



Planning Committee

10.00 a.m. Wednesday 3rd March 2010
The Chilterns Conservation Board office,
90 Station Road, Chinnor

Agenda

1. **Apologies**
2. **Public Question Time**
3. **Declarations of Interest**
4. **Minutes of Previous Meeting**
5. **Matters Arising**
6. **High Speed 2 – update**
7. **Chilterns Buildings Design Guide – update**
8. **Chilterns AONB Planning Forum**
9. **AONB Planning Policy Guidelines**
10. **Parish and Town Council training**
11. **Development Plans Responses**
12. **Planning Applications – Update**
13. **Any Urgent Business**
14. **Date of Next Meeting**

Wednesday 26th May 2010 at The Chilterns Conservation Board office, 90 Station Road, Chinnor, OX39 4HA

Future meetings – 8th September 2010, 1st December 2010 and 9th March 2011

Item 4 Minutes of Previous Meeting

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisations: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Approximately £500 a year for minute-taker plus staff time

Summary: Minutes of the previous meeting are attached (at Appendix 1) and need approving.

Purpose of report: To approve the Minutes of the previous meeting.

Background

1. The draft minutes from the meeting on 2nd December 2009 have been previously circulated and are attached (at Appendix 1) for approval.

Recommendation

1. **That the Committee approves the minutes of its meeting which took place on 2nd December 2009.**

1. Election of Chairman

The Planning Committee must elect a Chairman at its first meeting following the AGM, which took place on 21st October 2009. Barbara Wallis was the only nomination received by the Planning Officer and she was unanimously elected as Chairman.

2. Apologies

Cllr David Barnard (North Hertfordshire District Council), Mike Stubbs (the National Trust) and Richard Bossons (architect).

3. Public Question Time

No members of the public were present.

4. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made in connection with items on the agenda.

5. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes were approved and signed by the Chairman as a true record once the following amendments were made: item 6 (paragraph 2 line 3) 'sustainable' was replaced by 'sustainability' and item 15, future meetings: '6th June' was replaced by '2nd June'.

6. Matters Arising from the minutes

Item 6: It had been resolved that the Chairman would write to HS2 and Network Rail to seek to continue the process of engagement. Replies had been received. Network Rail stated that they would involve the Board and HS2 said that they would reply in due course.

The Planning Officer reported that the National Policy statement for networks (to include rail) is likely to arrive at the same time as the publication of the report on HS2.

Item 7 (Design Guide Review) – the Committee was informed that the date for the launch will be 23rd February 2010. Richard Simmons (CABE) is to be the keynote speaker. A venue in the Central Chilterns will be sought.

Item 14 (Wycombe Airpark) – Gill Gowing had spoken to Ian Westgate (Wycombe DC) about the Airpark, there was nothing to report at present though she would update the Committee as appropriate in the future.

7. High Speed 2- update

The Planning Officer gave a verbal update on a recent meeting where representatives from The Chiltern Society, Natural England and local planning

authorities had discussed High Speed 2 and possible implications. The CEO and Chief engineer of HS2 are due to meet with the Chief Officer and the Planning Officer on 4th December. They will go through the likely effects any potential plans may have on the Chilterns AONB. The Planning Officer will update the Committee in the future. It was agreed that a visit to Kent to view the impact HS1 had had on the countryside would be useful.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the current position in connection with High Speed 2.**

8. AONB Boundary reviews

The Planning Officer informed the Committee about: the number of queries that had been raised locally about AONB boundary reviews; the fact that Natural England would undertake any review; the processes required for such reviews, and the likely implications for the Chilterns AONB.

It was noted that the process of a boundary review is a resource intensive job. Compelling reasons are therefore required for boundary reviews to take place and it was agreed that they should not be undertaken in a piecemeal fashion.

The Planning Officer considered that the implications for the Chilterns AONB were limited at present.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the pressures for AONB boundary reviews and the processes required to bring these about.**
- 2. The Committee NOTED the likely implications for the Chilterns AONB.**
- 3. The Committee NOTED that should a boundary review take place it should address the whole AONB boundary and not be undertaken on a piecemeal basis.**
- 4. The Committee RESOLVED that the Planning Officer would look into the possibility of landscape character assessment work being undertaken, should funds allow, to address any known anomalies.**

9. Chilterns AONB Planning Conference 2009 – feedback

The 7th AONB Planning Conference took place on Wednesday 30th September 2009 at the Benson Parish Hall. 65 delegates had booked places. The reduced rates offered to Town and Parish Councils seemed to have generated interest as 25 delegates were present from such councils in and around the AONB. The AONB is increasing its engagement with these bodies.

The Planning Officer took the Committee through the various feedback responses and the overall results were positive. It was resolved that the format of the day should be retained for 2010. One particular point of note was the need to use a public address system even if the room was thought to be

acoustically acceptable.

With income from delegate's fees nearly covering the costs of the conference the financial position was considered to be healthy.

The date for the next Planning Conference was agreed as Wednesday 6th October 2010, and it was resolved that it should take place in the north of the Chilterns. The Planning Officer asked for suggested venues, topics for discussion and locations for site visits.

- 1. The content of the feedback from the seventh annual Chilterns Planning Conference was NOTED and further feedback was provided.**
- 2. The financial position as detailed was NOTED.**
- 3. The Committee APPROVED the date for the Planning Conference for 2010 and will provide suggestions for a venue, topics for discussion and suitable locations for site visits.**

10. Planning Forum – verbal feedback

The AONB Planning Forum had taken place on Thursday 26th November 2009 at the Chiltern District Council offices in Amersham and the Planning Officer gave a verbal feedback report. 28 people had booked to attend. 9 of the 13 Chilterns local planning authorities were represented.

The Environment Agency and the Landscape Institute both gave good presentations covering the issue of Green Infrastructure (GI) and its provision. Both CABI and Natural England have funds available for GI work. It was reported that there is a lack of skills in GI delivery. The presentations led to numerous questions and much discussion.

A number of other issues were also discussed including: lighting in the countryside, tranquillity, equestrian developments and HS2.

The recent review of the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide was mentioned and it will be actively promoted with training being given where required.

The suggested date for the next forum is 29th April 2010 and Dacorum BC had offered to host the event.

The Chairman thanked the Planning Officer for organising this valuable event.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the feedback from the AONB Planning Forum.**

11. Development Plans Responses

The Planning Officer informed the Committee about the responses that had already been sent, under delegated powers, in connection with public consultations on a number of development plan documents.

The Planning Officer noted that the Oxon CC consultation on highways options for LTP3 was a questionnaire on which one could not comment, only object. He had wished to comment at this stage as there was little detail in the documents available.

The Committee was informed that LTP3 will be a long-term strategy document, with policy statements which are starting to emerge. It was considered that the Board should be a consultee on these.

- 1. The Committee NOTED and APPROVED the responses already made on behalf of the Board in connection with the consultation exercises on the development plan documents as detailed.**

12. Planning Applications Update

The Planning Officer informed the Committee about the various representations that had been made in connection with planning applications and appeals and updated the Committee on any cases that had been determined.

Planning application CH/2009/0891/BCC (extraction of brick clay at Bellingdon Brickworks) – a member commented that the holes that would be left behind may not enhance the AONB. On future applications it was agreed that the Planning Officer would investigate the implications and seek reinstatement of the ground where appropriate.

- 1. The Committee NOTED and APPROVED the responses made in connection with the applications as listed in Appendix 2.**

13. Any Urgent Business

1. Mike Stubbs (National Trust) had asked the Committee to give thanks to the Planning Officer for the excellent work on the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide review. The Committee agreed with this.
2. Bettina Kirkham had attended a workshop on the review of landscape character assessment guidelines. The AONB must ensure that the use of landscape character assessment is not neglected.
3. Cllr Emmett informed the Committee that landowners whose potential successors no longer wish to farm the land are often seeking to sell their land and will often lease it back. This often means that land ownership is not clear and loyalties to the area are changing.

14. Date of the next meeting

Wednesday 3rd March 2010 at the Village Centre, High Street, Chinnor commencing at 10.00 am.

Future meetings: 26th May, 8th September and 1st December 2010.

The meeting closed 12.10

The Chairman

Date

Item 6 High Speed 2 update

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: The Chief Officer and Planning Officer had met the Chief Executive and Chief Engineer for High Speed 2 in December. The report from HS2 has been delivered to Government and a White Paper is expected by the end of March. Various press articles have reported a split in previous cross-party political support for HS2. A visit to Kent to look at the implications of High Speed 1 has been arranged.

Purpose of report: To update the Committee about the latest developments in connection with a possible high speed rail route through the Chilterns.

Background

1. The Board's Chief Officer and Planning Officer had a site meeting with the Chief Executive and Chief Engineer for High Speed 2 on 4th December. The HS2 representatives were taken to: the Bradenham Valley (met by Mike Stubbs), West Wycombe Hill, Speen, Great Kingshill, Great Missenden (met by Mike Overall), the Misbourne Valley, Amersham, Wendover, Tring, the West Coast Mainline corridor, Berkhamsted and Hemel Hempstead.
2. The idea had been to highlight some of the potential implications for the AONB of a new high speed rail line. During the visit the Chief Engineer informed the Board that he and a colleague had cycled round much of the area to get a feel for the landscape prior to preparing the report that was to be given to the Government. Both he and the Chief Executive appeared to be very receptive to the points that were being made.
3. HS2 have prepared the report that they were charged with producing and this was delivered to Government by the end of December. It is understood that the report details a London to Birmingham route to within 5 metres in urban areas and 25 metres in rural areas. The Government are in the process of producing a White Paper dealing with high speed rail and this is expected by the end of March. The publication of this would result in consultation on a preferred route.
4. In the last two weeks there has been a lot of press coverage of the issue with some reports suggesting that there has been a split in previous cross-party political support for HS2. The shadow transport secretary has said that the Conservatives have refused offers to view an advanced copy of the White Paper. The debate has been further complicated by the role that Heathrow is seen to play. The main political parties differ in their approaches with Labour apparently favouring a loop to Heathrow from a hub near Wormwood Scrubs and the Conservatives favouring a hub much closer to Heathrow.
5. These different options would result in different routes being taken via the Chilterns and various plans have been included with the newspaper articles. One plan that appeared

in The Guardian on 20th February showed the two routes appearing to go via the Bradenham Valley and the Misbourne Valley.

6. In order to assess the potential implications of a new high speed railway line a visit to Kent has been organised which takes place on 9th March. This visit should provide useful information to the Board and other organisations as they prepare to make responses to the eventual consultation exercise.
7. In the meantime the Board will continue to liaise with the Government and opposition as appropriate.

Recommendation

1. **That the Committee notes the report.**

Item 7 Chilterns Buildings Design Guide update

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: The Board launched the revised version of the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide on 23rd February. Promotion is being undertaken and endorsement of the Guide will be sought.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about the launch of the revised Design Guide and promotion that will now be undertaken.

Background

1. The Committee has received various reports on the progress of the revisions to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide. The Guide was adopted by the Board in October and the changes that were approved were all forwarded to the designer and incorporated into the final version which has now been printed. Copies of the Guide will be distributed to Committee members at the meeting.
2. The new Design Guide was launched at a special event which was held in Princes Risborough on 23rd February. About 50 people attended and heard talks about the background to the revised Guide, the importance of the Guide to architects and the need to fill gaps from the Planning Officer, Jon Allen (architect) and Richard Simmons (Chief Executive of CABA). A lively discussion ensued which carried on over lunch.
3. The need to promote the new Guide was highlighted by the Planning Officer and to this end a press release has been issued. Various interviews are to be given to local radio stations.
4. A report of the public consultation exercise will be prepared and sent to all the local planning authorities with a request that the Design Guide be endorsed as a material consideration in the exercise of their planning powers. This endorsement is vital to ensure that the Guide is given appropriate weight in decision-making. At the same time those local authorities that have yet to endorse the Management Plan will be reminded that this is also vital.
5. The Design Guide will be widely circulated and copies will be sent free of charge to all the local planning authorities, Parish and Town councils, Board members and a selection of other people (including The Chiltern Society). The Guide will be available to purchase from the Conservation Board (price £20 plus postage and packing) and can be downloaded free from the AONB website. Electronic copies will also be circulated where possible to those that receive a hard copy and this circulation will be much wider and will include architects, other local authority officers and other AONBs.
6. The Committee is asked to consider what other groups, organisations or individuals (if any) should be contacted about the Guide.

7. Once the promotion has been completed the Planning Officer will be undertaking more training for local authorities (officers as well as members). The interest in this has already been sparked by the launch event with Central Bedfordshire, South Oxfordshire and South Buckinghamshire all asking about possible meetings, to add to those for members and officers that are already due to take place shortly at Wycombe.

Recommendations

1. **That the Committee notes the report.**
2. **That the Committee alerts the Planning Officer to other groups, organisations or individuals that ought to be contacted about the Guide.**
3. **That the Committee promotes the Design Guide and its use as widely as possible.**

Item 8 Chilterns AONB Planning Forum

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time and £180 for room hire and refreshments.

Summary: The Board organises two Planning Forum events a year. The next one takes place on 13th May in High Wycombe and will focus on Local Transport Plans and the new Design Guide.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about the arrangements that have so far been made for the next Chilterns AONB Planning Forum.

Background

1. The Board organised two Planning Forum events in 2009 and intends to hold two again this year with the first taking place on Thursday 13th May (please note this change of date) in Committee Room 1 at the Council Offices in High Wycombe. The event takes place from 1pm to 4.15pm and will start with a buffet lunch.
2. The forum will focus on Local Transport Plans in order to enable engagement with the LTP3 process which has recently started. Ed Gurney (Transport for Buckinghamshire) has agreed to come and talk about the Buckinghamshire experience. An invitation has also been sent to Central Bedfordshire to try and get someone to talk about some of their own key messages. No reply has yet been received to this invitation so if there are alternative suggestions for people to invite these would be welcome.
3. With the publication of the new Design Guide the opportunity will be taken to promote the guide and to highlight some of the changes in order that it can be taken forward in a positive way, particularly in connection with its endorsement.
4. At the last forum there was a general discussion about a number of specific topics. Some thought has been given to this issue and it is suggested that the forum discusses the following: high speed rail (report and White Paper are likely to be in the public domain by May), emerging regional strategies, development plan progress (to update those present) and the need for engagement with the emerging AONB Planning Policy Guidelines. If there are other suggestions these can be discussed at the meeting.
5. An invitation will be sent out shortly with a draft programme and booking form. The list of invitees has grown over time and early booking will be encouraged as the room that we are using has a capacity of 28.

Recommendations

1. **That the Committee notes the arrangements that have thus far been made for the next Chilterns AONB Planning Forum.**
2. **That the Committee suggests additional topics for discussion and presenters as appropriate.**

Item 9 AONB Planning Policy Guidelines

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time plus £1,500 production and promotion costs.

Summary: Work on the AONB Planning Policy Guidelines has been held in abeyance whilst the Design Guide has been produced. Once promotion of the Guide is complete it will be possible to start drafting the Planning Policy Guidelines.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about progress with the production of the AONB Planning Policy Guidelines.

Background

1. The Committee has received various reports in the past about the Chilterns AONB Planning Policy Guidelines. Due to the need to concentrate on the production of the revised Buildings Design Guide it was not possible to progress the Planning Policy Guidelines.
2. The promotion work for the new Design Guide will mostly be complete by the end of March and this will enable work to progress in earnest on the Planning Policy Guidelines.
3. Comments that were previously made about the format and content of the Guidelines are being taken on board in the drafting work that is underway. Pictures will be included to illustrate key points and if the use of a diagram will save space this will be investigated.
4. The intention is that as sections are considered to be complete they will be brought to the Planning Committee for discussion and approval. This may result in more than one section being discussed at a single Committee meeting. It is also suggested that these sections may also be circulated to the local authority planning officers for their comments and suggestions.
5. Once the guidelines have been fully drafted they will be widely circulated and subject to a public consultation exercise that will last at least six weeks. Any changes will then be made and following this the intention is that the Guidelines will be adopted by the Board.
6. With a full and proper consultation it is hoped that the Guidelines may at least be endorsed by the local planning authorities. At the end of the process it should enable the Board to have less involvement in smaller and less controversial planning applications.
7. As work progresses further reports will be brought to the Committee.

Recommendation

1. **To note the report and that further reports will be brought to the Committee in the future.**

Item 10 Parish and Town Council training

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time and about £300 for room hire and refreshments.

Summary: The Board organised three successful training events for Parish and Town Councils in 2008. This year's events could focus on the new Design Guide and address some of the issues raised as feedback from the previous training.

Purpose of report: To seek the views of the Committee about the format, content and dates for this year's Parish and Town Council training.

Background

1. The Planning Committee will be aware that the Board organised three successful training events for Parish and Town Councils in 2008. These were attended by nearly 120 people representing nearly 50 Parish and Town Councils in the AONB.
2. It has previously been agreed that the training should be held every other year and it will therefore take place again this year.
3. At the previous training events the delegates were asked what their preference was for the format of any future events. The timings and format adopted for the events that were held were preferred by the majority. This had involved a welcome and introduction, two talks (the AONB and Conservation Board and decision making processes), a case study (development control), a short break, another talk on making representations at the development plan stage and planning committee and another case study (development plan). The events started at 7pm and concluded at 9pm. The general format and timings are considered to be appropriate and should apply this year. One common comment was that the events had tried to achieve too much and this should be taken account of.
4. It is considered that this year's events could focus on the new Design Guide and the Technical Notes and address some of the issues raised as feedback from the previous training including: roads and bridges, small householder applications, backland developments and landscaping considerations. It is hoped that a planning officer from a local authority will be able to attend each event in order to discuss some of the decision-making processes that they get involved in. The focus of the whole event will be design.
5. It is proposed that two talks be given before and after a break with a case study being done after the second one. The case study could focus on how to improve the design of a building to make it more acceptable. Plenty of time would be allowed for discussion.
6. Venues will be investigated once dates have been confirmed. It is suggested that the three events take place on the following dates – Monday 28th June, Thursday 1st July and Thursday 8th July (please bring diaries so that clashes can be avoided). The events should be spread throughout the AONB and it is suggested that the gateway centre at Dunstable Downs, Ballinger Memorial Hall and Woodcote village hall be investigated for availability.

7. The County associations for parish and town councils will be approached to publicise the events.
8. If there are any alternative suggestions for content, format, timing and location these can be discussed at the committee meeting.

Recommendations

1. **To note the proposed arrangements for the Parish and Town Council training.**
2. **That, subject to discussion at the meeting, the Committee approves the dates, content, format, timing and locations for the training.**

Item 11 Development Plans Responses

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisations: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: Responses have been sent in connection with public consultations on the following development plan documents: **Hertfordshire CC** Waste Core Strategy and Development Policies Issues and Preferred Options 2; **Bucks CC** LTP3 list of options; **Wycombe DC** consultation on interim policy statement – sites for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople; **DCLG** consultation on permitted development rights for small scale renewable and low carbon energy technologies and electric vehicle charging infrastructure; **DECC** consultation on draft National Policy Statements for Energy (EN1-6); **South Oxon DC** Green Infrastructure Strategy consultation; Oxfordshire CC LTP3 Transport Policies and **Aylesbury Vale DC** Aylesbury Growth Arc SPD consultation.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about, and approve, the responses that have been made under delegated powers in connection with development plan documents.

Background

The following paragraphs detail the responses that have already been drafted and sent in connection with the public consultation exercises on the development plan documents listed.

Hertfordshire CC Waste Core Strategy and Development Policies Issues and Preferred Options 2

1. The Chilterns Conservation Board supports Policy 8 (landfill and landraise) as drafted.
2. The Chilterns Conservation Board has the following comments to make in connection with Policy 16 (protection of Hertfordshire’s historic and environmental assets).
3. The Board welcomes the fact that the nationally designated and protected Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is mentioned as part of the consultation document. However, the Board is concerned that the references that are included fail to take proper account of the designation as drafted. The Core Strategy would benefit from being redrafted to include separate policies that deal with: international and national sites and areas that are statutorily protected (which would of course include the Chilterns AONB), and other sites and areas that are more local in nature and not subject to statutory protection.
4. As part of this suggested redrafting the County Council should clearly take account of the legislation that applies (The National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and PPS7) which all seek the ‘conservation and enhancement’ of the natural beauty of AONBs and ensure that major

developments should not take place in such protected landscapes. The Board considers that, as drafted, Policy 16 fails to take proper account of the legislation and relevant Government policy.

5. The two Acts of Parliament and PPS7 mentioned above are clearly significant policy drivers and form fundamental parts of the evidence base and should therefore be referred to as part of this section on page 59. Similarly, an appropriate indicator and targets (there are currently none) should also be included as part of the monitoring section (page 59).

Bucks CC LTP3 list of options

6. The Board welcomes the opportunity to both comment on the consultation and be involved in the transport symposia that have taken place and would like to focus its comments on the headline goals and objectives and the list of strategic options.
7. The 5 headline goals are to: reduce carbon emissions; support economic growth; promote equality of opportunity; contribute to better safety, security and health, and improve quality of life and a healthy natural environment.
8. There is little in the first four goals that anyone could object to and the Board supports them as drafted. However, the final goal appears to have had the environmental element stuck on as an afterthought. This perception is heightened when one sees the goal referred to on page 7 of the documentation without the environmental reference.
9. As drafted this goal does not adequately address environmental issues. The Board therefore suggests that it should be amended to read along the lines of the following – ‘improve quality of life and ensure a healthy environment’. This would ensure that the built environment would also be properly addressed.
10. The objectives that support the goals are generally supported, although the text which supports the goal that applies to the built and natural environment contains some errors and could usefully be amended to read ‘ensure that transport interventions improve and complement the built and natural environment and in doing so enhance the public realm and local distinctiveness’.
11. The reference to local distinctiveness is particularly welcomed and clearly reference should be made to the ‘Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Highways in the Chilterns’ when any schemes are being considered or proposed within the Chilterns AONB or its setting.
12. The final two objectives deal with the impacts of transport on the environment and users. The Board considers that it would be useful to mention the need to appropriately route heavy goods vehicles, which are increasingly (and wrongly) using minor roads within the AONB and its setting to the detriment of the protected landscape and its residents and users.
13. The Board has also examined the list of strategic options. There are many options in the list that are worthy of further consideration. However, the Board is mindful of the Council’s desire to get feedback on a small number of more favoured options and would like to offer its particular support to the following options (though these are not in any priority order):
14. **2 bus – rural** (improve rural bus coverage and links to the wider transport network);

15. **6** environment – noise (noise management schemes through engineering and maintenance, including working with Defra (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs) and on implementation of noise action plans);
16. **9** freight – limit freight travel with restrictions (Freight Strategy re-routing, weight and width restrictions to reduce negative environmental impacts);
17. **14** community transport on demand (develop demand responsive community transport solutions to rural accessibility issues such as “Wheels to work”, Demand Responsive Transport schemes and Community Rail projects, designed for individuals/small groups travel);
18. **20** street lighting energy saving (implement streetlight switch off, dimming and part night lighting initiatives);
19. **26** maintenance – proactive (invest in preventing the deterioration of the asset by repairing roads before they break), and
20. **39** (walking – promotion, implementation of walking and cycling schemes to promote healthier life styles and CO2 reduction)
21. The Board is also supportive of many of the other options that are listed but does not support the following options as they are likely to lead to detrimental impacts on the environment and greater emission of greenhouse gases:
22. **12** infrastructure – build roads (build roads to accommodate increased traffic and relieve congestion);
23. **16** encourage greater use of the car (lobby Government to reduce the costs [fuel duty, road tax] of running a car, reduce parking costs), and
24. **28** parking – increase parking provision (increased car parking spaces in town centres and for businesses).
25. Although supportive of the principles behind the following options the Board questions whether or not they would achieve the desired outcomes.
26. **8** freight – incentives for low emission vehicles (grants for low emissions technology for freight vehicles and buses or Introduce a Low Emission Zone). Though the aim is generally supported the outcome may be increased vehicle movements. If taken further this should be part of a package of measures aimed at decreasing vehicle use overall.
27. **21** initiative – sustainable fuels (develop sustainable fuel infrastructure, including electric charging points). Again this aim is supported the outcome may also be the same as for option 8 above – increased vehicle movements. If taken further this should also be part of a package of measures aimed at decreasing vehicle use overall.

Wycombe DC consultation on interim policy statement – sites for gypsies, travellers and travelling showpeople

28. The Board welcomes the prominence given to the importance of the nationally designated Chilterns AONB as part of the two stage process of identifying possible sites.
29. The site criteria that are detailed are generally supported with the following exceptions. For the policy constraints, the Board welcomes the need to ensure that any site does not compromise the objectives of nationally recognised designations (and by this we

presume that this covers the Chilterns AONB), however, the Board does not consider that this fully reflects the purpose of designation of the AONB. Therefore, it should be stressed that any development that takes place in the AONB should bring about conservation or enhancement of the natural beauty of the AONB.

30. In connection with the physical constraints the Board considers that any sites that are developed should be in 'good' proximity to local services, rather than 'reasonable' proximity as this is likely to be stretched to the limit thus pushing sites further out into the countryside away from settlements and their associated facilities.
31. For the first bullet point of the potential impacts section (in connection with not having adverse impacts on the landscape) the Board considers that it would be useful to add the following, before 'site' in line 1, to read 'development and use of any'.
32. Two possible sites are identified that are within the Chilterns AONB – GT034 (Dry Banks, Opposite Kiln Farm, Oxford Road, Stokenchurch) and GT035 (Storage Site, Oxford Road, Stokenchurch). The first site is identified as a possible medium-large permanent site for gypsies and travellers with between 6 and 15 pitches. This site is also identified as a possible suitable site for accommodating travelling showpeople, but only after the South East Plan partial review is complete. The second site, which is much smaller and closer to the M40, is identified as one of five other sites that are worthy of consideration if site constraints could be overcome. If taken forward this site would be for a small number of pitches (up to 5).
33. The Board recognises that both of the possible sites that are identified within the AONB are previously developed and that the previous uses have not enhanced the sites' settings or the AONB. However, this does not mean that an alternative use for gypsy or traveller accommodation will always be appropriate. If any development is to take place it is vital that the purpose of designation of the AONB is not compromised in any way and that any development should conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. Any detrimental features arising out of the current use of the sites should be removed prior to any other development taking place if either of these sites is taken forward. Therefore, although the Board does not object to the principle of the possible development of these sites for the uses identified, it is concerned that such developments must be undertaken with the greatest care in order that the purpose of designation of the AONB is not compromised.
34. Although the proposed site development criteria are welcomed, the Board considers that greater reference should be made to the fact that there are various relevant policies in the Council's adopted Core Strategy. This is particularly appropriate in connection with the sites in the Chilterns AONB and those that may affect its setting. The Board also considers that it would be appropriate to refer specifically to the adopted Statutory AONB Management Plan and associated design and materials advice. This would help to ensure that any developments that may take place in the AONB or its setting give due regard to the nationally protected landscape.

DCLG Consultation on permitted development rights for small scale renewable and low carbon energy technologies and electric vehicle charging infrastructure

35. The consultation paper seeks views on proposals for changes to the planning system in relation to the granting of permitted development rights for: domestic wind turbines and air source heat pumps; non-domestic wind turbines, air source heat pumps, ground

source heat pumps, solar panels, flues for biomass systems and CHP systems, structures to house anaerobic digestion systems and biomass boilers and structures to house hydro-turbines, and electric vehicle charging infrastructure.

36. Despite the often small-scale nature of some renewable energy installations, the visual impact of such developments can often be far reaching. The Conservation Board is therefore concerned that the Government does not propose to extend the restrictions that apply to World Heritage Sites (WHSs) and conservation areas to other Article 1(5) land including Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs). The restrictions ensure that wind turbines, air source heat pumps and solar panels are not granted permitted development rights if they are visible from a highway adjoining the site. The reason given for not extending the restrictions is that the density of wind turbines is likely to be comparatively low in the other areas such that, in the Government's opinion, their installation would not unduly harm their visual character. In most cases it is partly due to this very reason (low density) particularly when associated with less developed landscapes that such extended restrictions should apply.
37. In protected landscapes a single small wind turbine could have a significant detrimental impact on the natural beauty of the area if it is not located in the most appropriate place in landscape terms. This is particularly the case if it is the only wind turbine in an otherwise open vista. The only way that this could be properly controlled is if an application is required to be made. The Board therefore strongly recommends that the restrictions that would apply to WHSs and conservation areas should apply to all Article 1(5) land to include all other protected landscapes such as the Chilterns AONB.
38. Furthermore, the Board recommends that the criterion used to determine visibility ('visible from any highway which bounds the curtilage of the property') should be amended to reflect the fact that some installations are clearly visible from further afield thus resulting in potential harm to interests of acknowledged importance. In fact, in many cases, as one moves away from a site the overall impact often increases. The Board suggests that the criterion should be amended to read 'planning permission would be required if the installation would be visible from any highway, other public right of way or open access land in the vicinity of the property'.
39. In those cases where there is a risk to a protected landscape the advice of Natural England should be sought (as is currently the case for possible impacts on wildlife).
40. The consultation contains a number of tables that detail the permitted development proposals for various technologies and various premises (domestic and non-domestic). The Board's comment about the need to extend the restrictions that currently exist for WHSs and conservation areas to cover all Article 1(5) land, including protected landscapes such as the Chilterns AONB, applies to the following tables – 1 (wind turbines mounted on a detached house), 2 (wind turbines mounted on a freestanding outbuilding within the curtilage of domestic premises), 3 (stand alone wind turbines within the curtilage of domestic premises), 5 (wind turbines mounted on a detached non-domestic building), 6 (stand alone wind turbine on a non-domestic premises), 7 (air source heat pump on non-domestic premises), 10 (solar panels mounted on pitched roofs of non-domestic buildings), 11 (solar panels attached to flat roofs or the walls of non-domestic buildings) and 13 (flues for biomass systems and combined heat and power systems on non-domestic premises).
41. The Board welcomes the need for planning applications to be made for all stand-alone solar panels on non-domestic premises in AONBs and the inclusion of AONBs within the

‘areas where there would be further protection’ (table 12). However, the Board is confused as to why this is the only instance where this added protection applies to AONBs. The Board’s comment about the need to amend the criterion as detailed above also applies in this instance.

42. Table 14 deals with permitted development proposals for the erection of structures to house biomass boilers, anaerobic digestion systems and associated waste and fuel stores. The permitted development threshold requires that only fuel or waste generated on the farm or forestry holding can be disposed of. The Board considers that this is overly restrictive and should allow for fuel or waste to come from other holdings within a certain radius (say 10 miles in order to limit the distance travelled) in order to encourage schemes like district heating, combined heat and power for local people and associated improved woodland management for example. The Board also considers that certain thresholds related to the size of any building may be required.

DECC Consultation on draft National Policy Statements for Energy (EN1-6)

43. Draft Overarching Energy NPS (EN-1) – The Conservation Board welcomes and supports the criteria for good design as detailed in paragraphs 4.5.1 to 4.5.5 and hopes that, with such greater consideration being given to any new energy development, this would mean that greater account is taken of the local context, distinctiveness and building materials.
44. The Board supports the principles for biodiversity and geological conservation as outlined in section 4.18 and the principles for the historic environment as outlined in section 4.23 (and particularly the recognition of the importance of non-designated assets of archaeological importance).
45. The Board welcomes and generally supports section 4.24 in the draft NPS on landscape and visual impacts. The Board is particularly supportive of: the retention and clarification of the important protection provided by PPS7 for nationally designated landscapes (including AONBs and National Parks); the reiteration of the criteria for assessing major development in protected landscapes as outlined in PPS7 (as this clarifies that the NPSs will not override PPS7 for such developments); the recognition that development outside the boundary of a protected landscape may affect the designated area, and the reference to the duties placed on the IPC to have regard to the purposes of designation of AONBs and National Parks.
46. However, the Board considers, in connection with line 1 of paragraph 4.24.9, that the term “relatively close to” a nationally designated landscape is vague and therefore recommends that this is replaced with the following: “within the setting of” as this is considered to be a clearer form of wording. In addition, the Board considers that the words “should be” in the last line of paragraph 4.24.9 should be replaced with “is”.
47. The Board supports the principles for land use including open space, green infrastructure and green belt as outlined in section 4.25 and the recognition given to the potential adverse effects of noise on quiet places and areas with high landscape quality as outlined in section 4.26 (noise). However, the Board considers that lighting and air pollution can also have adverse effects on otherwise tranquil areas and therefore recommends that the importance of tranquillity is specifically highlighted in the NPS with this section being accordingly expanded.

48. The Board also supports the principles for water quality and resources as outlined in section 4.30.
49. Draft NPS for Fossil Fuel Electricity Generating Infrastructure (EN-2) – The Board welcomes the reference to having regard to the impacts of such developments on National Parks and AONBs as set out in the overarching energy NPS (EN-1). The Board also welcomes the recognition given to the potential impacts of lighting, the reference to mitigation and the requirement for applicants to design such facilities with the aim of providing the best fit with the existing local landscape. However, the Board considers that this should always include designing buildings to minimise the negative aspects of their appearance and therefore recommends that ‘may’ in the third line of paragraph 2.6.7 should be replaced with ‘will’.
50. Draft Renewable Energy NPS (EN-3) – The Board welcomes and supports the reiteration of the policy, as detailed in PPS22, that consent should only be granted on sites with nationally recognised designations (including National Parks and AONBs) ‘*where it can be demonstrated that the objectives of designation of the area will not be compromised by the development, and any significant adverse effects on the qualities for which the area has been designated are clearly outweighed by the environmental, social and economic benefits*’. However, the Board recommends that this should be amended to read ‘On sites within or affecting nationally recognised designations’ in order to comply with the overarching NPS (EN-1). This affects paragraphs 2.5.31 (biomass and waste combustion), 2.6.56 (offshore wind) and 2.7.32 (onshore wind).
51. The Board also considers that, within section 2.6, the draft NPS should recognise more explicitly the potential landscape, visual and other impacts of onshore infrastructure for offshore wind farms.
52. Draft Gas Supply Infrastructure and Gas and Oil Pipelines NPS (EN-4) – The Board welcomes the reference to the need to consider the impact of noise in quiet rural areas as a particular issue in paragraph 2.9.14.
53. The Board considers that paragraph 2.9.19 (which states that long-term impacts upon the landscape for pipelines are likely to be negligible) fails to give special consideration to nationally protected landscapes such as National Parks and AONBs.
54. The Board welcomes the reference to mitigation and compensation in paragraph 2.9.21. However, the Board recommends that the draft NPS should be amended to emphasise that restoration should be in accordance with the recognised landscape character in the vicinity of the route (whether this is in a nationally protected landscape or not) and, where possible, enhances the landscape. The requirement should not simply be reinstatement ‘as close to its original state as possible’.
55. Although the Board generally welcomes the statement in paragraph 2.9.22 that the IPC should expect, where possible, proposed routes of gas and oil pipelines to avoid any long-term impacts on AONBs or National Parks it considers that this fails to meet the tests for the acceptability of major development in nationally designated landscapes. Therefore, the Board recommends that the first sentence of paragraph 2.9.22 of the NPS should be amended to read: ‘The IPC will expect that where possible the proposed route will avoid AONBs or National Parks’. The Board considers that where a pipeline would cause harm to a nationally protected landscape, which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated, then the development should not take place. If, however, despite this harm, consent is exceptionally granted, then compensation for the residual harm should be

provided. This paragraph should therefore also refer to the need to provide compensation where any harm that arises is unavoidable.

56. Draft Electricity Networks NPS (EN-5) – Paragraph 2.2.5 refers to the duties of transmission and distribution licence holders under Schedule 9 of the Electricity Act 1989. The Board understands that these same licence holders are also subject to the statutory duties as set out in Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and Section 11(2) of the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949. These statutory duties require such bodies, in exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an AONB or National Park, to have regard to the purposes of designation of the AONB or National Park. The Board therefore considers that these statutory duties should also be referred to at this point in the NPS.
57. The Board welcomes the recognition given to the potential cumulative effect of overhead lines and related development and the reference to the “Holford Rules”. However, the Board recommends that the Government’s attitude towards the undergrounding of overhead lines in the draft NPS should be more positive, particularly in nationally protected landscapes and their settings, because of the potential significant landscape benefits.
58. Draft Nuclear NPS (EN-6) – The Board has no comments on this draft NPS.

South Oxon DC Green Infrastructure Strategy consultation

59. The Board welcomes and supports much of the consultation document and trusts that the strategy will actually lead to the direct provision of Green Infrastructure (GI) within the District.
60. The Board considers that rather than alighting on a single site preferred option for each town and large village it may sometimes be better to have multi-site provision with sites being spread out to enable easy access to such sites by a greater proportion of the local population.
61. The position at Henley is odd because a preferred housing site has not been identified as part of the Core Strategy. Paragraph 5.43 states that a preferred GI option has not been selected as it would need to be informed by the location of housing sites. However, paragraph 5.46 then states that the preferred option is an extension to Gillotts Field to the south. The need to provide accessible GI for Henley is very important because of the form of the town, the presence of the River Thames and the local topography. Local people should be encouraged to access GI by foot, cycle or other sustainable transport means and suggesting a single site on the south west extremity of the town is unlikely to achieve this. It would be much better to have a number of sites to meet the identified need.
62. The Board does not object to the sites that are suggested as options for Henley. However, whatever sites are ultimately identified as GI should be left unchanged in terms of their appearance. The only thing that may need improving would be accessibility to and through the sites in terms of footpath provision or maintenance. Sites should not be manicured (grass cut and flower beds planted for example) as this would fundamentally change the appearance of the sites (three of which are actually within the Chilterns AONB) and would not be likely to lead to conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the AONB.

Oxfordshire CC LTP3 Transport Policies

63. The Board welcomes the opportunity to comment on the policies but is disappointed that there appears to be no associated supporting text or background information. As a result some comments relate to possible misunderstandings arising from a lack of information.
64. The Board considers that in a number of areas there is a lack of specific policies. There should be an overarching policy that deals with the need to reduce the need to travel. The Board considers that the noise impacts of transport (road, rail and air) and the need to reduce these should be addressed by a specific policy. The impacts of light (energy use and the effects on nocturnal species and tranquillity in rural areas) should also be subject to a specific policy which should allow for street lights in rural areas to be switched off at night (as has been done in parts of Buckinghamshire). A specific policy should be included that deals with the need to identify and reduce the embedded energy associated with the materials used in construction. The Board considers that a policy should be included that deals with the need for greater accessibility on the County's public rights of way network and specifically bringing this about by stile removal.
65. Policy NM1 (junctions and crossings) – the Board is concerned that in designing junctions and crossing to operate effectively this may be without proper consideration of the impacts on the landscape and environment. Design and lighting provision for example would need very careful consideration and this is not addressed in the policy as drafted.
66. Policy ND1 (road network improvements) – the Board considers that this policy should also address the need to have regard to all other issues which will include the wider landscape and environment for example.
67. Policy ND2 (sequential test for network development) – the Board supports the sequential approach that is detailed which would consider all solutions with non-road building solutions being considered first, followed by small scale then large scale improvements.
68. Policy PTS2 (hierarchy of bus services) – though the Board does not object to the hierarchy that is detailed it suggests that the Council should not forget off-peak and weekend provision within this.
69. Policy PTS4 (community transport schemes) – the Board fully supports this policy.
70. Policy PTS5 (new developments served by public transport) – though the Board supports the principle of this policy it wonders whether, as worded (OCC will work to ensure developments are served by public transport), this will actually bring about the required provision. As drafted this policy appears to be more of a desire than a policy.
71. Policy PTI1 (development of bus services) – the Board fully supports this policy.
72. Policy PTI4 (bus service provision in new developments) – though the Board supports the principle of this policy it wonders whether, as worded (OCC will influence location and layout of new developments so that bus services can be provided), this will actually mean that the bus services will actually be provided. As drafted this policy appears to be more of a desire than a policy.

73. Policy R4 (support for electrification of the Great Western Line) – though the Board does not object to the principle of this policy it considers that the Council should take great care with the route as it passes through the AONBs within the County and detailed consideration should be given to the landscape impacts arising from the provision of power (gantries for example) as these do not blend in with the landscape and would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of any AONB.
74. Policy CY2 (improvement of facilities for cycling) – the Board considers that this policy should be redrafted to ensure that it deals with the actual provision of dedicated and traffic free routes for cyclists. The policy talks about the development of programmes to improve facilities and not provision.
75. Policy W1 (promotion of walking), Policy W2 (development of networks of pedestrian routes) and Policy W4 (investigation of improvements to walking facilities in rural areas) – the Board fully supports these policies.
76. Policy RS2 (road safety activity) – the Board considers that any identification and implementation of improvements to the highway network should take account of the local context, particularly when within an AONB and for the Chilterns proper account should be taken of the advice in the Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Highways in the Chilterns.
77. Policy RS3 (measures to reduce casualties) – the Board suggests that any engineering measures that are undertaken should be appropriate to the local context, particularly when located in one of the County's AONBs.
78. Policy TP2 (extension of travel planning to local areas) – the Board does not object to the principle of this policy but wonders whether 'local areas' include rural parts of the County or not. If not this should be addressed as the needs are not confined to towns and major developments.
79. Policy SEPR1 (improvement of the street environment and public realm) – though supportive of the principle of this policy the Board suggests that it should be extended to the whole County and not just Oxford and the larger towns because the need is not confined to these two elements.
80. Policies SEPR2 (de-cluttering of the street environment) and SEPR3 (street audit processes) – the Board welcomes these policies and is fully supportive of them. We would welcome the opportunity to suggest specific locations that should be assessed and would be grateful for confirmation that street lights are included in 'street furniture'. The Board considers that it is vital that the design and materials are carefully considered particularly in connection with rural roads in the AONBs.
81. Policy FD1 (freight transfer from roads to rail or water) – the Board welcomes and supports this policy.
82. Policy FD2 (suitable network of freight routes) – although the Board welcomes this policy it wonders if the identification of a network of routes suitable for freight movements will actually lead to the improvement of existing routes (canals for example) or the actual provision of new routes. This should be explicitly expressed in the policy.
83. Policy FD4 (support for provision of new rest facilities for lorries) – the Board does not support this policy as it appears to be encouraging freight movements by road and therefore runs counter to Policy FD1.

84. Policy PROW1 (public rights of way network) – although the Board is supportive of the principle of this policy it is not sure that promotion of a public rights of way network which enables access for all will actually lead to the implementation of such a network. This should be explicitly expressed in the policy.
85. Policy PROW2 (protection and maintenance of public rights of way) – the Board welcomes and supports this policy.
86. Policy PROW3 (development of more joined-up public rights of way network) – although the Board is supportive of the principle of this policy it considers that this: should particularly apply to the bridleway network which is currently fragmented, should also address links to the provision of green space and links to Green Infrastructure and should ensure that the network is joined up with neighbouring counties.
87. Policy PROW4 (public rights of way network contributing to thriving countryside) – the Board welcomes and supports this policy.
88. Policy AT1 (encouragement for use of sustainable travel rather than air within Britain) – the Board welcomes this particular stance but considers that this should apply to all trips within Britain and not just ‘domestic’ trips as a reduction in business trips would make a significant contribution to carbon emissions reductions.
89. Policy AT2 (encouragement for best use of airports) – the Board objects to this policy as it suggests that there will be increases in operations and throughput of aircraft at airports without any account being taken of the environmental implications (emissions and visual and noise pollution).
90. Policy AT4 (minimising the impact of air travel) – though the Board welcomes the stance taken in this policy, it considers that people (as well as landscape and wildlife) should be specifically mentioned and the issues of noise and visual pollution and the impacts on tranquillity need to be explicitly addressed.
91. Policy WW1 (encouragement for continued and increased use of waterways) – the Board welcomes and supports this policy.
92. Policy WW4 (promotion of waterways network to increase visitor and recreational awareness) – the Board welcomes and supports this policy.

Aylesbury Vale DC Aylesbury Growth Arc SPD consultation

93. AGA1 land use budget - The Board fully supports the principle of the provision of a minimum of 50% of land area for local and strategic Green Infrastructure.
94. AGA5 economic viability - Although in broad agreement with this principle, the Board questions whether the provision of 1% of housing for live/work units is adequate, particularly considering the push for businesses to be run from home in the future (as detailed in the next part of the principle).
95. AGA6 density - Although in broad agreement with this principle, the Board questions the desire to develop the sites in the form of a pyramid pattern with the highest buildings towards the centre and the lowest towards the edge. The Board is supportive of lower height development on the edge of such sites, but considers that much greater account should be taken of the context of each site. To build 5 and 6 storey buildings in an area where 2 storey dominates would clearly be at odds with the context.

96. AGA14 overhead power lines - The Board fully supports the principle that all existing overhead power lines should be placed underground within the SDAs.
97. AGA18 public transport - Although in broad agreement with this principle, the Board wonders why only one park and ride site is being proposed (within the SE SDA). To encourage modal shift and decrease congestion the Board considers that park and ride sites may need to be provided at the other SDAs unless other such provision has already been identified. As the SE SDA park and ride site is on the eastern extremity of the site next to the A41 great care will be needed with the design of this facility to ensure that it does not impact on the wider landscape. This will require careful and limited use of lighting.
98. AGA 25 Green Infrastructure detail - The Board fully supports the principle that 50% of land should be provided as local and strategic Green Infrastructure.
99. AGA26 design of GI, AGA27 GI linkages, AGA28 GI biodiversity, AGA29 need to take account of GI in design, AGA30 accessibility to GI and AGA31 tree retention in GI - The Board supports these principles.
100. SE1 views across the site - Although the need to take account of the views across the SDA to the Chilterns is addressed, the Board also considers that any development proposals should take account of views into the site from the Chilterns AONB. This should be addressed in the layout and design, particularly at the southern and eastern extremities of the site.
101. SE4 responding to local distinctiveness, SE8 strategic cycleway and footpath (beyond the site to the east) - The Board supports these principles.
102. SE6 employment allocation - Although the Board does not object to the strategic employment allocation it considers that there should be more employment provided throughout the site (as with affordable housing) in order to encourage modal transport shift and more walking and cycling. The chosen location will only bring about car borne commuting. In addition very careful consideration will need to be given to the layout, design and materials used at this site as it will be visible from the Chilterns AONB and wider landscape to the east of the SDA.
103. SE7 supermarket allocation - Although the Board does not object to the allocation of land for a supermarket or superstore it considers that there should be more retail provision throughout the site (as with affordable housing) in order to encourage modal transport shift and more walking and cycling. The chosen location will only bring about car borne shopping. In addition very careful consideration will need to be given to the layout, design and materials used at this site as it will be visible from the Chilterns AONB and wider landscape to the east of the SDA.
104. SE9 park and ride site - The Board does not object to the provision of a park and ride site as part of this SDA. However, as the SE SDA park and ride site is on the eastern extremity of the site next to the A41 great care will be needed with the design of this facility to ensure that it does not impact on the wider landscape. This will require careful and limited use of lighting.
105. SE18 community woodland to the north of Weston Turville - The Board supports this principle.

106. SE20 – green corridors - Although the Board supports this principle it considers that any green corridors should be extended well beyond the site and they should link into existing public rights of way.
107. Paragraph 6.3.2 - This paragraph states that no strategic infrastructure requirements need to be in place before the developments are started. The Board disagrees with this point and suggests that Green Infrastructure provision should be considered prior to the developments taking place and any necessary planting done at this stage in order to ensure that when the first occupants arrive they are not faced with a lack of such infrastructure. If it is in place from the first day of occupation this will help to establish patterns of movement and may encourage more sustainable modes of travel.
108. AGA33 implementation - Though the Board broadly supports this principle it considers that for Green Infrastructure in particular 'timely and commensurate delivery' would require work to be undertaken prior to the developments taking place and this is not reflected in the implementation schedules.

Recommendation

- 1. That the Committee notes and approves the responses already made on behalf of the Board in connection with the consultation exercises on the development plan documents detailed above.**

Item 12 Planning Applications Update

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisations: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: Representations have been made regarding a small number of planning applications and appeals and a number of previous cases have been determined.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about the various representations that have been made in connection with planning applications and appeals and to update the Committee on any outcomes.

Background

1. In the year from 1st April 2009 details of 98 planning applications or appeals have been brought to the attention of, or requested by, the Planning Officer. All of these have been responded to, with 27 being the subject of formal representations (20 objections and 7 supporting representations). 21 of these applications have been determined, with 19 being in line with the Board's comments (90%).
2. The 27 applications that have resulted in formal comments thus far this year are for: a housing development including care home and employment buildings (and subsequent revisions), change of use of land to site 9 gypsy caravans and associated buildings (and subsequent revisions and appeal), retrospective applications for alterations to a scheme approved on appeal, retention of chicken sheds and mobile home, replacement aircraft hangars (and subsequent revised scheme), enforcement appeals against development, extensions to a house, mobile home for agricultural worker, one or two very large chicken houses, demolition of two dwellings and replacement with nine dwellings, three lighting columns for a manege, 12 flats on a constrained site, a 75 bed care home, a coachway, park and ride and hotel development, a 2.83m solid metal gate and the provision of floodlights and bollard lights at a pub (objections), extraction of loam and extraction of clay both for the local brick making industry (plus two later revised applications), a new milking parlour and extensions to existing cattle buildings, the undergrounding of some overhead power lines and the provision of temporary accommodation for a farm worker (supporting representations).
3. The outstanding formal representations are detailed in Appendix 2, and where decisions have been made by the local planning authorities these are detailed.

Recommendation

1. **To note and approve the responses made in connection with the applications listed in Appendix 2.**

APPENDIX 2

Location	LPA	Development	Ref. No.	Status	AONB Planning Officer's Response	Date
Bellingdon Brickworks, Chesham	Bucks CC	Amendment to planning permission for extraction of brick clay	CH/2009/08 91/BCC	Approved – 23.09.09	Support – based on the need to provide good quality local building materials the planning application is supported as the extraction will take place over a relatively short time period and the void will be planted with trees thus having limited impact on the landscape.	06.07.09
Arrewig Lane, The Lee, Bucks	Bucks CC	Extraction of loam and backfilling void with soil and stones and tree planting	CH/2009/08 92/BCC	Approved – 23.09.09	Support – based on the need to provide good quality local building materials the planning application is supported as the extraction will take place over a relatively short time period and the void will be backfilled with soil and stones and trees will be planted thus having limited impact on the landscape.	10.07.09
RAF Edlesborough, Tring Road, Edlesborough	AVDC	2 barns for chicken farm	09/11395/IN F2	Application discouraged due to impact on AONB and Green Belt	Object – a full planning application should be made (this is a notification), the two buildings (109x18x5m) would introduce an appropriate built form into a part of the landscape that has no such buildings, resulting in significant detrimental impacts on the natural beauty and enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB, combining the 2 buildings into 1 would not lessen the impact, Board is also concerned about other associated development (feed stores, access tracks, other storage buildings, lighting and domestic accommodation) that would introduce urbanising features into the landscape.	16.09.09
Manor Farm, Markyate	DBC	40 dwellings	4/02083/MF A	Appeal allowed – 02.12.09	Object – design (3 storey dwellings on steep site, dormers are wrong, more use of chimneys and roofs should be gabled), materials (more use of local brick, no concrete tiles, wooden windows should be used, no render, better surface materials	11.10.07

					for roads and parking areas, boundary walls should be 1.2m high only, no close board fencing which should be replaced by post and rail and hedge), affordable housing is not properly detailed and landscaping should be reduced as it appears to hide the site. Significant changes made that resolve most objections.	Dec 07 and Jan 08
Manor Farm, Markyate	DBC	40 dwellings – revisions to drawings	4/02083/MF A	Appeal allowed 02.12.09 –	Object – most of the objections remain, though there has been greater use of chimneys and many dormers have moved down the roof slopes. Further comments sent in connection with use of local materials, removal of permitted development rights (for boundary treatments and loft conversions) and design of some of the dwellings. Changes – see above.	18.12.07
The Ivy House pub, Amersham Road, Chalfont St Giles	CDC	4x4m floodlights, 27 bollard lights and car park resurfacing	CH/2009/18 01/FA	Pending	Object – do not object to car park resurfacing as resin bonded gravel is proposed, kerbs should not be concrete, object to amount and design of lighting and suggest that 2 floodlights should be removed, number of bollard lights reduced as street lights are in the vicinity and the proposal would lead to large amount of light pollution. Lights should be designed to light the car park surface and be in keeping with the listed building, directional cowls should be used, passive infra-red detectors and timers should be used.	09.02.10
Chinnor Cement Works, Chinnor	SODC	178 dwellings, care home, B1 offices, access and landscaping	P09/E0145/O	Pending	Object – lack of recognition given to the AONB, lack of renewable energy provision, building materials are inappropriate, there should be much less use of impermeable materials for surfacing, flint should be removed (it appears as token panels at the bottom of some walls) or should form the majority of any wall on which it is used and traditional construction should be specified, less	05.05.09

				Revisions	<p>use should be made of hit and miss, close board and larch lap fencing and more use made of post and rail and hedging, local building materials should be specified (particularly red/multi bricks and hand made clay tiles or natural slate), less use of render, no high level street lighting, lower heights of buildings should be used on the eastern side of the site, the large care home and flat building should have more varied roof heights, more chimneys should be included, vehicle activated sign should be removed from Hill Road unless there is a high traffic flow and specific collision problem and the red surface material should be replaced by buff coloured material.</p> <p>Object – changes have not improved the appearance, stepped terraces are contrived, the use of much 2½ and 3 storey buildings results in a wider impact arising from the site, flint still appears as a token with its use on the entrance building (which is particularly poorly designed) being completely out of context, greater use should be made of better brick bonds (Flemish is suggested for the part of one building), there is still a lack of chimneys (the designs talk of them being ‘used sparingly’), some of the dormer windows are out of context, there is a lack of variety in the provision of renewable energy and use should be made of a district CHP and also domestic CHP (wood fuelled) and documents that are 30Mb and larger cannot be accessed.</p>	14.09.09
Olga Mowforth House, Folly Road, Woodcote	SODC	Replacement of Olga Mowforth House with 12 flats and development of	P09/E0991	Pending	Object - The Board does not object to the principle of the redevelopment of the current built up part of the site but much of the site is not previously developed and this would bring about a significant amount of development where there is currently	23.10.09

		rest of site for 10 houses and 16 flats			<p>none. The Board objects to the following: the design fails to take proper account of the location of the site within the Chilterns AONB and fails to conform to the CBDG or the technical notes leading to a failure to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. The proposal is contrary to the AONB Management Plan and SODC Local Plan (Policy C2). The materials proposed (concrete roof tiles and artificial slates for example) are not sustainable and fail to take account of the site's context and location within the Chilterns AONB. This is contrary to the CBDG, supplementary technical notes and Policy C2 of the Local Plan. The application represents a lost opportunity to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, special landscape quality and distinctiveness of the AONB.</p> <p>These objections could be overcome with the following changes: a reduced level of development that would be commensurate with the site as existing, re-design of the buildings to take account of their context within the AONB, and use of locally distinctive materials, particularly those that are hand-made or traditionally-made (bricks, hand-built flintwork, clay tiles for example).</p>	
Whittles Farm, Mapledurham	SODC	Demolition of hangar and erection of 3 replacement hangars	P10/E0078	Pending	Object – although number of hangars has reduced to 3 (from 4) their use when associated with the licence that applies to the site could lead to a doubling in the number of aircraft stored at the site and a consequent increase in the intensity of use of the site. Suggest use of the site should be restricted to a level commensurate with that which is currently permitted. Limits should be placed on: the number of aircraft that could be stored at the	09.02.10

					site (3 maximum), the number of days of operation, the number of movements and times that the airstrip could be used. If not achievable then the number of hangars would have to be reduced. Objection removed – clarification given by SODC in connection with Lawful Development Certificate and use that could take place being in excess of licence that applies. Objection could not be sustained.	24.02.10
Mulberry Bush, Dawes Lane, Sarratt	TRDC	Enforcement appeals re tree house and building with toilet and 4 brooder units	Inspectorate	<i>Tree house appeal dismissed and brooder units appeal allowed</i> – <i>04.01.10</i>	Object – Inspectorate reminded of S85 duties, development has had detrimental impact on the AONB and its enjoyment, is contrary to saved Local Plan, emerging LDF and adopted AONB Management Plan policies and should be dismissed. The appeal would exacerbate the detrimental impacts that have taken place on the site.	03.07.09
Grange Farm, Widmer End	WDC	Agricultural building to be used as potting shed	07/06948/F UL	Pending	Object - The proposal seeks to construct a very large (30m by 15m and 5.6m high) utilitarian, agricultural, building that will be clearly visible to users of the local rights of way. The principles of the AONB appear not to have been taken on board by the applicants. The development could not be assimilated into the Chilterns AONB. The proposal could create a dangerous precedent. The Board is mindful of the need to facilitate growth in the local economy and the evident importance of the applicant's business, however, it considers that the proposal would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB.	07.09.07
Stockwells former timber yard, Ibstone Road,	WDC	75 bed care home	09/07268/F UL	Pending	Object – some changes have been made from previous schemes, though the bulk, mass and scale are still too big and the building should be reduced in height and scale. The design has	18.12.09

Stokenchurch					improved but the chimneys that are proposed are too small and need to be increased in size and number and made properly (GRP is proposed). Some of the materials that are proposed are not traditional and should be replaced (cast stone and slate appearance roof material for example). Landscaping is proposed that would seek to hide the development, this should be changed. Care is needed with any lighting design.	
Wycombe Sports Centre, Handy Cross, High Wycombe	WDC	Coachway, park and ride, business development, car parking, hotel	09/07309/R 4OUT	Pending	Object – Whilst not objecting to the principle of the development a number of concerns have been submitted. The development proposes the inclusion of a number of wind turbines that would almost certainly sit idle for most of the time based on their location within the development where the wind resource will be affected by both the topography and adjacent buildings. It would be better to investigate other forms of energy generation, particularly wood fuel (which should be conditioned should approval be given). Any lighting used should take full account of the site's proximity to the nationally protected Chilterns AONB. The Board objects to the bulk, mass and draft designs for the hotel and headquarters buildings as these would be up to 8 storeys high and, despite the visual appraisals in the supporting information, the Board considers that they would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the Chilterns AONB. The Board has suggested that greater work is required on photomontages that show these prominent buildings in their setting and has yet to see this information. This objection would be removed if the scale, mass and bulk of these two buildings were significantly reduced. The Board is also concerned about the level of parking that is to	06.01.10

					<p>be provided for the proposed office buildings. At the level proposed the Board considers that this will be unlikely to lead to modal shift. Increased bus provision and re-routing would also be required.</p> <p>Changes proposed – reduced height for prow building and hotel that would significantly lessen the potential impact on the setting of the AONB and on views from the AONB. If developed as proposed the changes, combined with the imposition of a proposed condition 12 and the inclusion of appropriate tree planting (not screening to hide the development), enable the Board to withdraw its previously stated objection.</p>	24.02.10
Turville Court, Dolesden Lane, Turville Heath	WDC	2.83m gates	field	09/07345/F UL	<p>Refused – 04.02.10</p> <p>Object - the Board considers that the 'gate' that has been installed constitutes something akin to a large steel wall which neither conserves nor enhances the natural beauty of the nationally protected Chilterns AONB. The 'gate' has had a significant detrimental impact on the naturally beauty and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Chilterns AONB. The development is contrary to: nation planning policy as outlined in PPS7; local planning policy as detailed in the Council's adopted Core Strategy and Local Plan, and policies of the statutory Chilterns AONB Management Plan. The Board's objection would be resolved if the current development was removed and in its place a more appropriate gate was installed that was more in keeping with the site and its locality. A better form of gate would be a standard wooden field gate and fence (examples of which are detailed in the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide) which would allow views through to the countryside beyond the entrance that is</p>	11.01.10

					currently being blocked.	