



G R E A T M I S S E N D E N P A R I S H C O U N C I L
Minutes of a Zoom Conference call of the Planning Committee
held at 7.30 pm on Monday 5 October 2020

Councillor Cook as chair welcomed all present to the Zoom conference call

Present during the call: Councillor L. Cook (Chair)

Councillors: C. Baxter, J. Brooke, M. Johnstone, I. Lovegrove, V. Marshall, R. Pusey, and S. Rhodes
Councillor J Gladwin of the Planning Authority was also present in a liaison capacity.

1) Apologies: there were none

2) Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest in the planning applications listed.

3) Minutes - It was agreed by all that the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 7 September as amended should be signed as a correct record by Councillor Cook, and that the minutes would be delivered to Councillor Cook for signature in due course.

4) Matters arising –

i) The committee noted that the issue of a potential breach of planning in relation to Kimba Farm Stud, Moat lane Prestwood had first been discussed in July and that despite 2 replies dated 24 August and 17 September from Buckinghamshire Council's planning enforcement team to letters both indicating that substantive responses should be provided within 10 working days – so by 9 September and 1 October, as yet no substantive reply had been received. Councillor Rhodes offered to draft a letter to be circulated with a view to it being sent, once approved, to the Head of Planning at Bucks Council and the Planning Committee Chair.

ii) The committee noted that on 17 September Mike Shires of Buckinghamshire Council had acknowledged receipt of the complaint from and response submitted to the resident of Peters Close Prestwood with regard to parking issues, and confirmed that he had also received a complaint from the resident to which he had responded to in similar vein.

iii) The committee noted that on 22 September Buckinghamshire Council had acknowledged receipt of the representations made on behalf of Great Missenden Parish Council in respect of the decisions made by the Planning Committee on 7 September as ratified by full Council on 14 September.

5) Public Forum:

2 residents of the Villas London road Great Missenden had made contact and expressed a wish to participate in the public forum and comment on the application for compliance with a condition as to lighting in respect of the Misbourne School. One resident appeared by zoom and made observations on behalf of GMVA (Great Missenden Village Association) the residents of Rookwood Way and The Villas. They explained that the representations made by Great Missenden Village Association would not be considered by the planners as they were not a consultee. It was suggested that individual residents might be considered to be consultees and should lodge their objections. The representations were that a) lighting was not required for the coach drop off area, b) there is no lighting along the London Road so it is a dark sky zone, c) that the light columns at 5 metres are too intrusive and that low level lighting would be more suitable if indeed any lighting is required, d) that the site is within the AONB and e) the site is in part on the South Bucks Way. In addition the deputy clerk read the representations of the 2nd resident who was unable to participate in the meeting. After discussion by the committee of this application (number 16 on the agenda) it was agreed that the resident would send in their comments and these would be amalgamated with the comments made originally by the Parish Council in respect of the proposed lighting at Misbourne School and that the representations would be circulated for the committee to approve sending in as the deadline for responses is 6 October.

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) "Land to the West of Park Farm, Potter Row, Great Missenden, Bucks. PL/20/2747/HS2

Request for approval of plans and specifications under condition imposed by paragraphs 2 and/or 3 of Schedule 17 to the High Speed Rail (London-West Midlands) Act 2017 for a bat house, earthworks and fencing.

This matter had been discussed at the September meeting although notice of the application had only been received from Buckinghamshire Council after that meeting had taken place.

2) "The Laurels" Village Road, Ballinger, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9LQ. PL/20/2622/FA

Part 2 storey, part single storey rear extension, front porch extension, and additional windows to side elevation.

No objection, although the absence of a location plan had caused some difficulty in identifying the property, a matter to be raised in the representations as to the future of planning.

3) 8, Over Hampden, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9DZ. PL/20/2610/FA

Erection of an outbuilding

No objection

4) 20 Green Park, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0PZ. PL/20/2640/FA

Demolition of existing rear conservatory and replacement with single storey extension.

No objection

5) "Rackmere" Village Road, Ballinger, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9LQ. PL/20/2724/FA

Demolition of existing conservatory. 2 rear extensions, changes to existing porch, windows and doors.

No objection.

6) "Parsonage House" 2 Walnut Close, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9AL. PL/20/2992/KA

T1 Willow. Reduce overall canopy by up to 50%, T2 Coppice Buddleia, T3 fell Ash Tree, T4 lift Silver Birch to approx. 3 m. (Great Missenden Conservation Area).

No objection.

7) 24 Clare Road, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0NR. PL/20/2732/SA

Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed vehicular access.

In principle the Parish Council has no objection subject to the Highways Authority being satisfied that it is safe and appropriate to have 2 adjoining properties with adjoining dropped kerbs.

8) "Tyseley" Grimms Hill, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9BG. PL/20/2830/VRC

Variation of condition 3 of planning permission PL/20/0085/FA (Demolition of existing garage and erection of garage with room in roof, utility room and workshop and a link to house) to allow raising of roof and additional window.

No objection.

9) 19, Misbourne Drive, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0BL. PL/20/2837/FA

Single storey side/front extension incorporating front porch.

In principle the Parish Council has no objection subject to the Planning Authority being satisfied that there will be sufficient on-site parking to accommodate the needs of the property once extended.

10) "Orchard Hey" Ballinger Road, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9QH. PL/20/2665/FA

Single storey rear extension.

No objection.

11) Buryfield Recreation Ground, Link Road, Great Missenden Buckinghamshire. PL/20/2913/NMA
Non Material Amendment to planning permission PL/20/0325/FA (Increase the existing car park at Buryfield Recreation Ground by 22 spaces with changes to landscaping and relocation of picnic tables.) to replace the surfacing of 10 car parking spaces with tarmac instead of planings.

No need to consider as application already determined – see below.

12) Land On The North West Side of Frith Hill South Heath Buckinghamshire. PL/20/3030/NMA
Non Material Amendment to planning permission PL/20/0979/FA (Single storey extension and re-cladding of single dwelling.) to allow for changes to windows.
No objection.

13) "Fieldview", Green Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QA. PL/20/3038/FA
Erection of garden building.
No objection.

14) 146, Wrights Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0LG. PL/20/3056/FA
Single storey rear extension.
Council will be aware that in April 2020 it opposed an application PL/20/0881/FA for a single storey extension and roof conversion of this property. The committee has no objection to the revised application for a single storey rear extension subject to the following observations:-
a) That the extension will not reduce the amount of amenity space below the required level.
b) That the extension will not reduce the available on-site parking below the required standards.
c) That this will not be the forerunner for a future first floor extension, which the parish council would oppose for the reasons set out in April.

15) "The Nags Head", Public House, London Road, Little Kingshill, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0DG. PL/20/3104/CONDA
Application for approval of details reserved by condition 2 on planning permission PL/19/4178/FA. (Demolition of existing two storey extension and erection of replacement part two, 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.)
No objection.

16) 48 Lodge Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire HP16 0QG. PL/20/2968/FA
Erection of stable and feed store, retention of existing tractor shed and creation of permeable bark pathway between existing and development.
No objection subject to the planning authority being satisfied that there is safe and lawful access to and from the part of the property to be developed.

17) Deep Mill Farm", Hyde Lane, Little Kingshill, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0RE. PL/20/2958/EU
Certificate of Lawfulness for existing use of former agricultural building as a dwellinghouse.
The parish council are not in a position to object to the application but would make the following observations:-
a) This property is within the Green Belt and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
b) The services to the property are those to the main farmhouse and not independent
c) The history as evidenced by statutory declarations suggests usage as staff accommodation between 2001 and 2002 a period of vacancy and then staff usage between 2003 and 2006. There then follows a period of occupation from 2008 to 2018 by one tenancy who interestingly gives their current address as also being on a farm/equestrian unit, before occupation by members of the family of the owners of the site for the last 2 years.
d) Bearing in mind the joint services, and the location if the planning authority are minded to agree to a certificate of lawfulness for the property to be reclassified as a dwelling it is suggested that a condition s would be appropriate that it is occupied solely in relation to the owners or occupants of the site as a whole so either as staff accommodation or for family.

b) Objections

1) "The Rosary", Marriotts Avenue, South Heath, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9QN. PL/20/2414/FA
Detached double carport.
The council did not oppose an application for an outbuilding at the property in June of this year. (PL/20/1292/FA)

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

- a) The car port proposed is immediately in front of the existing garage and appears to block it and extends to the front boundary of the property. It appears to either be additional covered parking or potentially alternative parking and together with the other recent additions significantly increases the footprint of the building.
- b) The design and appearance is not in keeping with the local street scene.
- c) The impact of this extension would be such that the density and layout of the property would be out of keeping with the local street scene.
- d) If the car port is intended to replace the garage for parking, to allow the conversion of the garage to habitable accommodation that should be a part of this planning application so that the proposal can be considered in total and not in isolation or piecemeal.
- e) If the planning authority is minded to grant permission can it be subject to a condition that the garage should remain a garage and not be converted to accommodation.

2) "Deep Mill Farm", Hyde Lane, Little Kingshill, Buckinghamshire, HP16 ORE.

PL/20/2674/FA

Change of Use (Retrospective) of agricultural building to Fitness Studio (Use Class D2 Fitness and Assembly)

The Parish Council oppose this application on the following grounds:-

- a) The property is within the Green belt and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is retrospective in nature the current use said to have commenced in 2012 without approval or permission
- b) The location plan and other plans do not show any parking spaces. The application refers to their being 4 allocated car parking spaces on site. There is concern as to whether 4 spaces for what is said in the application to be 2 full time staff and a client base of between 45 and 50. This is particularly the case bearing in mind that there is no public transport to and from the site.

3) Annie Baileys Restaurant", Chesham Road, Hyde End, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QT.

PL/20/2526/FA

Demolition of restaurant and erection of community rehabilitation centre (Use Class C2)

When a previous similar application was made in 2018 CH/2018/0018/FA the parish council did not oppose that application which was refused by the planning authority on the grounds that the proposal required considerable extension of a property within the Green Belt.

The parish council whilst in principle supportive of an application of this nature namely to provide a community rehabilitation facility has reservations namely:-

- a) The property is currently derelict having sustained significant fire damage. As such it is understood that for planning purposes it is considered su generis.
- b) The property is within the Green Belt where there is a presumption against development save in very special circumstances and that the National Planning Policy Framework at S172 states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in, for example areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- c) There are concerns as to the extent of the parking provision and as to whether this will be sufficient for the combination of staff, residents and visitors to residents be they professional or family.
- d) That concern is reinforced by the observations within the application as to access and transport arrangements and the referrals as to public transport and pedestrian access. The reality is that public transport is not a viable means of transport to and from the site for residents or staff as the buses which pass nearby are infrequent (it is believed to be 2 a week) There is no clear direct access on foot from the nearest settlement- Great Missenden where there is public transport. Accordingly it seems that all staff and visitors to the centre would need to drive to the premises which increases the need for adequate parking provision on site

If the planning authority is able to be satisfied that a) the parking provision and highways access for the type and number of vehicles likely to be going to the site on a daily basis are adequate and b) that the development would not involve any significant change in footprint so as to impact upon the Green Belt then the parish council would not oppose the applications.

4) Mulberry Lodge", 64A Wycombe Road, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0PQ.

PL/20/2843/FA

Detached dwelling and garage, subdivision of garden.

The parish council oppose this application and is aware that 2 previous applications were made in 2017 for permission for a detached garage the first of which was refused and the appeal against that decision was refused, (CH/2017/1660/FA) and the second of which CH/2017/2073/FA was granted. There is also a history of applications for a dwelling on this site all of which have been refused and appeals rejected.

The parish council objects on the grounds that:-

- a) The proposed development is clearly within the Green Belt despite the applicant's assertions to the contrary.
- b) The proposed development is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

- c) There is a presumption against development save in very special circumstances and the National Planning Policy Framework at S172 states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in, for example areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- d) The access to and from the location is restricted and the applicants highways assessment is now 12 years old so clearly out of date in terms of any data as to the volume of traffic movements on the A4128 the road onto which any access would lead.
- e) The design and appearance of the proposed development is out of keeping with neighbouring properties.
- f) The layout and density – the development is out of keeping with the street scene.
- g) permitting this development in this location would set a precedent for further development in the green belt behind other properties that front on to the Wycombe Road (A4128).

5) “ Arley House” Broombar Lane, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9JT. PL/20/3026/TP.

3 Sycamores – works according to a schedule –protected by a Tree Preservation Order.

In 2016 an application was made for crown reduction of these trees and application that was not opposed by the Parish Council. With regard to the current application the parish council opposes the application.

The grounds are:-

- a) These trees are subject to a Tree Preservation Order.
- b) There is nothing to suggest that regular maintenance of the trees will not both protect them and reduce any negative impact from the trees on the applicants and their property.
- c) There is no expert arboriculturist or tree surgeon report that has been provided to suggest that the trees are either diseased, or at risk of falling, or at risk of causing any damage to property

6) “ The Misbourne School” Misbourne Drive, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire. AOC/0051/20

Discharge of Condition 8 (Lighting Scheme) of planning permission CC/0043/19

The parish council objects to this application on the following grounds:-

- a) The majority of this site is located within the Green Belt.
- b) The majority of this site is located within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- c) The site is close to the Great Missenden Conservation Area.
- d) That the original plans made inadequate provision for parking and servicing.
- e) That there would be a significant increase in traffic generation with an additional access way on to an already congested and busy highway.
- f) The lack of appropriate infrastructure to support the development and lack of sustainability in terms of the environmental consequences of the development.
- g) It is apparent that the original transport plan and policy suggested in the planning application was fundamentally flawed as was pointed out in the original representations made to Bucks Council by the parish council. The travel plan suggested that many pupils would cycle from Chesham and Amersham to school, or that public transport would be used. The parish council pointed out that the roads from Chesham and Amersham have no cycle routes incorporated and are not suitable for cyclists being busy highways with either no or limited street lighting. Those issues have not been addressed by the planning authority. As predicted by the parish council it would seem that the majority of the predicted additional 211 pupils will not be local and will be travelling to the site by coach, hence the need for a coach drop off and turning area. However there is no reason, it seems, why that area requires any lighting, bearing in mind the operational hours of the school- almost entirely within daylight hours and predominantly between 8am and 3.30pm. Even if lighting for this area is required the extent should be limited, and the style of lighting should be in keeping with the area and not invasive as proposed by the suggested use of some 17.5 metre high lighting columns. Even when not lit these will be obtrusive and impact upon the landscape.
- h) The parish council accepts that for other parts of the site some lighting is clearly required, but again it is fundamental that, bearing in mind the location, this lighting should be sympathetic to the surroundings and the fact that there is no street lighting on the London Road, and that this area is in effect a dark sky location and within the AONB and Green Belt.
- i) The parish council is sure that it does not need to remind the planning authority that there is a presumption against development in the Green Belt save in very special circumstances and that the National Planning Policy Framework at S172 states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in, for example

areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. A lighting scheme such as that proposed would have a detrimental impact on the public visual amenity, namely the Green Belt area of the hillside from the London Road towards Prestwood as well as the grounds of Missenden Abbey.

j) It is fundamentally flawed for the lighting designers to treat the southern car park and the coach drop off area as one unit. They are not and serve separate purposes and have separate lighting requirements and will be in use at different times, the coach drop off area predominantly if not exclusively between the hours of 8am and 3.30 pm so during daylight hours. It is therefore not apparent as to why any lighting is necessary in this area and there is no safety study to justify it.

k) If however it is felt that for safety reasons some lighting is a necessity it should be by way of ground lighting or low level bollards which would be far less obtrusive and far more sympathetic to its surroundings, to the dark sky, for local residents, and for the public visual amenity of the Green Belt and AONB. Cost should not be a factor precluding this option.

l) Finally the Parish Council is aware of the strength of feeling against this lighting scheme of both local residents who would suffer the impact of this high level lighting, particularly those within The Villas on London Road and in Rookwood Way, and the Great Missenden Village Association which seeks to represent the residents and business within the village of Great Missenden.

7) “ The Misbourne School” Misbourne Drive, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire.

AOC/0052/20

Application for approval of details reserved by condition 4(Landscape Planting), condition 5 (Frontage Fencing) and condition 14 (MUGA details) of planning permission CC/0043/19

The parish council opposes this application on the following grounds:-

- a) Not for the first time in this case the application appears to include land that is not owned by the applicants and for which no appropriate notice has been served on the land owners namely the parish council.
- b) The discharge of condition application dated 24 September refers to an email- it is not readily apparent as to who that email is from, its date or as to it being a document loaded on to the website for perusal and consideration.
- c) A number of the documents provided on the website are simply extracts of bigger documents and do not assist with any specifics to allow proper consideration of the proposals

8) “Chestnut House”, Broombar Lane, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9JD

PL/20/3070/CONDA.

Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 13, 15 & 16 on planning permission PL/19/4163/FA. (Redevelopment of site to provide 2 detached dwellings with vehicular access, associated hardstanding, landscaping and car parking.)

Council will be aware that it opposed the original application for planning permission for this development of this site and as to issues raised concerning the implementation of the planning permission and a previous request for a non-material amendment. Councillor Rhodes had drafted and circulated a letter to the committee to consider with a view to it being sent to the planning authority dealing with the current request and the outstanding potential enforcement issues. To date only limited responses have been received.

7) Correspondence:-

- i) The committee noted that on 3 September Buckinghamshire Council had advised that an appeal had been lodged in respect of the refusal of planning permission for the erection of 3 dwellings each with a garage and amenity space along with demolition of existing garage and replacement with a new garage to the rear of Holly Cottage and a new vehicular access to be obtained from the construction of a private drive connecting to Ballinger Road via the existing driveway serving Holly Cottage, Ballinger Road, South Heath, Buckinghamshire HP16 9QH (planning application PL/20/0842/FA) The original application had been opposed by GMPC. The appeal is to be determined under the written appeals procedure - appeal reference APP/X0415/W/20/3257572. Councillor Johnstone had drafted representations to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate subject to the approval of the planning committee who had seen the representations and unanimously endorsed them.
- ii) The committee noted the various communications from Buckinghamshire Council with regard to the proposed non material amendment to the planning application for the extension to the Buryfield Car Park PL/20/0325/FA and that on 3 September it awaited verification and that on 15 September it had been approved.
- iii) The committee noted that on 4 September Buckinghamshire Council had provided a briefing note on changes to the planning system which have already come into force- including changes to use classes (This is totally separate from the recent and ongoing consultations and had been provided for councillors when considering future planning applications.

- iv) The committee noted that on 7 September Mike Shires from Buckinghamshire Council had sent out to all parish councils in the Chiltern Area a newsletter setting out details of the planning team for the area, and that these newsletters could become a regular feature to assist the working relationship between the County Council and the Parish and Town councils.
- v) The committee noted that on 12 September the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England had written asking for signatures to their petition against changes to the planning system, but determined not to take any action.
- vi) The committee noted that on 17 September the Open Spaces Society had sent out a briefing note with regard to funding for Neighbourhood Plans. Councillor Lovegrove advised that he felt that for a variety of reasons both personal and regarding planning changes that any further consideration of preparing a Neighbourhood Plan should be deferred for a further period. The committee agreed that this was sensible.
- vii) The committee noted that on 2 September BALC (Bucks Association of Local Councils) had also sent out guidance as to the new planning uses classes.
- viii) The committee noted that Buckinghamshire Council had sent through a series of outcomes of planning applications on 17, 19, 23, 25, 29 and 30 September and that the deputy clerk had set out an analysis of the outcome of applications with details of the stance that the parish council had taken, for which he was thanked.
- ix) The committee noted that on 29 September Buckinghamshire Council had provided a copy of their response to the government concerning the proposed changes to the planning system and invited parish and town councils to support their response although the deadline for that response was in fact 1 October, and the parish council's own response to that consultation had already been submitted both to the Ministry of Housing and to BALC and NALC.

8) Matters for information

There were none save to report that the working party had met by Zoom on Friday 2 October to discuss the Government white paper "Planning for the Future" and that as a result of that meeting a proposed response had been prepared and circulated to the committee who approved that it should be provided to council for approval with one amendment suggested by Councillor Johnstone namely that in answer to question 1 the response "undemocratic" should be replaced by the word pseudo- democratic.

9. Date of the Next Meeting –Monday 2 November 2020 at 19.30 in the Parish Office unless otherwise advised

The meeting closed at 21.10.