

# GREAT MISSENDEN PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee  
held in the Parish Office at 7.30 pm  
on Monday 6 January 2020

**Present:** Councillor S. Rhodes acting chair

Councillors: V. Marshall and R. Pusey and CDC Councillor J. Gladwin in a liaison capacity

**Apologies:** Councillors C. Baxter, S. Humphreys, M. Johnstone and I. Lovegrove.

At the start of the meeting Councillor Rhodes welcomed all those present and asked to place on record the appreciation of the committee and council of the work of the clerks in servicing the requirements of council and the planning committee.

## **1) Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Rhodes drew the attention of the committee to the fact that he was involved in the application at 4 on the list of applications and would not take part in the discussion as to this application. There would therefore not be a quorum for the decision relating to this application, but as the application is not a new build and in any event the committee decision has to be approved by full council the advice was for the remaining members of the committee to consider the application in due course.

**2) Minutes** - It was agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 2 December should be signed as a correct record, and Councillor Rhodes duly signed a copy of the minutes.

## **3) Matters arising –**

- i) The committee noted that its representations as ratified by full Council on the planning applications considered at its meeting on 2 December had been submitted to Chiltern DC on 10 December.
- ii) The committee noted the updated list showing the outcomes of the planning applications considered at the meeting of 2 December 2019.
- iii) The committee noted that an amended form of the draft letter of complaint circulated to council had been sent to Chiltern DC on 12 December and not yet acknowledged despite the fact that it was e-mailed, posted, and passed to a CDC Councillor, and that the householder who complained has received an acknowledgement, and expressed concern that the issues raised were not being taken seriously by Chiltern DC. The Deputy Clerk was instructed to draft a letter to be sent to the Chiltern DC Cabinet member for planning expressing their concern.

## **4) Public Forum:**

There were 3 members of the public for the public forum 1 of whom had submitted written representations on 4 January. All were present in respect of the application at 6 on the list of applications regarding “Ikoyi” Broombar Lane, Great Missenden, PL/19/4163/FA. The committee agreed to hear the representations and consider the application at this point in the meeting to allow those present to leave as and when they wished to. The committee determined to oppose the application (see below). The application relates to the last house on the left at the bottom of Broombar Lane and the application has changed from the previous withdrawn application the proposed development no longer being a tandem development. The representations made are summarised as:-

- i) Concerns over the adequacy of parking provision on the site.
- ii) Concerns as to access to and from the site for both the occupants and for service vehicles.
- iii) The form and the height in particular of the 2 proposed dwellings which were out of keeping with neighbouring properties, would be overbearing and also impinge on the privacy of those occupying neighbouring properties.
- iv) The fact that this is overdevelopment of a plot within the AONB and on the border of the Green Belt

## **5) Correspondence:-**

- i) The committee noted that notices of determination of planning applications had been received from Chiltern DC on 28 and 30 November, 3, 4, 7, and December.
- ii) The committee noted that on 28 November Bucks CC had confirmed the registration of Councillor Rhodes to speak on behalf of GMPC in respect of The Misbourne School application to be considered by Bucks CC planning committee on 2 December and Councillor Rhodes had duly done so.

- iii) The committee noted the correspondence between a resident in South Heath, Chiltern DC planning department and the deputy clerk in respect of the planning application PL/19/2782/FA (items 5 iii to vi on the agenda).
- iv) The committee noted that on 3 December Chiltern DC had advised that the application PL/19/2722/FA in respect of Hildreth's Garden Centre was to be determined at the Chiltern DC planning committee meeting on 16 December.
- v) The committee noted that on 3 December Chiltern DC had advised that the application PL/19/2431/FA in respect of the former Zion Chapel in Kiln Road, Prestwood was to be determined at the Chiltern DC planning committee meeting on 16 December.
- vi) The committee noted that on 3 December Chiltern DC had advised that the minutes of its planning committee meeting held on 7 November were available to view on their website.
- vii) The committee noted that on 3 December Chiltern DC had advised that the agenda for its planning committee meeting scheduled for 6pm on Monday 16 December was available to view on their website.
- viii) The committee noted that on 4 December Bucks County Councillor P. Martin had advised that Chesham Town Council were applying to start work on a Neighbourhood Plan.
- ix) The committee noted the email of 6 December from NALC and the link to the National Trust guide to Heritage in Neighbourhood Plans.
- x) The committee noted that on 13 December Chiltern DC had advised that the comments relating to planning application PL/19/752/HB had been added to the public website.
- xi) The committee noted that on 13 December Chiltern DC had advised that they are not obliged to give notification of a planning application in an adjoining district and accepted that they did not have a consistent policy on whether they would provide such notifications.
- xii) The committee noted that after some delay in responding to an advice request made of them on 16 December Chiltern DC had advised as to a planning enquiry made of them and as a result the application for a Certificate of Lawfulness had been lodged and acknowledged. The committee regretted to note that over 14 days later the application has not yet been validated.
- xiii) The committee noted that on 20 December Chiltern DC had advised of the upcoming High Street Bucks event to take place on Tuesday 11 February at Pinewood Studios.
- xiv) The committee noted that on 20 December Chiltern DC had advised of the publication of the agenda for its planning committee meeting scheduled for 9 January 2020 at 6pm.
- xv) The committee noted that on 20 December Chiltern DC had advised of the withdrawal of the committee call in in respect of the application relating to land adjacent to "Idaho Cottage" PL/19/3739/VRC.
- xvi) The committee noted that on 24 December Chiltern DC had advised that their proposal for the Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule was to be discussed by both cabinet and council on Tuesday 7 January.
- xvii) The committee noted the Buckinghamshire Council plans as to the proposed planning services to be implemented on the succession of the unitary authority. It was observed that a number of the District Councils were suffering recruitment and retention issues with staff as a result of the uncertainty of the way in which the new Unitary Authority was to work.

## **6) Planning Applications lodged-various dates**

### **a) Approvals with any relevant notes**

The Committee considered the applications set out below to which it had no objection and for which separate letters would be drafted:-

- 1) "West Hyde House", London Road, Little Kingshill, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 ODE  
Single storey side and rear extensions and internal and external alterations. **PL/19/4106/FA**  
No objection
- 2) 118 High Street, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 OBG  
Notification of proposed works to trees in a conservation area Height and side reduction of a silver birch in Conservation Area. **PL/19/4117/KA**  
No objection although there was a discussion as to why such extensive cutting back was deemed necessary.

3) "The Beeches", Martinsend Lane, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9HR  
Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, conversion of existing garage to self-contained annex, removal of front canopy and erection of front porch, changes to windows, rendering existing property and extensions, and erection of entrance gate and fencing. **PL/19/4062/FA**  
No objection

4) "Dapple Grey", Broomfield Close, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9HX  
Demolition of conservatory and construction of single storey rear extension. **PL/19/3944/FA**  
No objection subject to full council not having any objection.

5) "The Nags Head Public House" London Road, Little Kingshill, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0DG  
Demolition of existing 2 storey extension and erection of replacement part 2, part single storey side/rear extension, erection of outbuilding to form additional accommodation, internal alterations, an extension to the existing car park and associated soft and hard landscaping. **PL/19/4178/FA**  
The Parish Council support this application to provide additional much needed hotel accommodation in the Parish, subject only to the planning authority being satisfied that the parking provision on site is adequate for the property if extended as proposed, and that there is adequate provision for disabled access.

6) "The Cottage" Broomfield House, Broomfield Hill, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9PD  
Erection of detached double garage. **PL/19/4211/FA**  
No objection

7) "Russets" Village Road, Ballinger, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9LF  
Non Material Amendment to planning permission PL/19/2218/VRC (Variation of condition 7 of planning permission: CH/2018/0907/FA (Demolition of existing bungalow and garage and erection of two storey house with detached garage using the existing access.) to allow for: extending the rear single storey by 1 metre; repositioning garage; new garage roof to allow loft storage with access via external timber stair.) to allow for: Alterations to windows and doors. **PL/19/4179/NMA**  
No objection although the Parish Council note with concern that they were not notified of the proposed non-material amendment and yet the planning officer's report is rather misleading in stating that no Parish Council representations were received. Whilst this is technically correct it is because the Parish Council were not made aware of the proposed amendment until after it had been permitted some 2 weeks before the determination deadline.

## **b) Objections**

1) London Luton Airport, Airport Way, Luton, LU2 9LY  
Consultation from Luton Borough Council re application to vary condition 10 of planning permission 15/00950/VARCON for a temporary period (to the end of 2024) to enable the area enclosed by the 57dB (A) daytime noise contour to increase from 19.4sq km to 21.4 sq. km and the area enclosed by the 48dB (A) night time noise contour to increase from 37.2 sq. km to 44.1.sq.km. **PL/19/4165/ADJ 19/00428/EIA**

**NB** There are no documents on CDC web site as this is a neighbouring application notification. To view documents go to Luton Borough Council Planning website and reference 19/00428/EIA.

The Parish Council whilst noting that this is in the first instance a variation of a condition which increases the daytime noise contour marginally and the night time noise contour to a somewhat larger extent and that it is for a temporary period oppose this application for the following reasons:-

- a) There is a belief that if permitted on a temporary basis that permission will be used to justify a permanent increase in the noise contours.
- b) The parish being in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and a substantial part of the parish being within the Green Belt is deserving of a degree of tranquillity to allow both residents and visitors to the area to enjoy the countryside. Any increase in noise will be intrusive for the residents and visitors to the area.

c) This nuisance of noise intrusion is exacerbated by the fact that the parish is also within the area of operation of Heathrow airport and the aerodromes at Booker (High Wycombe), Denham and Halton (Wendover)

A copy of the letter of objection will be sent to CDC and direct to Luton Borough Council.

2) "Ikoyi" Broombar Lane, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9JD

Redevelopment of site to provide 2 detached dwellings with vehicular access, associated hardstanding, landscaping and car parking. **PL/19/4163/FA**

A similar application **PL/19/2508/FA** was considered by the committee at its September meeting, and was subsequently withdrawn. The Parish Council agree that some redevelopment of the existing property would not be inappropriate. The revised application whilst a marginal improvement in that it is no longer a proposed tandem development, which is something that the Draft Local Plan under policy DM DP8 indicates, will specifically not be permitted.

However the Parish Council oppose the current application on the following grounds:-

a) **Parking.** Chiltern's current Parking Standards Policy TR16 residential minimum design dictate that the site would require a total of a minimum 6 parking spaces with the minimum internal dimension of any single garage being 2.7m x 5.0m. Plot 2 in the proposal has a double garage building with two single garages each having internal dimensions of only 2.4m x 4.75m and as such considered storage areas not garages, for purposes of car park space count. Therefore it appears that the proposed parking arrangements fall materially short of the current requirements in respect of parking provision and the safe manoeuvring to enable egress and access in a forwards manner and would fall even further short of the latest official parking standards set out in the planning authorities draft plan, upon which the public have already been consulted. Bearing in mind the location of the site, on a single track road with passing places and no parking provision on the road other than with a risk of obstruction of the highway and interference with the rights of those in neighbouring properties as to access, on-site parking must be adequate. In addition a total of approximately 14 refuse/recycling bins/containers would need to be parked on the site somewhere in the hard standing / parking area for which no specific provision is made in the proposal.

b) **Access.** The position and nature of the parking and access provided on the plans suggests that to leave the premises vehicles might have to reverse. Bearing in mind this is a single track road this creates a very significant highway safety issue. A combined access to both proposed properties fails to address these concerns and fails to provide scope for service vehicles to the property.

c) **Traffic Generation.** The size and scale of the proposed dwellings is such that it will generate a level of traffic movements both of residents and for service vehicles that is inappropriate as the only access is from Broombar Lane, a single track road.

d) **Overlooking and loss of privacy.** Because of the design of the proposed new properties one would appear to overlook from its front first floor bedroom full floor to ceiling height window and Juliet balcony, a neighbouring property which as a result will suffer an unacceptable loss of privacy and amenity for occupiers of both properties.

e) **Green Belt/AONB.** The site lies within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is bounded on 2 sides by the Green Belt in which any development should only be approved in very special circumstances. Permitting additional building risks setting a precedent in favour of further development within or encroaching upon the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework at S 172 states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and **Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty**, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues and this is reinforced in the existing local plan at LSQ1 which states that Development should conserve, and where considered appropriate and practicable by the Council, enhance the special landscape character and high scenic quality of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposed development does not enhance the special landscape character not the high scenic quality of the AONB, and would have a significant detrimental impact on the public visual amenity namely the views along the valley and in the Green Belt.

f) **Layout and density.** Although the layout is improved by not being a tandem development the overall impact of 2 houses of the size proposed on the plot is out of keeping with other plots along the road and is

overbearing with the roof heights being significantly greater than that of neighbouring properties. Furthermore because of the need to preserve privacy between the dwellings there are limited windows in the side walls which in view of the height of the building will restrict the natural light to the properties.

g) Design and appearance. The design and appearance is out of keeping with the street scene. Furthermore by only allowing one means of access to and egress from the site highways safety is likely to be compromised. Furthermore the parking provision on the plans does not indicate which parking spaces are allocated to which property which risks issues with sufficiency of car parking on the site.

h) Trees and ecology. There is concern that despite the ecological report prepared suggesting that many trees will be retained, and some replaced, one tree supposedly to be retained has already been felled which may well be an indicator of the risk of the loss of further established trees on the site.

i) ERASC. The planned development is within an established area of special character which provides that and development must retain the special character of the area. Damage to the special character or development that significantly increases the density of buildings is not to be permitted. The proposal has an adverse impact on the plot pattern, rhythms and gaps that create the semi rural distinctiveness of the area. In particular criteria for development in such locations provides amongst other things that each dwelling should have an existing frontage to an existing road ( being a metalled carriageway) and that the frontage width should be similar to other plots widths on the road. The proposed property, Plot 2 is screened from the highway, has no independent access to the highway and arguably therefore has no frontage to the highway and is non-compliant.

3) Amersham School, Stanley Hill, Amersham, Buckinghamshire, HP7 9HH

Consultation from Bucks CC re removal of condition 6 ( provision of cycleway) to application CC/0013/19( Proposed demolition of an existing defunct single storey dining hall in poor condition and its replacement with a 2 storey and a single storey classroom extension of the existing science block **PL/19/4399/BCC Bucks CC no CC/0013/19**

Although this application is not within the parish, the request to remove a condition imposed was considered by the parish council in light of the recent proposal by Bucks CC to itself to expand the Misbourne Academy which is within the parish, and which permission if given is likely to incorporate a number of conditions designed to reduce the ecological impact of the development. It appears that the current request to remove a planning condition to provide a cycleway is driven purely by financial constraints with no consideration for the need to provide adequate alternative transportation strategies for schools and to enhance and improve the health of young people by encouraging them to travel to and from school other than by motorised transport and on that basis the Parish Council objects to the proposed removal of the condition, anticipating that is the condition is removed in this case , similar conditions imposed in respect of the Misbourne Academy will be the subject of similar requests if and when the principal development has been completed.

**7. Date of the Next Meeting – Monday 7 February 2020 at 19.30 in the Parish Office.**

The meeting closed at 21.20.