



## GREAT MISSENDEN PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Zoom Conference call of the Planning Committee  
held at 7.30 pm on Monday 7 December 2020

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

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

Councillors: J. Brooke, S. Humphreys, 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.

Also present were members of the Public Forum being 4 residents who wished to hear the discussion with regard to planning application 23 on the agenda and 1 who wished to hear the discussion with regard to planning applications 19 and 20 on the agenda.

**1) Apologies:** were received from Councillor Baxter.

### **2) Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest in the planning applications listed save that Councillor Rhodes declared an interest in respect of the planning applications at 19 and 20 on the list as he continues to correspond with the planning authority with regard to alleged breaches of planning and the issue of commencement of work and whether the permission granted remained lawful.

**3) Minutes** - It was agreed by all that the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 2 November 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 on 29 October NALC had acknowledged receipt of the copy of the representations that had been submitted by the Parish Council to the government in respect of the white paper “Planning for the Future”.

ii) The committee noted that on 5 November Buckinghamshire Council had acknowledged receipt of the representations of GMPC in respect of the planning application for “Holly Cottage”, Ballinger Road, South Heath, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9QH. (PL/20/2889/FA) submitted as agreed by the planning committee on 2 November 2020.

iii) The committee noted that on 11 November Buckinghamshire Council had acknowledged receipt of the representations of GMPC in respect of the planning applications considered at the planning committee meeting of 2 November as ratified and agreed by the council at its meeting on 9 November.

iv) the committee noted that as agreed by the committee on 2 November and ratified by council on 5 November the letter sent to the Buckinghamshire Council cabinet member for planning, Councillor Whyte, in respect of the failure by Buckinghamshire Council to do anything more than acknowledge receipt of the letters sent to them relating to the potential unauthorised development at Kimba Farm Stud, Moat Lane, Prestwood had been responded to by Councillor Whyte the same day indicating that the issue would be investigated and a substantive response would follow, That response was received on 3 December after the preparation of the agenda. It was agreed to circulate it to the planning committee. -.

## 5) Public Forum:

After identifying themselves and their interests one of the members of the public who had attended with regard to the planning application in respect of “**Land at rear of Rosadel and Westway**”, **Spurlands End Road, Great Kingshill, Buckinghamshire, HP15 6HX**. Reserved matters following outline planning permission CH/2018/0628/OA (Outline Application for construction of two detached dwellings with access via upgraded existing driveway), **PL/20/3845/DE** outlined their representations as to the detailed application and the impact it would have on the ancient woodland at the rear of the property, the ecological environment, the increased access issues to the site as a result of the extent of the development, and the fact that the design and appearance of the proposed detailed plans would impact upon the adjoining properties and result in a loss of privacy, light and amenity. They agreed to submit the document from which they had read their points. The Committee went on to consider this application before the others on the list.

The member of the public with an interest in the applications in relation to **Chestnut House” Broombar Lane, Great Missenden, HP16 9JD, PL/20/3070/CONDA**. Approval of details reserved by conditions 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 13, 15, & 16 on planning permission PL/19/3163/FA (redevelopment of site to provide 2 detached dwellings with vehicular access, associated hardstanding, landscaping and car parking) as amended by way of amended landscaping plan and Construction Traffic Management Plan dated 25 and 26 November did not wish to make any representations save to pass on that no parking signs had been fixed to the boundary fence of the property. The Committee went on to consider this application before others on the list to allow the member of the public to leave.

## 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) Buryfield Recreation Ground, Link Rd, Great Missenden, HP16 9AE. PL/20/3608/KA.**

Proposed tree works in a conservation area. Lime Tree x 1 height reduction by up to two thirds.  
No Objection or comment on the basis that this is an application by the Parish Council itself.

**2) 3 Over Hampden, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9DZ. PL/20/3353/FA.**

Erection of detached outbuilding and changes to doors and windows of existing property including enlarged garage door.  
No Objection.

**3) 25, The Glebe, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9DN. PL/20/3384/EU.**

Certificate of Lawfulness for existing single storey rear extension (amendment to that permitted by PL/20/1295/SA).  
No Objection.

**4) “Highways”, 6, London Road, Little Kingshill, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0DE. PL/20/3304/FA.**

Single storey rear extension and single storey side infill extension. Changes to windows and doors and new side rooflight.  
No Objection.

**5) "Deep Mill Farm", Hyde Lane, Little Kingshill, Buckinghamshire, HP16 ORE. PL/20/3305/EU.**

Certificate of Lawful Development for existing use: Erection of Buildings, Erection of Horse-Walker, Menage, use of land for open-air storage of vehicles, use of buildings & Horse-Walker & Menage & land for Equestrian and Livery Commercial Business. Further to confirm that Condition 1 of planning permission CH/1992/1339/FA has been breached for at least 10 years and is therefore no longer enforceable.

The Deputy Clerk advised that there was limited opportunity to comment on this application as if the unauthorised development had taken place 10 years ago and no enforcement action had been taken the planning authority had fettered its powers to address the breach. Unless there are issues with or inconsistencies in the evidence put forward by the applicant, there is little that the Parish Council can say. Mindful of the fact that there have been a number of applications with regard to this site over recent months Councillor Lovegrove volunteered to investigate further and report back in advance of the Parish Council meeting scheduled for Monday 14 December.

**6) 47, Church Street, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0AZ. PL/20/3555/FA.**

Removal of a dormer window and first floor rear extension.

No Objection.

**7) "Barley View House", 1, Barley View, Prestwood, HP16. 9BW. PL/20/3635/FA.**

Single storey side/rear extension and side open porch.

In principle the Parish Council does not oppose the application. However it is not clear from the plans as to whether the proposed development will result in any loss of on-site parking, and of course the extension is significant in size and increases the overall size of habitable accommodation. There is a shortage of off-site parking in this area, and indeed frequent parking of vehicles on the pavement in front of properties in Barley View. Accordingly the Parish Council would ask the planning authority to ensure that the proposed development is consistent with current parking standards in terms of the provision of on-site parking

**8) "Rivendell" Bernards Close. Great Missenden, HP16 0BU. PL/20/3650/VRC.**

Variation of condition 8 of planning permission PL/18/4740/FA (Replacement dwelling and detached covered carport and store) to allow change of design to make house smaller and remove basement accommodation. Approval of details reserved by conditions 2, 3 and 5.

In principle the Parish Council does not oppose the application as it reduces the size of the property and its footprint. However the view of the Parish Council is that the new design is a substantial departure from the original application and would be better dealt with by way of a new planning application. It is on the face of it more than a simple approval of details reserved by conditions 2, 3, and 5.

**9) "The Pippin", Cherry Close, Prestwood. Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QD. PL/20/3682/FA.**

Single storey rear extensions and garage conversion.

In principle the Parish Council does not oppose the application subject to the planning authority being satisfied that:-

a) There is adequate viable on-site parking to reflect the increase in habitable accommodation and the loss of the garage parking, and the lack of available safe on street parking in the vicinity of the property.

b) That access to and from the property once the extension and conversion has taken place and taking into account the on-site parking will be possible without the need for vehicles to reverse out

of the property – in other words ensuring that there is adequate space on site for parked vehicles to turn and manoeuvre.

**10) “Jasmine” Marriotts Avenue, South Heath, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9QL. PL/20/3729/FA.**

Erection of new orangery to rear.

No Objection.

**11) “Wheatsheaf Cottage”, Browns Road, Hyde End, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0RQ. PL/20/3787/FA.**

Single storey front extension.

No Objection.

**12) “Oakleigh”, Martinsend Lane, Great Missenden, HP16 9BH. PL/20/3524/TP.**

T1- Oak - Crown reduction by 2 - 3 metres (TPO/2008/009).

Whilst in principle the Parish Council does not oppose the application, it is noted that bearing in mind the nature of the application, according to the application form at point 4 (1) 1. As the Condition of the tree is said to be of concern - the applicant is required to provide written arboricultural advice or other diagnostic information from an appropriate expert which does not appear to have been provided and is certainly not available for scrutiny and consideration.

**13) “Tylers Cottage” Peterley Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0HH. PL/20/3614/FA.**

Conversion of garage to habitable use, first floor side extension and side porch.

No Objection.

**14) “Brynawel”, 27 Upper Hollis, Great Missenden, HP16 9HP. PL/20/3764/FA.**

Two storey side/ front extension, single storey rear extension, front porch, canopy and new detached double garage.

On balance the council does not object to the application but note that the proposal includes the relocation of the garage further forward on the plot and would suggest that appropriate conditions as to size and design are imposed to ensure that the development is not out of keeping with the street scheme and does not have any negative impact on adjoining properties.

**15) 22 Honor Road, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0NJ. PL/20/3805/SA.**

Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed Loft Conversion with the addition of a rear dormer.

No Objection.

**16) 28, Nairdwood Close, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QN. PL/20/3778/FA.**

Single storey rear extension alterations to existing side carport and alterations to roof over existing garages.

No Objection.

**17) Misbourne School, Misbourne Drive, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0BN.**

**AOC/0063/20.**

Application for approval of details pertaining to condition 6 (Archaeology) of planning application no. CC/0043/19 for Misbourne School.

No Objection.

**18) “Ladymede”, Grimms Hill, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9BG. PL/20/3350/NMA.**  
Non Material Amendment to planning permission CH/2015/1993/FA (Demolition of outbuildings, erection of single storey side extension to garage, detached greenhouse, new entrance gates to both access points and retaining wall) to allow for brick pillars to entrance gates  
No Objection.

**19) “Meadow Cottage”, Trafford Road, Great Missenden, HP16 0BT. PL/20/3659/FA.**  
Part conversion and addition of pitched roof and door to garage.  
No Objection.

## **b) Objections**

**1) 48 Lodge Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QG. PL/20/3721/FA.**  
Single storey rear extension with roof light and first floor rear extension incorporating Juliet balcony, changes to rear windows and doors and changes to internal layout

The Parish Council oppose this application. It is noted that less than 2 months ago there was an application PL/20/2968/FA for the erection of stables and feed store, retention of existing tractor shed and creation of permeable bark pathway between existing and proposed development. That application awaits determination.

The submission of a further application for further development should it is submitted be considered along with the previous application so that the totality of the situation can be seen by the planning officer and to avoid a situation of an accumulation of consents or consideration of each application without reference to the other.

The 2 principle objections to the proposal are:-

- a) The cumulative loss of amenity space within the curtilage of the property as a result of the 2 developments proposed.
- b) The adequacy of viable parking provision on site taking into account both the increase in habitable accommodation and the potential parking required in association with the stables.

**2) “Peterley Wood Farm Barn”, Peterley Lane, Prestwood, HP16 0HH. PL/20/3247/FA.**  
Conversion of existing barn to form single residential unit C3, together with alterations to fenestration, erection of detached car port structure, landscaping and hardstanding. (Amended)

The Parish Council opposed the original application and its reasons are clearly set out. The proposed amendments to the application do nothing to address those issues raised by the Parish Council which for the avoidance of doubt are:-

- a) The proposed development is within the Green Belt and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty where 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.
- b) Whilst the applicant suggests that the development would be a change from the use of the barn as industrial storage and car repair premises, it is believed that the barn is in fact **not occupied** for storage or for car repairs and **is therefore not in industrial use**. If this is the case any suggestion that conversion from industrial use to residential will reduce traffic flow is incorrect and in fact the development would lead to an increase in traffic movements.
- c) The Parish Council has concerns as to the Highways access to and from the site and as to whether or not it is adequate to provide safe access and egress for road users and in particular pedestrians if there is additional traffic flow from the site.

**3) “Peterley Wood Farm”, Peterley Lane, Prestwood, HP16 0HH.**

**PL/20/3487/FA.**

Erection of 2 replacement 2 storey dwellings and 1 single storey dwelling and 2 garages.

The Parish Council oppose this application which it understands has been called in for consideration by the planning committee. The grounds for opposing the application are:-

- a) The proposed development is within the Green Belt and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty where 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.
- b) The Parish Council has concerns as to the Highways access to and from the site and as to whether or not it is adequate to provide safe access and egress for road users and in particular pedestrians if there is additional traffic flow from the site, as is inevitable with the creation of 2 additional dwellings along with an additional dwelling if permission is given in respect of PL/203247/FA. This is particularly critical in light of the 3<sup>rd</sup> ground, namely
- c) Sustainability. There appears to be limited safe pedestrian access from the site to the main roads and to the nearest point at which public transport is available. This would seem to necessitate the use of motor vehicles by those resident on the site if the development is approved.

**4 & 5) “Chestnut House” Broombar Lane, Great Missenden, HP16 9JD.**

**PL/20/3070/CONDA.**

Approval of details reserved by conditions 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 13, 15, & 16 on planning permission PL/19/3163/FA (redevelopment of site to provide 2 detached dwellings with vehicular access, associated hardstanding, landscaping and car parking). Including amendment by way of amended landscaping plan and Construction Traffic Management Plan dated 25 and 26 November.

The Parish Council set out its objections clearly in its letter of 11 November and for the avoidance of doubt they are repeated:-

Condition 2: The hard landscaping materials do not appear to have been specified.

Condition 3: No objection as long as the proposal complies with the original planning permission and terms on which it was granted.

Condition 5: The planning authority must be satisfied that there is sufficient parking for contractors on site at the same time as vehicles are delivering and removing from site. Also where on the plans is the wheel wash station? Bearing in mind the extent of excavations this is a fundamental requirement.

Condition 6: It appears the existing hedging has already been removed rendering the plans wrong.

Condition 10: There is supposed to be a Tree Protection Plan but none is apparent, save for a diagram of proposed trees. Indeed it appears that the existing trees have already been removed.

Condition 13: Soil disposal. Bearing in mind that there will be at least 72 journeys to and 72 journeys from site with soil the plan should specify where the soil is to be removed to and the route- particularly bearing in mind issues set out in the Traffic Management Plan and the HS2 preparatory works in the area.

Condition 15: Ecological scheme and timetable – whilst there is a plan there appears to be no timetable or detailed scheme.

Condition 16: Traffic Management Plan there is no objection to the proposed plan save that the working hours of 7.30am to 6pm with an hour for preparation and an hour for closing down each day seem excessive for a rural residential area.

Whilst it is noted and acknowledged that the proposed hours of operation have been reduced the Parish Council is of the view that the provisions for traffic flow to and from the development and the provisions for on-site parking for contractors are inadequate and implausible. There is no capacity

for on road parking for contractors bearing in mind the nature of Broombar Lane and neither is there within reasonable distance any alternative on road parking.

The Parish Council is also aware of alleged breaches of conditions and arguments as to whether or not the development has already commenced the combination of which does not bode well for future compliance.

#### **6) Land at The Green Man Public House, 2 High Street, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9EB. PL/20/3173/CONDA**

Application for approval of details reserved by condition 10 on planning permission CH/2018/0243/FA. (Demolition of existing single garage and erection of a pair of 3-bed semi-detached dwellings, together with associated access, parking, landscaping, bin and cycle storage.)

The Parish Council has already in a letter date 11 November set out its opposition to this application and repeats the grounds set out in that letter, as nothing in the application appears to have changed, namely on the following grounds:-

a) In September 2018 only 2 years ago planning permission was given for a development of part of this site – the building of a pair of semi-detached houses. That development has taken place. 2 pertinent conditions were imposed:-

that the development hereby approved shall be implemented in accordance with the tree and hedge protection measures described in the Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Method Statement Ref 181008 - AIA dated 12 February 2018 by Ecurban Ltd Arboricultural Consultancy and the revised Tree Protection Plan ECO 3 submitted on 7 June 2018. This shall include the use of tree protection fencing, ground protection measures and no-dig construction in accordance with these documents. In addition no-dig construction shall be used for the pedestrian access path to the dwelling H1.

Reason: To ensure that the existing established trees and hedgerows **in and around the site** that are to be retained, including their roots, do not suffer significant damage during building operations, in accordance with Policy GC4 of the Chiltern District Local Plan Adopted 1 September 1997 (including alterations adopted 29 May 2001) Consolidated September 2007 and November 2011.

And that no tree or hedge shown to be retained on the revised Tree Protection Plan ECO 3 submitted on 7 June 2018 by Ecurban Ltd Arboricultural Consultancy shall be removed, uprooted, destroyed or pruned for **a period of five years** from the date of implementation of the development hereby approved **without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority**. If any retained tree or hedge is removed, uprooted or destroyed, or dies during that period, another tree or hedge shall be planted of such size and species as shall be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Furthermore, the existing soil levels within the root protection areas of the retained trees and hedges shall not be altered. Reason: To ensure the retention of the existing established trees and hedgerows within the site that are in sound condition and of good amenity and wildlife value, in accordance with Policy GC4 of the Chiltern District Local Plan Adopted 1 September 1997 (including alterations adopted 29 May 2001) Consolidated

Within 2 years of the grant of the permission the applicant is seeking to remove a long existing mature tree. There is no evidence submitted with the application to suggest that the tree to be removed is either diseased or dangerous other than the suggestion that it is said to be poisonous although there is again no expert evidence of this, and indeed the type of tree and its characteristics have not changed over the last 2 years so that any risk is as it was at the time that the tree protection plan was prepared, submitted and agreed.

b) The letter in support of and outlining the reason for the application makes reference to proposed material changes to the property itself. As yet no planning application has been submitted for such changes and it is respectfully suggested that in fact any application with regard to trees within the

curtilage of the site would be best addressed within the context of any proposed redevelopment of the building and site as a whole.

**7) "Land at rear of Rosadel and Westway", Spurlands End Road, Great Kingshill, Buckinghamshire, HP15 6HX. PL/20/3845/DE.**

Reserved matters following outline planning permission CH/2018/0628/OA (Outline Application for construction of two detached dwellings with access via upgraded existing driveway)

The Parish Council opposes this application and notes that a previous application was made earlier this year reference **PL/20/0920/DE** and refused in July.

At that time the Parish Council's objections were:-

a) The proposed development in terms of layout, scale appearance and landscaping does not comply with Policy GC3 of the Chiltern Local Plan 1997 as amended and does not provide adequate safeguards of the amenities of the locality.

b) The proposed layout and density of the proposed development is inappropriate for the location and is overdevelopment. In particular the size of the proposed new dwellings and their ridge height is excessive and out of keeping with neighbouring properties. The proposed development would dominate the neighbouring properties.

c) The proposed development would therefore be overbearing in its nature.

d) The proposed development is out of character and keeping with the surrounding area taking into account the fact that this is a proposed development is within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The size and scale of the proposed development would make it too visually dominant.

e) The proposed development would lead to a loss of privacy for those in neighbouring properties, again in large part due to the size and scale of the proposed development.

f) The proposed development would impact on the ancient woodland at the rear of the site and involve both the loss of trees and the loss of ecological habitats.

g) The size and scale of the proposed development would mean that the extent of amenity space for each dwelling was both inadequate in terms of size and of limited quality because of the impact of the woodlands to the rear of the site.

h) Paragraph 13.2 of the Core strategy (to be read as part of Policy CS20) requires new buildings to be well integrated with, and complement, neighbouring buildings and the local area in terms of scale, density, layout and access. Being located in a backland position, as a secondary tier to roadside development the proposed dwellings are excessive in size and therefore too dominant on neighbouring properties and the street scene.

i) There are concerns as to the viability of the proposed access bearing in mind the size and scale of the proposed development.

In the original grant of planning permission CH/2018/0628/OA it was stated that the applicants are advised that the new rear dwellings will need to be single storey bungalows in order to protect the character of the area and the amenity of neighbouring properties. The previous detailed application proposal ignored that advice as does that application albeit that the roof ridge heights have been reduced marginally, and the proposed new properties have been moved slightly in terms of their site position.

Furthermore the new proposals create an additional highways access which calls into question highway safety in view of the view expressed by Highways in respect of the outline application that a single access was appropriate

Accordingly the Parish Council maintains its objections as set out earlier this year on the basis that the proposed development is out of keeping with the outline permission granted and is over development of the site.

**8) “The Old Red Lion” 62, High Street, Great Missenden, HP16 0AN. PL/20/3529/FA.**

Change of use of front ground floor to provide two residential units (Use Class C3), addition of rear first floor level terrace, changes to windows and doors, reconfigured outdoor private amenity space for approved units, minor amendments to approved Unit 1 to retain existing ground floor area previously consented for demolition, reconfigured rear bin storage area and alterations to the parking court to rear (part retrospective)

There have already been a number of amendments to the planning permission granted on appeal in respect of this site under reference CH/2017/1943/FA both to change the layout and number of dwellings. It is understood that this application comes about because of further proposals, not yet seen as a planning application, in relation to development of the area around the entrance to Great Missenden railway station along with the provision of access to this site from Station Approach. The Parish Council is of the view that it would be better to defer any decision on any changes to the Old Red Lion site’s current planning permission, until such time as the totality of the proposed scheme is known and can be considered in the round rather than piecemeal. In particular this would have some bearing on the Parish Council’s view, as the current application would see the loss of business premises from the High Street which potentially may be replaced in another part of the proposed extended development, but for which at present there is no planned replacement

**7) Correspondence:-**

i) The committee noted that notices advising as to the outcomes of planning applications had been received from Buckinghamshire Council on 31 October, and 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 28, November and 2 December. Of the 21 cases in 15 the decision made was in accordance with the Parish Council’s views in 6 it was contrary to representations made.

ii) The committee noted the email from the Chiltern Society indicating that it had submitted comments to the Government in respect of the 'Planning for the Future' White Paper and giving the link to read those representations :- <https://chilternsociety.org.uk/radical-changes-proposed-for-the-planning-system/>

iii) The committee noted that following on from Councillor Gladwin’s advice multiple communications had been received from Buckinghamshire Council advising that the Chiltern and South Bucks draft local plan was being withdrawn.

iv) The committee noted the letter from Councillor Rhodes in a personal capacity, sent to Buckinghamshire Council regarding the alleged breaches of condition and other issues appertaining to “Chestnut House”, Broombar Lane, Great Missenden. (PL/20/2448/NMA and PL/20/3070/CONDA).

v) The committee noted that the applicant had been successful in their appeal against their decision to refuse planning permission in respect of the original planning application for the development at Holly Cottage, Ballinger Road, South Heath, Bucks, HP16 9QH (PL/20/0842/FA) APP/X0415/W/20/3257572 and that a partial costs award against Buckinghamshire Council had been made for making inaccurate assertions in its submissions, citing this as unreasonable behaviour.

vi) The committee noted that a decision was awaited in respect of the application in respect of the proposed tree works in a conservation area to the Lime Tree x 1 height reduction by up to two thirds at Buryfield Recreation Ground, Link Rd, Great Missenden, HP16 9AE. (PL/20/3608/KA) and that at present only essential site visits are being undertaken.

**vii)** The committee noted that on 13 November Buckinghamshire Council had confirmed receipt of the email sent to them in respect of Chestnut House, Broombarn Lane PL/20/3070/CONDA and that subsequently Mr Shires from their planning department had asked for and been provided with clarification of the issues outlined, namely the incorrect suggestion by a planning officer to a GMPC Councillor that in addition to notifying them of this application, Great Missenden Parish Council had also been notified. A further response is awaited.

**viii)** The Committee noted that on 17 November Buckinghamshire Council had advised of the dismissal of the appeal against their decision to refuse planning permission in respect of the planning application for development at Hildreths Garden Centre, Wycombe Road, Prestwood, Bucks, HP16 0HJ ( PL/19/2722/FA) APP/X0415/W/20/3249143.

**ix)** The committee noted that on 26 November Buckinghamshire Council had advised of the dismissal of the appeal against their decision to refuse planning permission in respect of the planning application for development at Honor Cottage 15 Barley View, Prestwood, Bucks, HP16 9BW (PL/19/2772/FA) APP/X0415/W/20/3252539.

**x)** The committee noted the email of 29 November from Chiltern Countryside Group with regard to the consultation period in relation to the Dacorum Local Plan – which runs until 5 February 2020, but determined it was not appropriate to comment.

**xi)** The committee noted that on 1 December Buckinghamshire Council had advised of the dismissal of the appeal against their decision to refuse planning permission in respect of the planning application for the development at 2 Sylvia Close, Great Missenden, Bucks HP16 0ES, (PL/19/2929/FA) APP/X0415/D/20/3250389.

## **8) Matters for information**

a) The committee noted the email from Buckinghamshire Council to Councillor Rhodes dated 30 November 2020 with regard to various planning issues and in particular issues relating to “Chestnut House” Broombarn Lane. Councillor Rhodes indicated that he was intending to respond at length correcting various matters raised, but stressing that his original letter had been sent( as had been made clear) in a personal capacity, and that his response was also sent in a personal capacity.

b) The Deputy Clerk updated the committee as to the fact that 3 representations had been received with regard to the proposed development at Great Missenden Railway Station that would be taken into account as and when a planning application was available for consideration, bearing in mind that the Parish Council had determined not to meet with the developers prior to a planning application being submitted and available for consideration. There was some discussion as to whether this was the correct approach taking into account that other local groups are meeting with the developers, but as the decision had been made by council it was accepted it could not be changed at this time. There was also discussion as to the impact that the proposed scheme might have on traffic flow in the village and a suggestion was made that as part of any planning permission the developers should be required to replace or improve the railway bridge in Station Approach

**9. Date of the Next Meeting** –Monday 4 January 2021 at 19.30 in the Parish Office unless otherwise advised

The meeting closed at 21.12.