalows on the eastern boundary would not have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbours”. By implication a lack of bungalows on the eastern boundary would have an unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbours. The Hills Family was a party to the original application for outline permission in January 2014 when bungalows were included in the masterplan and throughout the outline application process and appeal, there was no suggestion that bungalows would not be included

Design and Access Statement in the original application:

P.19: “Consider amenity of existing bungalows”

P.22: on Storey Heights: “Reserved matter though it is envisaged that the development provide a predominance of 2 storey dwellings. Some single and 2.5 storeys are considered to be appropriate for this site”

P.24: on the Design Solution – bungalows are shown in the north-east corner, all down the eastern boundary and in the south-east corner.

**Affordable Housing**

Has consultation been undertaken with Local Registered Housing Providers who will own and manage the affordable housing units? What did they say? Statement of community involvement says they have.

In terms of the mix & split and looking at recent Housing Demand and Social Housing preference it would be appropriate to assume a mix of 2 & 3 bedroom family homes as well as a number of bungalows for older people. A recommended split being 20x2 bedroom & 20x3 bedroom houses as well as 5x2 bedroom & 4x1 bedroom bungalows.

**Materials**

We have been promised details of the materials to be included. These are not yet available. The consultation period should be extended commensurate with the delay in providing this information which is fundamental to the reserved matters decision. The dominant building material should be stone and all prominent buildings should be in stone in order to comply with the Design Policies of Collingham Neighbourhood Plan.

**Other important points:**

* Flood basin completely flat will not drain, complete bog and eyesore. Landscape details not provided, hydrological design not provided.
* Highway design not provided
* Tree planting to be kept to species that are easy to maintain
* There are no 2 bedroom houses for sale on the open market.
* It was agreed the bin store adjacent to plot 110 would be moved, it has not been
* Plot 94 and 95 have been moved by say 1 metre and a double garage put between them right on the boundary with Lowcroft. Is this a deliberate, vindictive act or just careless?
* No attempt to reduce density in the north-east corner where 5 units (111 to 115) abut a single existing dwelling!
* We were promised reduced roof heights for some of the house types adjacent to the boundaries with existing dwellings. Tolkin style properties at 2.5 stories are still shown on the boundary.
* We have been promised cross-sections to allow the impact of the build platform to be assessed. These have not been provided. ***(One additional cross-section has been provided, C-C. This shows the garage at the same elevation as 4 Lowcroft which we know flooded in 2007. This is clearly nonsense and indicates the architect doesn’t know the houses are to be built on a flood platform. Very very worrying. Suggest before new design is prepared levels are agreed with Environment Agency).***
* The Environment Agency recommended a covenant to control the scale of extensions/any future development on this site.

***Additional comments relating to latest proposal:***

***The acoustic fence added under item K on the planning drawing will look horrendous. Immediately visible on entering the new estate. This should be replaced with a stone wall and should be provided to Lowcoft plots 5 and 6 as the removal of trees will impact on noise from A58 at these properties also.***

***The temporary bridge includes removal of more trees. Mature ones should be put back.***

**Conclusion**

***Collingham with Linton*** Parish Council does not consider the revised proposals as a serious attempt to present an acceptable solution. The application should be ***rejected*** and the developers told to take LCC and the community feedback seriously before presenting another iteration.

***The boards of Bellway Homes and Miller Homes should be advised that the actions of their officers and consultants are not acceptable and that these actions have made all associated with the project a laughing-stock. The person responsible for signing the proposal off as ready for submission should question their suitability for the role they are in. We will be asking both boards for comment.***