

# GREAT MISSENDEN PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee  
held in the Parish Office at 7.30 pm  
on Monday 5 February 2018

**Present:** Councillor C Baxter (Chair) Councillors: K Allan, R. Hougham, S Humphreys, M Johnstone, L. Cook, V. Marshall, I Lovegrove.

1) **Apologies:** None

**Public Forum:** No members of the public attended

**2. Minutes** - It was agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 2 January 2018 should be signed as a correct record. There was a brief discussion about the minutes of the extraordinary meeting that had taken place on 15 January and it was confirmed that these minutes need to go to the Full Council for approval before signature

### 3. Matters arising –

i) The Committee noted that Chiltern DC had acknowledged receipt of the comments on the planning applications reviewed in the January meeting on 10 January 2018

ii) The committee noted that both HS2 & Chiltern DC had acknowledged receipt of the comments made by the Parish Council on the Bury Farm Potter Row works associated with the creation of the Bury Farm habitat ecological mitigation comprising earthworks (2 no. hibernacula) and fencing. The committee had Councillor Johnstone's paper in response and proposed to write to HS2 and Chiltern DC making the following points as set out in the paper namely:-

- a) The enlarged section of the site map shows the mitigation site edged in light green and to the north of it a pond and reptile basking bank which we maintain are outside the site
- b) Whilst accepting that Fusion JV are not directly involved with decisions on any relocation of the north portal to the Chiltern Tunnel, we maintain that they have a duty of care to build a mitigation site which does not present a hazard. The current plan under Royal Assent gives the diverted Right of Way GMI 13/3 running alongside the mitigation site- see map. A new fence is proposed to separate the diverted Right of Way from the mitigation site and especially the 300 square metre mitigation pond which will be built by the main works contractor within the site created by Fusion JV. The fence will need to be substantial to safely separate the public from the hazards on the mitigation site

iii) The committee noted that Planning Permission had been granted for the development of The Polecat subject to some amendments regarding parking.

iv) Subject to an amendment suggested by the Deputy Clerk the draft letter to be sent to Chiltern DC regarding the timeliness of planning notifications and other related issues was approved for submission to Full Council for ratification.

v) The committee noted that on 17 January a letter had been sent to Chiltern DC reaffirming the Parish's observations on the proposed development at Peterley Wood Farm **(CH/2016/1762/OA)**

**4. Declarations of Interest** – None

### 5. Correspondence:-

i) The committee noted that the Planning Appeal in respect of the land to the rear of Chiltern Road, Ballinger and the proposed development of a stable to replace the existing field shelter **(CH/2017/0402/FA) APP/X0415/W/17/3185504** had been allowed.

ii) The Committee noted that the Planning Appeal at The Green Man in respect of the

demolition of the garage and erection of a pair of semi –detached houses served by access from Broombar Lane (**CH/2017/0838/FA**) **APP/X0415/W/17/3185133** had been dismissed.

iii) The committee noted that the interim Head of Planning for Chiltern DC Andrew Ashcroft had indicated that he was available to attend the Parish Council meeting on 12 March 2018. (See below).

iv) The committee noted and discussed the response from HS2 to the representations made by the Parish Council as to the Bury Farm Potter Row works and endorsed Councillor Johnstone’s draft response for recommendation to Council.

v) The committee noted the new contact details for the Chiltern DC planning management team.

vi) The committee noted the invitation to attend the Planning Appeal Hearing in respect of the Enforcement Notice relating to The Pheasant at Ballinger on 21 February but proposed to the Council that a simple letter be sent to Chiltern DC to put before the Appeal reiterating the objections previously set out to the development. The committee felt it was not appropriate to give evidence on the legal issue of compliance with an Enforcement Notice.

vii) The committee noted the NALC guidance as to appropriate and inappropriate matters for consideration on planning issues and asked that a copy be put on the wall of the Parish Offices for easy reference

viii) The committee noted that the appeal regarding Rivendell, Marriotts Avenue, South Heath, Buckinghamshire HP16 9QW (**CH/2017/1236/FA**) **APP/X0415/D/17/3188120** was now to be dealt with in writing and discussed the draft representations prepared by Councillor Johnstone and endorsed them for submission to the Planning Inspectorate by 23 February as required

ix) The committee noted the Campaign to Protect Rural England 8 step guide on how to respond to planning applications was available to them electronically and that printed copies are with the Planning Chair and in the office for reference if required.

## 6. Planning Applications lodged-various dates

### a) Approvals

The committee considered the applications set out below to which it had **no objection**:-

#### CH/2017 (All “FA” unless otherwise indicated)

2241 (i)	2298/TP (ii)	2312 (iii)	2319/TP (iv)	2304	2342	2018/0025/KA (v)	2018/0078/TP
2018/0018 (vi)	2370/HB (vii)	2018/0050	2018/0077	2018/0057			

### Notes to approvals

- i) This application is linked with 2370/HB
- ii) The Committee felt that the report from the arboriculturalist was excellent and fair and enabled the committee to make a well informed decision to support the application.
- iii) The Committee asked that consideration be given to a revision of the plans to reduce the height of the parapet above the flat roof line as it appeared to be superfluous. To reduce the height would reduce the visual impact of the development to neighbouring properties.
- iv) The committee noted that the provision of photographs was most helpful and that the tree types were not valuable for native wildlife and approved the felling proposed.
- v) The committee suggested that on T1 a tall stump to just below the first branches be retained to rot in situ to provide a habitat for insects and other invertebrates and a feeding site for woodpeckers and that removal to ground level was not necessary.
- vi) The committee would ideally have wanted to see the retention of a Public House on

this site but accepted that this may not be commercially viable. In those circumstances the committee considered that as the proposed development was a good one but that clarification was required as to what exactly the site was to be used for – residential rehabilitation or respite or day care and also observed that public transportation serving the site was extremely restricted which may need to be reflected in parking provision on site

vii) The application is linked with CH/2017/2241 but was received by the Parish 27 days after it.

The committee also wanted to raise with the planning department tree specialist the fact that the breeding season for birds is starting earlier due to environmental change and consideration should be given as to the dates in which tree work should not be undertaken in order to protect bird life.

**b) Objections**            There were none.

**c) Other authorities** The application 17/08392/FUL in Wycombe District Council relating to Spring Bank Perks Lane Prestwood HP16 0JQ was considered and recommended for approval

## **7. Matters for information.**

- i) The committee agreed that the revised layout of the room for the meeting was more conducive to supporting members of the public who attend the committee meetings. The committee also agreed that the clerk or deputy clerk should ensure that the committee were introduced to the public perhaps by using the agenda and confirming those present at the meeting. Furthermore in circumstances where a member of the public is struggling to put their point the clerk or deputy should intervene to offer support or clarify issues.
- ii) The committee determined that they did not need copies of the individual applications to be sent to them. The list for consideration is sufficient. It was helpful to have feedback as to the outcome of applications as against the representations made and if possible this should continue for the next 3 months.
- iii) The committee had a brief discussion about the Neighbourhood Plan but agreed that in light of the forthcoming visit of the Chiltern DC head of planning the discussion should be postponed. However it was agreed that if at all possible it would be preferable for the CDC Head of Planning to attend the planning meeting rather than the Full Council meeting and proposed that an invitation be extended to that effect.
- iv) The Deputy Clerk would prepare some key questions for the committee to consider for the meeting with Chiltern DC

6. **Date of the Next Meeting** – Monday 5 March at 19.30 in the Parish Office subject to a possible change of time to accommodate the attendance of the Chiltern DC head of Planning

The meeting closed at 9.10pm