



## GREAT MISSENDEN PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Zoom Conference call of the Planning Committee  
held at 7.30 pm on Monday 1 March 2021

Councillor Rhodes as chair for the evening welcomed all present to the Zoom conference call

### **Present during the call:**

Councillors: C. Baxter, J. Brooke, S. Humphreys, V. Marshall, R. Pusey, S. Rhodes and for part of the meeting Councillor Pither.

Councillor J Gladwin of the Planning Authority was also present in a liaison capacity.

Also present were members of the Public Forum being 3 residents who wished to hear the discussion with regard to planning application 4 on the agenda. In addition a member of the public was present for part of the meeting to observe with a view to becoming a councillor.

**1) Apologies:** were received from Councillors L. Cook, M. Johnstone and I. Lovegrove.

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

Councillor Baxter declared an interest in respect of the planning application listed at number 5 in section 6 of the agenda, as did Councillor Humphreys on the basis that the applicant is known to them.

Councillor Pusey declared an interest in respect of the application listed at 21 in section 6 of the agenda on the basis that he is a part owner of the property.

**3) Minutes** - It was agreed by all that the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 1 February should be signed as a correct record by Councillor Johnstone, and that the minutes would be delivered to Councillor Johnstone for signature in due course.

### **4) Matters arising –**

i) The committee noted that on 17 February Buckinghamshire Council had acknowledged receipt of the copy of the representations that had been submitted by the Parish Council in respect of planning applications considered at its February meetings.

ii) The committee noted the update in respect of the complaint sent to Mike Shires of Buckinghamshire Council and received a verbal update from the Deputy Clerk who read the email response received from Mike Shires on 24 February in which he apologised both for the delay and for the error on the part of one of his planning officers. The committee agreed that the matter could be considered as closed.

iii) The committee noted the response from the neighbouring resident to the development to the rear of Rosadell and Westway in Spurlands End Road.

iv) The committee noted that a further meeting of the Misbourne Greenway working party was to take place in due course and that at present there were no planning issues in respect of this project.

v) The committee noted that contact had been made with the agents for the developers of the Great Missenden Railway Station development and that dates for a meeting between the developers and the Parish Council were awaited.

## **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 to rear of 14-16 Kings Lane”, South Heath, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QY and the erection of three dwellings with associated parking and landscaping and using an existing access from Kings Lane addressed the committee expanding upon the letter of objection that they and their partner had emailed to the committee. The development would use an existing access right alongside the boundary to an adjoining property, which is presently unused and would become the access point for vehicles at 3 properties along with service vehicles. This is not the first planning application, in 2017 an application was refused and in 2019 an appeal was refused – on both occasions access to the site for a potentially larger development was proposed via Sibley’s Rise. Although the new proposed development is smaller, it would still be obtrusive for the properties in Sibley’s Rise and for these residents. There are concerns as to access, and the impact of the development upon the environment.

A further neighbouring resident and their partner explained that they rented accommodation from HS2 but hoped to buy the property in due course. The appeal was the location and the tranquillity, privacy and lack of light and noise pollution and they pointed out that the trees to the rear shielded their property from Sibley’s Rise and the development would see those trees removed.

A further resident outlined concerns as to the location and use of the access way proposed by the developer and indicated that a similar proposed access on another development had been unacceptable to a planning officer. Having heard from the residents the committee went on to consider this application in order to allow the residents to hear the discussion and leave the meeting. The committee agree to oppose the application for the reasons set out below under Section 6 (4)

At this point Councillor Pither joined the meeting.

The Committee noted the emails received from residents in respect of the alleged breach of planning condition at “Brynawel” 27 Upper Hollis, Great Missenden, Bucks. HP16 9HP- planning application PL/20/3764/FA. None of the residents complaining had attended the meeting and it was noted that there was an application at 6 (25) for a variation of the condition which the deputy clerk advised may well have come as a result of the complaints and discussion between the developer and the planning office. It was agreed by the committee to take into account these representations when considering the application.

## **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) 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.

Noted by the committee as application withdrawn on 8 February after call in to committee.

- 2) 75, High Street, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9EJ. PL/20/4431/FA.**  
Single storey rear extension following demolition of existing conservatory.  
No objection.
- 3) "Quarteracre" Kiln Road, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9DG. PL/21/0116/FA.**  
Remodelling of house including demolition of existing detached outbuildings and erection of new detached double garage at front, demolition of existing single storey rear extension, raising roof height with 3 front, 2 side and 1 rear gable end roof extensions, 1 front and 4 rear roof lights, front porch canopy, changes to windows and doors and part cladding/rendering.  
No objection.
- 4) 22 Honor Road, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire HP16 0NJ. PL/21/0257/FA.**  
Loft conversion with three dormer windows to the front and 1 dormer window to the rear elevation, addition of a flue for log burner to the side elevation.
- 5) "Red Gable" Nags Head Lane, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0HG. PL/21/0302/FA.**  
Raising of roof ridge height and installation of 3 side roof lights on existing garage; new roof space to be converted to provide additional living space.  
No objection subject to the planning authority being satisfied that there is sufficient on-site parking to support the increase in living accommodation proposed.  
No objection.
- 6) Land to rear of 6 Old Town Farm, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9PA. PL/21/0418/KA.**  
Apple tree - Fell (Great Missenden Conservation Area).  
No objection but as biodiversity and tree loss are such important issues, can it be a condition attached to the consent that a replacement tree is planted?
- 7) Relyyn" Spurlands End Road, Great Kingshill, Buckinghamshire, HP15 6HY. PL/21/0304/FA.**  
Single storey front extension.  
No objection.
- 8) 20, Clare Road, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0NR. PL/21/0364/SA.**  
Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed Vehicular access.  
In principle the Parish Council has no objection to this but subject to the Highways Department being satisfied that the proposed access and any further dropped kerb will not have any highway safety impact bearing in mind that the property is in close proximity to a school.
- 9) "Haredell", Martinsend Lane, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9HR. PL/21/0370/TP.**  
G1 - 3 beech, 2 oak and 1 hornbeam - reduce by 3m in height and 3m in width.  
No objection.
- 10) Fernside, Great Kingshill, Buckinghamshire, HP15 6HN. PL/21/0400/SA.**  
Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed garage conversion.  
No objection subject to the planning authority being satisfied that the loss of the garage and its conversion into additional living space will not result in their being inadequate on-site car parking provision at the property.

**11) "Frenchwood", 10, London Road, Little Kingshill, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0DE. PL/21/0422/FA.**

Alterations to existing two storey rear extension, erection of single storey side/rear extension and addition of 1 side roof light and 1 window (amendment to planning permission PL/20/2276/FA)  
No Objection.

**12) 48, Lodge Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QG. PL/20/2968/FA.**

Erection of stables, creation of pathway, retention of tractor shed and change of use of land from agricultural to equestrian use (part retrospective)  
No objection subject to the observations made in respect of the original application.

**13) 23 Rook Wood Way, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0DF. PL/21/0555/FA.**

Demolition of existing conservatory and porch, part two, part single storey side / rear extension, construction of new porch, changes to doors and windows including additional first floor window to side elevation, new cladding.

No objection subject to the planning authority being satisfied that the proposed extension is subservient to the existing dwelling

**14) "Upton Cottage", Nairdwood Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QH. PL/21/0523/FA.**

Demolition of single storey rear extension, erection of new two storey rear extension and single storey side extension.

In principle the Parish Council does not object to the development proposed, however it notes

a) That there are first floor windows that appear to overlook the neighbouring property which may result in a loss of privacy – could these be relocated so as not to cause such an issue and if not can it be a condition that they are made of obscure glass.

b) The extension is considerable and the Parish Council would ask the planning authority to ensure that there is sufficient on-site parking to accommodate the increase in accommodation.

**15 and 16) "Thimble Farm Cottage", Green Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QA. PL/21/0384/FA and PL/21/0385/HB.**

Replacement windows (and associated listed building consent).

No objection.

**17) "Belmont Cottages" 110 High Street, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9HB. PL/21/0494/FA.**

Single storey rear / side extension and addition of parking space to front of property.

In principle the Parish Council does not oppose this application. However this is subject to the planning authority being satisfied that there is sufficient on-site parking to meet the needs of the additional accommodation, and that there is adequate safe access to that parking if it is located at the rear of the property, which would be preferable to parking in front of the property which would have an impact on the street scene.

**18) "Brynawel", 27 Upper Hollis, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9HP. PL/21/0650/VRC.**

Variation of condition 2 (Materials) of planning permission PL/20/3764/FA (Two storey side/ front extension, single storey rear extension, front porch canopy and new detached double garage.) to allow for changes to materials.

The planning committee noted the various issues raised by local residents with regard to the apparent breach of conditions as to materials to be used for the extension and garage and assume that this application is to address that alleged breach. In principle the parish council does not oppose the application to vary material types

**19 and 20) Land at the Rear of “The Old Red Lion”, High Street, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0AN.**

**PL/21/0344/CONDA and PL/21/0383/CONDA.**

Approval of conditions 9 (materials), 10 (working drawings/sections), 11 (slab levels) and 18 (boundary strategy) of planning permission CH/2017/1943/FA (Demolition of three four-bed houses, a disused industrial building (Use Class B2) and 20 garages, removal of spoil and trees from the rear of the site. Development of 34 residential dwellings comprising 25 houses and 5 flats, with associated landscaping tree replacement, car parking and internal shared surface road. Change of use of the upper storeys of The Old Red Lion (62 High Street) from office to residential to provide 4 flats. Ground floor building line amendment to southern elevation of The Old Red Lion (62 High Street) to remove 700mm at ground floor only to provide improved visibility onto the High Street. Amendments to Forge Cottage on Missenden Mews to relocate front door, relocate car parking space and provision of new private amenity space within the site).

And

Approval of conditions 3 (Construction Phase Plan) & 25 (Energy statements) of planning permission CH/2017/1943/FA - Demolition of three four-bed houses, a disused industrial building (Use Class B2) and 20 garages, removal of spoil and trees from the rear of the site. Development of 34 residential dwellings comprising 25 houses and 5 flats, with associated landscaping tree replacement, car parking and internal shared surface road. Change of use of the upper storeys of The Old Red Lion (62 High Street) from office to residential to provide 4 flats. Ground floor building line amendment to southern elevation of The Old Red Lion (62 High Street) to remove 700mm at ground floor only to provide improved visibility onto the High Street. Amendments to Forge Cottage on Missenden Mews to relocate front door, relocate car parking space and provision of new private amenity space within the site.

No objection.

**21) “Beechcroft”, 7 Upper Hollis, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9HP.**

**PL/21/0345/NMA.**

Non material amendment to planning permission PL/20/0909/FA (Two storey front extension, part single/part two storey side extension and single storey side and rear extensions incorporating roof reconfiguration. Changes to windows and doors to allow for squaring up of single storey rear extension.

No objection.

**22) Land on the North West Side of Frith Hill, South Heath, Buckinghamshire. PL/21/0550/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 window materials.

No objection.

**23) 15 Wrights Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0LH.**

**PL/21/0536/SA.**

Certificate of lawfulness for proposed single story rear extension.

No objection.

**b) Objections**

**1) Land to rear of 14-16 Kings Lane, South Heath, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QY. PL/21/0238/FA.**

Erection of three dwellings with associated parking and landscaping and using an existing access from Kings Lane.

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

a) It is considered that the proposed development represents overdevelopment of the site with all its attendant problems and issues such as the volume of traffic passing along the access way adjacent to another property, the impact on neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy.

b) The development would appear to lead to the loss of a significant number of trees, and to have an impact on the ecological habitats of wildlife with little or no proposals to rebalance those losses. No Biodiversity net gain is offered by the proposal. Habitats and Biodiversity NPPF 170/174/175.

170(d) requires planning decisions to provide net gains in biodiversity

174 (b) requires plans to identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity; and

175(a) states that if significant biodiversity losses cannot be avoided, mitigated or compensated then permission should be refused.

There is no plan submitted with the Application that secures measurable net gains for biodiversity.

None can be imagined in any event given the density of dwellings and services proposed.

c) Sustainability: Under NPPF 8 a) b) and c)

South Heath has no health, grocery or other facilities except the common, the hall, and very limited public transport. The development would lead to a loss of amenity (privacy) to adjacent occupiers in Sibleys Rise and Kings Lane by reason both of the housing and car parking adjacent to them. In effect this would intensify and provide vehicle noise and movements affecting adjacent dwellings in close proximity in Sibleys Rise and Kings Lane. Therefore there would be no mutual supportive economic, social and environmental gain which is a requirement of the NPPF.

d) **Car Parking** – Policy TR16 of the CDLP had its origins in the 1991 census and is out of date. The Planning Inspectorate of course knows this is the starting point for considering the parking requirement and heavily criticised the LPA for a wholly and completely unreasonable dogmatic application of TR16 and for not giving consideration to the extent to which this policy is consistent with the NPPF citing that a set of uniform standards is not consistent with the NPPF 105, and completely out of date and that TR16 can be afforded no weight under NPPF 213. The LPA therefore must (using the weight of the NPPF 105 pointers) consider accessibility of the development, the type of development, availability and opportunities for public transport, local car ownership levels and the need to ensure adequate provision for charging plug-in and ultra-low emission vehicles. A total of 10 bedrooms in the proposal, in this location, with known current car ownership data, clearly reveals insufficient parking spaces for residents let alone visitors and deliveries. The swept path analysis shows that a refuse lorry trying to access the development would cross and damage a soft landscaping area to plot 1. In short there is inadequate car parking provision.

e) This is a Backland Development and Backland or tandem developments with no frontage to the road are considered extremely harmful to neighbouring amenity in terms of vehicular intrusion and noise, light intrusion and privacy. The proposed development does not constitute limited infilling in a washed over green belt village as per NPPF 145 (e); it is back land development.

f) The proposed access is deemed insufficient for the volume of traffic that can be anticipated from the size and scale of the development proposed.

g) The layout and density proposed is out of keeping with the area and would be overbearing on nearby properties.

h) Finally the site is of course within the Green Belt where very special circumstances would be required to justify any development.

**2 and 3) "Greyley", 2 Nairdwood Way, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HPO16 0QW.  
PL/21/0273/FA and PL/21/0559/TP.**

Demolition of outbuilding and erection of single storey front and side extensions, conversion of garage to living space, rendering of external walls, new vehicular access to Nairdwood Lane with gate,

and Beech (T1) - Crown reduction canopy and sail by 3m, crown lift of 6m front ground (TPO/1974/001)

The Parish Council object to these proposed developments and understands that the application has been called in to committee.

- a) The proposed development appears to be out of keeping and character with the local area where restrictive covenants have seen the majority of properties retain an open frontage. This proposed development would see the open frontage of this property removed.
- b) The proposed new access is on to a busy road Nairdwood Lane and it is proposed that it should be gated. There are concerns that there is inadequate space between the road and the gate to allow for vehicles to be off road whilst the gate is opened or closed.
- c) There are concerns that the conversion of the garage and additional living accommodation proposed will mean that there is inadequate parking provision on site, and there is no scope for on-road parking in the vicinity.
- d) There are concerns that the extent of the development is such that it would lead to an unacceptable level of loss of amenity space for the property.
- e) There are concerns that the design and appearance of the proposed development is out of keeping with the immediate neighbourhood and would have a negative impact on the street scene.

Turning to the application relating to the tree reduction sought, this appears to be a significant reduction. The Parish Council would question whether there are any grounds for such extensive tree work other than to facilitate the proposed development. Therefore it is suggested that the application with regard to the proposed tree work should be determined in conjunction with the planning application but immediately after it, unless there are other valid sustainable reasons from an expert as to why such tree work is required.

**4) "Chestnut House" Broombar 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 has set out in detail on more than one occasion its views with regard to the application for approval of conditions relating to the planning application and in particular with regard to ecology. None of the assortment of reports produced by the developer to date has properly addressed the need to satisfy the planning authority that the proposed scheme would provide the required net gain in biodiversity. Indeed many reports are flawed as to the baseline used, which postdates work commencing on the site which reduced the biodiversity.

For the avoidance of doubt the Parish Council repeats its objections as lodged in February:-

The ecological plan does not appear to provide any degree of enhancement. It is inadequate in scope and detail and does not compensate for the works already undertaken on the site and nor does it appear to be in compliance with the planning permission granted for the development. The Elite Ecology spreadsheet (trading style not a company) states that the proposed buildings and hard standing will remain at 0.05ha as before. This is not correct by reference to the GEA submitted with

the permission, which is 0.05508ha for the buildings alone and before the widened and larger hard standing area.

Condition 10: Was discharged with a Tree Protection Plan in conflict with the Tree plans approved in the Permission and most of which have been removed.

**5 and 6) 17 Tetherdown, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0RY. PL/21/0446/FA.**

Demolition of existing garage, erection of two storey side, part two storey, part single storey front and single storey rear extensions. Amended by adding: - Partial pitched roof to existing side projection adjacent to No. 7 Collings Walk.

The Parish Council opposes this application of the following grounds:-

- a) It appears that the proposed development would result in such a loss of amenity space for the property as to make the development inappropriate
- b) The demolition of the garage and its replacement with a significant increase in habitable accommodation removes the parking available on site and the Parish Council is of the view that there is insufficient parking available on site for the size of the proposed development.
- c) The layout and density of the property is out of keeping with properties in the immediate vicinity and constitutes overdevelopment of the site.

**Neither approval or objection**

**1) Land at "Middle Grove Farm", Chesham Road, Hyde End, Buckinghamshire, HP16 ORD. PL/21/0316/OA.**

Hybrid Application comprising full planning permission for the conversion of an existing stable block into two, 4-bedroom dwellings and outline planning permission including details for scale, layout and means of access for 11 new dwellings including demolition/clearance with details reserved in respect of appearance and landscaping.

**Determination date: 4 May 2021**

This is a significant application for change of use and development of an agricultural site within the green belt to residential use.

The site itself borders other industrial or commercial sites within the green belt and thus any decision relating to this application may be a precedent for further development.

The development site is owned in part by a Parish Councillor.

For all these reasons in order to be seen to be addressing this application properly and fairly for all concerned before making any representations, the Parish Council would ask for an extension of time in order to respond, noting that the determination date is 4 May 2021. The intention would be for the planning committee to undertake site visits as deemed appropriate and to meet on 6 April to draft and submit its representations

**7) Correspondence:-**

i) The committee noted that notices advising as to the outcomes of planning applications had been received from Buckinghamshire Council on planning applications on 28, 29 30 January and 3, 6, 9, 10, and 24 February and the outcomes thereof.

ii) The committee noted the email from the Chiltern Countryside Group advising that the consultation on the Dacorum Borough Council Local Plan closed on 28 February and advising that it makes provision

for 17,000 new homes some being up to the boundary with the Chilterns AONB. Whilst the committee understood the possible consequences of this it was deemed both impractical and inappropriate to seek to comment on the draft local plan for Dacorum.

iii) The committee noted the email from the Open Spaces Society advising of their vision for planning being launched in January promoting good quality green space near homes.

iv) The committee discussed the issue raised by Councillor Rhodes with regard to a potential breach of planning at a property "Old Stocks" Broombarn Lane. Councillor Pither declared an interest in this matter. The committee did not feel it appropriate to pursue this alleged breach as a parish council.

v) The committee discussed the issue raised by Councillor Rhodes with regard to a potential breach of planning by way of a development on the Wycombe Road on the outskirts of the Parish and determined to write a letter to the planning authority asking them to investigate whether there had in fact been a concealed unauthorised development. A letter will be drafted for circulation to the committee for approval in due course.

vi) The committee noted that Buckinghamshire Planning Authority had advised that the planning application PL/20/3778/FA in respect of 28 Nairdwood Close, Prestwood had been withdrawn and would no longer be before committee on 9 February.

vii) The committee noted that Buckinghamshire Council had e-mailed an outline of their response to the government's Infrastructure and Permitted Development consultation.

viii) The committee noted that Chiltern Countryside Group had sent an e-mail advising of a planning application 21/00031/VARCON in respect of Luton Airport aimed at increasing passenger numbers and changing noise contours.

ix) The committee noted that Buckinghamshire Council had confirmed that under delegated powers it had without consultation other than with its own experts deemed the conditions 3, 7, 8, and 11 under planning permission AOC/0009/20, AOC/0051/20 and AOC/0001/20 in relation to the Misbourne Academy to be met. Arboriculture, Biodiversity, lighting (5 metres high) and traffic management). Councillor Gladwin explained that the extent of the lighting was considerable both in terms of height of lampposts but in terms of brightness.

x) The committee noted that Buckinghamshire Council had e-mailed advising of the launch of its community involvement in the planning process consultation which closes on 22 March but determined that any responses should be individual rather than from the Parish Council.

xi) The committee noted that Buckinghamshire Council had e-mailed advising of the start of work on its new local plan to cover the period up to 2040- the first stage of which is the aforementioned consultation and the second stage of which will be the Brownfield call for sites. At that stage it might be appropriate for the Parish Council to contribute information with regard to remaining possible brown field sites.

xii) The committee noted that Buckinghamshire Council had e-mailed advising that an appeal had been lodged in respect of their decision to refuse planning permission under application PL/20/3017/FA for 1 Ivy Cottage, London Road, Little Kingshill and that the appeal- reference APP/X0415/D/21/3266670 is by way of written representations under the Householder Appeals

service so no further representations can be submitted. The committee noted that the Parish Council had not opposed the application.

**xiii)** The committee noted that Buckinghamshire Council had e-mailed advising that an appeal had been lodged in respect of their decision to refuse planning permission under application PL/20/3084/FA for “Holly Hatch Cottage” Nags Head Lane, Great Missenden. The appeal -reference APP/X0415/W/20/3265871- is by way of written representations. Any further representations to be made are to be submitted by 23 March 2021. The Parish Council had opposed the application and a copy of the representations made would automatically go to the planning inspectorate. The committee did not feel it necessary to add any further comments.

**xiv)** The Committee noted that Buckinghamshire Council had e-mailed advising that under new law it was required to require planning applications to include information on how any proposed development will maintain and increase biodiversity. The committee will study future planning applications with interest to see if this requirement is made.

**xv)** The committee noted that Buckinghamshire Council had lodged an application for planning permission in respect of the turning circle for Great Missenden Combined School. As the application has not yet appeared it seems unlikely that it has been validated as yet.

#### **8) Matters for information**

There were none save that a vote of thanks was given to Councillor Rhodes for, at short notice, chairing a difficult meeting with numerous applications.

#### **9. Date of the Next Meeting –TUESDAY 6 April 2021 at 19.30 by zoom unless otherwise advised**

The meeting closed at 21.54