



## GREAT MISSENDEN PARISH COUNCIL

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

Councillor Johnstone as vice-chair welcomed all present to the Zoom conference call

**Present during the call:** Councillor M. Johnstone (Chair)

Councillors: C. Baxter, J. Brooke, S. Humphreys, I. Lovegrove (for part of the meeting) 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 Cook.

### **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 4 January should be signed as a correct record the minutes will be delivered for signature in due course.

### **4) Matters arising**

i) The committee noted that on 19 January Buckinghamshire Council had acknowledged receipt of the representations of GMPC in respect of the planning applications considered at the planning committee meeting of 4 January as ratified and agreed by the council at its meeting on 11 January.

ii) The committee noted that as yet no application for planning permission has been received in respect of the proposed development at Station Approach, Great Missenden. Previously the committee and council had decided not to meet with the proposed developers prior to any planning application being submitted. However it had now been confirmed that the developer's agents have met with GMVA, the Revite Group and the ward Councillors from Buckinghamshire Council. That being the case the committee felt that these consultations amounted to new information which made it appropriate to arrange a meeting with the developers to discuss their plans before submission of a planning application.

The Deputy Clerk explained that contact had been made with the developers agents who had been prepared to address the committee but as the presentation of the development was lengthy it had been decided that if the planning committee felt that a meeting was appropriate it should be a separate meeting. The Deputy Clerk was authorised to report back to the developers and get some potential dates for such a meeting for the invitation of all councillors.

iii) There having 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 regarding notification of an application relating to "Chestnut House" the committee decided that a reminder should be sent to Mike Shires and copied to his line manager Susan Kitchen.

iv) The committee noted that following the meeting of the Misbourne Greenway working party on Friday 15 January Missenden the further questions that had been raised as to the proposals were had been sent to Sustrans Ltd for a response, which is awaited shortly. Councillor Johnstone confirmed that planning permission had been granted for the section of the Greenway to the north of Great Missenden and that he had been in touch with a local resident who had organised a petition in support of an off road cycle way through Great Missenden, potentially along the South Bucks Way.

## **5) Public Forum:**

No members of the public appeared or had expressed any intention to attend the planning committee meeting save as indicated in item 4 (ii) above.

## **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) “Annie Bailey’s Restaurant, Chesham Road, Hyde End, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QT. PL/20/2526/FA**

Demolition of restaurant and erection of community rehabilitation centre (Use Class C2). After discussion the committee did not oppose the application as amended having supported the original application in principle subject to certain concerns that had been raised with the planning authority. Those concerns remained. It was noted that there was a report from HS2 as to the impact of HS2 on the proposed development.

#### **2) 31 Wren Road, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0SB. PL/20/4326/FA**

Part 2 storey, part first floor side extension.

No objection save to request that the planning authority ensure that the proposed extension if permitted will incorporate sufficient parking on site to reflect the new size of the property in accordance with both current parking standards and the parking standards set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

#### **3) “The Lawns” Rignall Road, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9PE. PL/20/4410/FA.**

2 storey rear extension

No objection.

#### **4) “Moat Farm”, Moat Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9DF. PL/20/4251/HB.**

Listed building consent for alterations, extension or demolition of a listed building. Removal of rear plasterboard, door and window and insertion of new rear door.

In principle the committee does not oppose the proposed alterations but does question whether the materials it is proposed to use are in keeping with, or indeed suitable for a historic building and would in fact materially affect the design and appearance of the building.

#### **5) “Long Pipers”, Little Hollis, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9HZ. PL/20/4100/FA.**

Proposed hipped roof to replace existing flat roof of garage and porch area.

No objection.

#### **6) “Ellesmere”, Green Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0QA. PL/21/0071/FA.**

New roof tiles, external paintwork, cladding, changes to porch including brick pier removed and timber posts added, changes to windows and doors.

No objection.

**7) "South View", 11 Chiltern Manor Park, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9BL. PL/21/0155/TP.**

Works to trees subject to Tree Preservation Order, T1 Oak- crown reduction by 2.5 metres (TPO 44 of 91968)

No objection.

**8) "The Green Man" Public House, 2 High Street, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9EB. PL/20/4468/FA.**

First floor rear extension.

No objection.

**9) "Frenchwood" 10 London Road, Little Kingshill, Buckinghamshire, HP16 ODE. PL/21/0044/NMA.**

Non Material Amendment to planning permission PL/20/2276/FA (Alterations to existing two storey rear extension, erection of a single storey side extension and addition of a roof light to existing roof and addition of two new windows to side elevation) to allow for an enlarged porch and changing from French doors and windows to bi-fold doors.

No objection.

**10) "Rivendell", Bernards Close, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 OBU. PL/21/0101/FA.**

Demolition of existing dwelling and garage and erection of dwelling and detached covered carport and store.

No objection the committee consider that this proposal is an improvement in design on the application PL/18/4740/FA.

**11) "The Beeches" Martinsend Lane, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9HR. PL/21/0114/FA**

Single storey rear extension, internal alterations and new entrance gate & fencing.

No objection.

**12) "Old Stocks", Salmons Lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0PY. PL/21/0119/FA.**

Single storey side / rear extension.

No objection.

**13, 14 and 15) "The Old Red Lion", 62, High Street, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0AN. (and land at the rear)**

**13) PL/21/0239/CONDA**

Approval of condition 2 (Materials) of planning permission PL/19/2241/FA – Change of use to 7 residential apartments (Use Class C3) comprising 5 flats in the upper storeys and 2 at the rear ground floor, with partial demolition of ground floor, addition of external stairs to side and balconies to rear, changes to doors and windows, and formalisation of car parking spaces to the rear of the Old Red Lion.

No objection.

**14) PL/21/0280/CONDA**

Approval of condition 15 (Construction Method Statement) 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.

#### **15) PL/21/0263/CONDA**

Approval of conditions 4 and 5 (Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement) 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.

#### **16 & 17) "The George Inn" Public House, 94 High Street, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 0AN.**

Front infill extension and rear landscaping.

No objection.

#### **b) Objections**

##### **1) "Rose Cottage", Broomfield Hill, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9PD. PL/20/4085/FA.**

Removal of condition 3 (occupancy restriction) of planning permission AM/816/67 (Erection of staff cottage and garages) and insertion of 2 front and 1 side dormer windows and 3 front, 2 rear and 3 side roof lights, changes to doors and windows and landscaping (part retrospective).

The committee by majority oppose this application on the following grounds:-

- a) There are concerns as to the accuracy and level of detail of the drawings provided with the application. In particular the plan appears to be inconsistent with the boundaries as they are on the ground. This makes it difficult to properly assess the merits of the application.
- b) It is not clear if the intention is to subdivide the plot and sell the staff cottage and garages as a separate dwelling.
- c) It is not apparent from the application what the intention is with regard to "Rose Cottage" itself.
- d) If the intention is for the staff cottage and garages to be used as a separate dwelling then:-
  - i) there are concerns as to whether or not there is adequate parking provision on site to support 2 separate dwelling;
  - ii) there are concerns as to access from the highway in respect of the development.
  - iii) without more accurate details as to the curtilage of each of the properties namely "Rose Cottage" and the staff accommodation it is not possible to see if each has sufficient amenity land and whether the dwelling to be created from the staff cottage would in design and appearance as well as layout be in keeping with the street scene.

iv) the creation of a separate independent dwelling- if that is the intention would be a significant change in the density and layout of properties in this road.

**2) “Kimba Farm Stud”, Moat lane, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9BT. PL/20/4379/FA**  
Erection of covered manege (retrospective).

The committee oppose this application on the following grounds:-

- a) it is noted that the original change of use from agricultural to equestrian was obtained retrospectively and that in others words planning permission was not sought in a timely fashion. It is noted that this too is a retrospective application taken only sometime after the erection of the building, and after contact from the planning enforcement team.
- b) the committee are not clear that each and every building on the site is permitted and in view of the above observations would ask the planning authority to check the planning status of all buildings on the site.
- c) The manege is located both within the Green Belt and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty where the presumption is that building development is not appropriate. If it is permitted it must be sympathetic to its surroundings. This building is not. It is clearly visible from a considerable distance and is obtrusive to the vista and view of open countryside.
- d) As such the design and appearance is considered to be inappropriate for the location.

**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.

Amended plans

The Parish Council opposed this application and lodged reasons for its objections. The amendments proposed do not address those concerns which the Parish Council reiterate namely:-

- 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) “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

For the avoidance of doubt in so far as relevant to the current application those representations are repeated:-

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

Furthermore 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.

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.

In addition the intention in any development is that there should be ecological net gain that is over and above the ecological position before development commenced. In this instance because trees and hedging was removed prior to the latest ecological assessment being carried out that assessment would appear to start from a false baseline which means it is impossible to determine if there will be any ecological net gain under the proposed scheme.

**5) "Stoke Cottage", Village Road, Ballinger, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9LQ. PL/20/4464/FA.**

2 storey side/rear extension, new garage following demolition of existing.

The committee oppose this application on the following grounds:-

- a) any extension should be subordinate to the existing building. This extension is not. It is significant in size.
- b) the proposed development is overbearing in nature due to its size and scale, and completely changes the appearance of both the property and the street scene. It would render the property out of keeping with the neighbourhood.
- c) there is concern as to whether there is adequate parking provision available on site to reflect the parking standards required of a property of this size.
- d) the property is in the green belt where the starting point is that development should not be permitted and if it is, it should be sympathetic and in keeping with the area. The committee do not consider that this proposed development meets that test.

**6) "Dovetail Cottage", 22 High Street, Prestwood, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9ED. PL/21/0172/FA**

Erection of an oak timber storage building at the front of property.

The committee oppose this application on the following grounds:-

- a) This appears in fact to be a double car port with potential storage above it. It appears to be positioned so as to be right up against the front boundary of the property.
- b) This may necessitate the removal or indeed cause damage to the tree on the boundary line, and the tree should be protected.
- c) The location so close to the front boundary would have a detrimental impact to the street scene. If the planning authority were minded to approve the building it should at the very least be set back from the boundary so as to be less intrusive in terms of design and appearance.
- d) Furthermore the positioning of this structure so close to the boundary has the potential to impact on the vision splay for those leaving the property. The Parish Council is aware that an application for a neighbouring property to create a new access on to the highway was refused and refused on appeal on the grounds of highways safety and vision splays.

**7) Correspondence:-**

- i) The committee noted that notices advising as to the outcomes of planning applications had been received from Buckinghamshire Council on Buckinghamshire Council have submitted a series of outcomes of planning applications on 31 December, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 16, 22, 23 and 27 January 2021.
- ii) The committee noted that on 12 January Buckinghamshire Council had advised of an appeal against the refusal of and that the application for a detached carport, double garage and store at "Peppers House" 119 Wycombe Road, Prestwood, Bucks, HP16 0HN PL/20/0743/FA. The committee further noted that the appeal is under the Householder Appeals Service and will be determined by

written representations with the previous observations of GMPC being forwarded to the planning inspectorate but with no option to submit further comments.

**iii)** The committee noted that on 14 January the resident who had addressed the planning committee at the December 2020 meeting with regard to the detailed application for land at the rear of Rosadel and Westway, Spurlands End Road, Great Kingshill, Bucks, HP15 6HX. (PL/20/3845/DE.) wrote advising of the grant of detailed permission for what in effect is two 2 storey houses when the outline permission granted was for single storey properties. The committee agreed that the Deputy Clerk should write to the resident expressing the committee's sympathy but explaining that like the resident the Parish Council has no right of appeal against the decision of the planning authority.

**iv)** The committee noted the various communications from residents affected by the development at "Chestnut House" Broombar Lane, Great Missenden, Buckinghamshire, HP16 9JD, (PL/19/4163/FA) both as to apparent non-compliance with existing conditions attached to the planning permission and as to the proposed means of fulfilling outstanding conditions, and noted that there is ongoing contact with the planning authority over these issues.

**v) a)** The committee noted the various communications from residents in relation to the proposed development at the Misbourne School in Great Missenden and in particular as to the blocking up of the right of way by contractors without any notice or diversion signs and that subsequently enquiries of the strategic access officer for Buckinghamshire Council elicited the response that the authority knew that they should have submitted request for a TRRO and given notice but had chosen not to do so in order to try to have the works to the proposed access way to the school completed whilst traffic was light. As a result of various representations submitted, the right of way was re-opened but is to be closed shortly for the works to be carried out in compliance with a TRRO.

b) The committee also noted that no notice had been received as to the proposed lighting scheme, the Planning Authority having determined that *"Therefore only our lighting consultants and ecologist have been consulted and if they advise they are satisfactory then I would anticipate that the conditions will be discharged i.e. the submissions will be approved under officer delegated powers"* this despite the representations made at the planning stage both by local residents and the Parish Council. There was a discussion about the issue of lighting and the need for it to ensure safety for children at the school, but to balance this with the lighting not being obtrusive for local residents or causing an extension of the urbanisation of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

The committee after discussion agreed to submit representations to the planning authority

a) Pointing out that they should have been consulted as to the proposed lighting scheme and

b) indicating that the lights should not be 5 metres high but of an adequate height to provide safe lighting for pupils of the school whilst not being intrusive, bearing in mind the location and the lack of street lighting and

c) Adopting the views set out by the local residents in particular pointing out that the lighting consultants will judge the applicant's lighting scheme purely on technical merits and whilst it might be technically sufficient they will consider the wider issues of the AONB, the dark skies, the ugly intrusion of permanent 5m high lamp standards and that there other low level solutions which are also technically acceptable and meet the needs of this sensitive location. The height now proposed was always said by local residents and interest groups such as the Chilterns Conservation Board and the Great Missenden Residents Association to be too high and obtrusive.

**vi)** The committee noted the update document from Buckinghamshire Council and in particular the appointment of a new head of planning.

**8) Matters for information**

There were no matters for information save that Councillor Johnstone indicated that in the absence of the chair of planning, and because he has an alternative council commitment on 1 March a volunteer to chair the committee meeting was required. Councillor Lovegrove volunteered

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

The meeting closed at 21.10.