



GREAT MISSENDEN PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Zoom Conference call of the Planning Committee
held at 7.30 pm on Monday 4 January 2021

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

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

Councillors: 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: 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 application at 11 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 planning permission granted remained lawful.

3) Minutes - It was agreed by all that the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 7 December as amended to incorporate the addition from Councillor Lovegrove 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 17 December the representations of GMPC on applications considered at the planning committee meeting on 7 December had been submitted and receipt acknowledged the same day by Buckinghamshire Council.

ii) The committee noted that to date no application for planning permission has been received in respect of the proposed development at Station Approach, Great Missenden. It is understood that the developers have met with the GMVA and other interest groups to discuss their plans.

iii) The committee noted that as yet there has been no response to the letter of 1 December sent to Mike Shires at Buckinghamshire Council Planning team with regard to the misleading statement made by one of his team to one of the councillors with regard to notification of an application relating to "Chestnut House".

5) Public Forum:

The committee noted that there had been no indication by anyone of a wish to attend the planning committee meeting and that no members of the public had tried to join the meeting.

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) 106 High Street, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0BE. PL/20/3911/FA.

2 storey rear extension enclosing staircase, addition of rear window, new slate roof with 3 front and 2 side roof lights to left front of building, retaining existing rear joinery workshops and its parking spaces, internal refurbishment and upgrade.

No Objection.

2) "Havenfields", Aylesbury Road, Great Missenden, Bucks, HP16 9LS. PL/20/3906/FA.

Demolition of existing side extensions, erection of part single/part 2 storey side extension with formation of basement level below, first floor and roof extensions with windows at front, infilling and raising of land levels at front of property, removal of existing and siting of new front porch entrance and new rear porch extension, alterations to windows and doors and associated hard landscaping.

No Objection.

3) 20 Trafford Close, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0BS. PL/20/4011/FA.

Demolition of existing conservatory and single storey lean to. Garage conversion and construction of single storey side and rear extensions with internal alterations.

No Objection.

4) 20 Lodge Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0SU. PL/20/3985/FA.

First floor side extension with balcony, insertion of front roof light and extension of chimney.

No Objection.

5) Veterinary Surgeons, "Merrilaw", Martinsend Lane, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9HR. PL/20/3796/AV.

Non-illuminated fascia sign.

After some discussion as to the objection of a neighbour and as to parking issues relating both to these premises and generally along Martinsend Lane the committee decided it had no objection to the proposed sign.

6) "Lapwing Cottage", Broombar Lane, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9JD.

PL/20/4107/FA.

Single storey rear extension and conversion of part of garage to living space, including changes to windows and door.

In principle the Parish Council does not oppose the application subject to the planning authority being satisfied that there will be 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.

7) 26, Clare Road, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0NR. PL/20/4165/SA.

Certificate of lawfulness for proposed widening of vehicular access.

No Objection

8) "Upton Cottage", Nairdwood Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QH. PL/20/4232/FA.

Demolition of single storey section at rear, erection of 2 storey rear extension and single storey side extension.

In principle the Parish Council does not oppose the application subject to the planning authority being satisfied that there will be adequate viable on-site parking to reflect the increase in habitable accommodation and that the garage is to remain as a garage and not be converted into habitable accommodation.

9) Land Adjacent (to North Of) "Idaho Cottage", 36 Wycombe Road, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0PJ. PL/20/4320/CONDA.

Approval of condition 2 (Biodiversity enhancements) on planning permission PL/20/0704/VRC for Variation of conditions 2 and 10 of planning permission CH/2018/0714/FA (Erection of new dwelling

house with integral garage) to allow for: changes to windows and solar panels, additional rear roof light, changes to roof line and revision to materials for the Juliette balcony, garage door and slate roof and cladding.

b) Objections

1) “Astons House” 24 Wycombe Road, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0PJ. PL/20/4126/FA
Demolition of existing outbuilding and construction of new single storey detached outbuilding.
Repair works to the main house and garage roofs, rainwater goods and terrace.

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

a) It is not clear what the intended use is- if it is intended to be office accommodation as seems possible from the plans, presumably the appropriate course of action would be for an application for change of use. As the property is within the AONB such an application would not be supported by the Parish Council.

b) If the intention is to use the building as ancillary accommodation to the main property the Parish Councils view is that in principle it would still oppose the replacement of the existing building on the grounds that the increase in roof height and overall size is such that the building would be overbearing. However in the event that the planning authority determines that in principle planning permission would be granted the Parish Council would suggest that any permission is:-

i) Subject to the planning authority being satisfied that there is sufficient on-site parking to allow for the increase in habitable accommodation within the curtilage of the property;

ii) Subject to a condition to ensure that the existing garage will remain as available parking and not be converted into accommodation; and

iii) Subject to a condition that the annexe should only be permitted to be used as accommodation ancillary to the main dwelling on the plot, and not as a separate dwelling.

**2) “Stableside”, “ Peterley Wood Farm” Peterley Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0HH.
PL/20/4249/SA.**

Certificate of lawfulness for proposed single storey rear extension and new window at side.

The Parish Council oppose this application. It did not oppose the application PL/20/3251/EU for existing use of land in association with dwelling, and for which a certificate was granted on 10 December. It now appears that the intention was and is to extend the property. The property is within the Green Belt and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and as such the presumption is against development. Creeping or piecemeal development to try to negate restrictions imposed as national policy should not be encouraged.

3) “Chestnut House” Broombarne Lane, Great Missenden, HP16 9JD. PL/20/4250/CONDA.
Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 6 & 15 on planning permission PL/19/4163/FA. (Redevelopment of site to provide 2 detached dwellings with vehicular access, associated hardstanding, landscaping and car parking.)

The Parish Council set out its objections to the previous CONDA PL/20/3070 clearly in its letter of 11 November and for the avoidance of doubt in so far as relevant to the current application they are repeated:-

a) With regard to Condition 6 it appears the existing hedging has already been removed rendering the plans wrong.

b) With regard to Condition 15 Ecological scheme and timetable – whilst there is a plan there appears to be no timetable or detailed scheme.

Furthermore it does not appear that the ecological plan provides any degree of enhancement and is entirely inadequate in scope and detail and to compensate for the works already undertaken to the site and nor does it appear to be in compliance with the planning permission granted for the development.

7) Correspondence:-

i) The committee noted that notices advising as to the outcomes of planning applications had been received from Buckinghamshire Council on 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 23, and 30 December 2020.

ii) The committee noted that on 4 December Buckinghamshire Council had sent an email advising that the application relating to Peterley Wood Farm Barn in Prestwood, PL/20/3247/FA was to be determined by committee on 15 December and that on 16 December planning permission was granted for this development despite the objections of the Parish Council.

iii) The committee noted that a response had been obtained from Buckinghamshire Council relating to the issues raised by the Parish Council in respect of “Kimba Farm Stud”, Moat Lane, Prestwood, and that the planning authority had raised the issue of the potential unlawful development with the owner of the property. There was discussion as to the contradiction between the explanation given for the delay in responding to the Parish Council on this matter, and the information set out by Buckinghamshire Council as to its planning and enforcement work in light of Covid 19.

iv) The committee noted that on 8 December Buckinghamshire Council had sent an email advising that the application (PL/20/3608/KA.) by GMPC in respect of the Lime Tree reduction proposed on Buryfield, had been approved and that a TPO would not be made

v) The committee noted that on 8 December BALC had advised of a proposed talk about Buckinghamshire Planning Services to take place on Tuesday 15 December at 5pm and that all councillors had been forwarded the e mail. Councillor Pusey had attended the session. The slides of the presentation had subsequently been made available and it was noted that they had been circulated to all councillors. There was a discussion as to the apparent inconsistencies between the planning policy guidance and the way in which applications are actually determined and Councillor Pusey queried as to whether the representations of the Parish Council carried any weight being restricted to planning grounds rather than based on more local knowledge. It was pointed out that the planning authority can only consider planning issues and that sometimes, such as with Kimba Farm Stud, local knowledge on the part of the Parish Council can be a material benefit to the planning authority if it addresses a planning issue.

Councillor Pusey also asked for clarification of the call in process. Councillor Gladwin explained that only Bucks Councillors could ask for cases to be called in for committee to decide and not Parish or Town Councils. He explained that whilst there is an option for the Planning Chair or Head of planning services to challenge a councillor as to a call in request, he has not experienced any difficulty in having cases called in.

vi) The committee noted that on 8 December a decision letter had been received from the planning inspectorate advising that an order had been made in respect of the Right of Way/3229106 this being the right of way running from Widmere Field to footpath GMI/48(F)/2 and Bridleways GMI/43/1 and GMI/48(BW)/3. It was confirmed by the Deputy Clerk that the letter made it clear that the order made meant that the right of way was confirmed, despite the opposition of the new landowners.

vii) The committee noted that on 14 December Buckinghamshire Council had advised that on 26 November they had adopted the Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy Supplementary Planning Document.

viii) The committee noted that on 16 December the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England had advised by way of their newsletter of a change of heart by the government in respect of the proposed changes to the planning system and in particular the abandonment of the government's proposed algorithm with regard to housing quotas.

ix) The committee noted the expressions of thanks from residents of Broombarne Lane for the ongoing work of Councillor Rhodes in monitoring the works being carried out to "Chestnut House"

8) Matters for information

The committee noted that as yet the planning application in respect of that part of the proposed Misbourne Greenway from Wendover to The Black Horse at Mobwell (PL/19/4427/FA) had not been determined. Councillor Gladwin was invited to update committee as to the position and explained that the aim of the Greenway was to move cyclists from the A4513 particularly bearing in mind the significant increase in motor vehicles that would be seen as a result of the HS2 work. In addition it would improve accessibility for those walking in the area. It was explained that the major hold up with the planning application was the insistence by Network Rail that the unguarded crossing at GM/70 be closed.

This had been explained in an email by the County Strategic Access officer who had claimed that as the Parish Council had in principle supported the planning application the representations submitted with regard to retaining the existing footpath and rail crossing were inconsistent. The committee was updated to the effect that it had been explained that the 2 were not necessarily exclusive and that the council had made a decision not to support the closure of the rail crossing and the diversion of the footpath. There was general discussion as to the merits of the Misbourne Greenway with divided opinion as to the ecological issues, and as to the potential benefits for local businesses. It was agreed that further discussion should await the next Misbourne Greenway meeting due to take place later in January

9. Date of the Next Meeting –Monday 1 February 2021 at 19.30 by way of zoom unless otherwise advised

The meeting closed at 20 38.