



Planning Committee

10.00 a.m. Wednesday 2nd December 2015
The Chilterns Conservation Board office,
90 Station Road, Chinnor, OX39 4HA

Agenda

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 1. Apologies | 10.00 – 10.01 |
| 2. Declarations of Interest | 10.01 – 10.02 |
| 3. Minutes of Previous Meeting | 10.02 – 10.10 |
| 4. Matters Arising | 10.10 – 10.15 |
| 5. Public Question Time | 10.15 – 10.20 |
| 6. Update on rail electrification | 10.20 – 10.35 |
| 7. Workshop on CCB's planning role and planning committee working arrangements | 10.35 – 11.10 |
| 8. Introduction of pre-application chargeable advice service | 11.10 – 11.30 |
| 9. Development Plans responses – update | 11.30 – 11.45 |
| 10. Planning Applications – update | 11.45 – 12.00 |
| 11. Any urgent business | 12.00 – 12.25 |
| 12. Date of Next and Future Meetings | 12.25 – 12.30 |

Item 3 Minutes of Previous Meeting

Author: Lucy Murfett Planning Officer

Lead Organisations: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Budget of £520 per year for minute-taker plus staff time

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

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

Background

1. The draft minutes from the meeting on 9th September 2015 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 9th September 2015.**

Appendix 1

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON
Wednesday 9th September 2015 at THE CHILTERN CONSERVATION BOARD
OFFICE, STATION ROAD, CHINNOR, COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM AND
CONCLUDING AT 12.22 PM**

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Member	Appointing Body
Appointed by Local Authorities	
Cllr Lynn Lloyd	South Oxfordshire District Council
Cllr Nick Rose	Chiltern District Council

Appointed by the Secretary of State	
Gill Gowing	Secretary of State, Chair
Helen Tuffs	Secretary of State
Elizabeth Wilson	Secretary of State

Elected by Parish Councils	
Cllr Tony Penn	Buckinghamshire

Others present-	
Lucy Murfett	CCB Planning Officer
Mike Stubbs	Planning Advisor for the CCB
Others	
Deirdre Hansen	Minute taker

210. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Cllrs David Barnard (North Herts District Council) and David Collins (Dacorum District Council)

211. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

212. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held 30th July 2015 were approved as a true record and signed by the Chairman after the following amendments were made:

- 206.2: 2nd sentence, a major development site was changed to a major “*developed*” site.
- 206.3: at the start of the sentence “*The developer argued that*” was added.
- 207: Cllr Lynn Lloyd was changed to “*the Planning Officer*”
- 208. “*and Heathrow airport* “ was added to the sentence.

213. Matters Arising from the minutes

- Re 200- 190.i. Events: The Planning Officer reported that 22nd October had been set for the Planning Forum at the Board’s offices in Chinnor. Depending on the take up the location may need to be changed.
- Re 206- the decision on the Molins Planning Application has been deferred again. The Board has been invited to a public meeting of the WDC Task and Finish Group on 7th October at the Clare Foundation about the site.
- Re 207- Crowmarsh Gifford. The Chair reported that the Planning Officer had drafted an excellent letter of comment, which has been sent.

214. Public Question time

No members of the public were present.

215. High Speed 2 update

The Planning Officer provided a detailed report updating the Committee about the latest developments regarding HS2 and the Select Committee (SC) hearings.

1. The Chairman of the SC made a statement on 21st July informing that in the SC’s view the case for a long tunnel was not made out and the northern extension of the South Heath green tunnel, this had been noted at the previous Planning Committee meeting.
2. The CCB and the other statutory bodies had written to the Chairman of the SC asking for a more detailed statement setting out the basis for the conclusions reached in the statement. A negative response had been received.
3. The SC statement has implications for the Board in terms of what HS2 will publish and any supplementary ES consultation.
4. The Board is provisionally scheduled to appear on 29th October on non-tunnel mitigation. Further Additional Provisions and an Environmental Statement are now expected in relation the changes announced (if agreed). This could result in the Board and Local Authorities submitting a further petition. The above letter also made a request for deferral of any further SC appearances until after submission of further petitions. The response from the Chair, Robert Symes, does not appear to agree to this.
5. A meeting was held 5th August with local groups, who have presented to the SC in favour of the Chiltern Long Tunnel and a number of local actions were agreed. Nick Rose further reported on the meeting, the thoughts discussed and other subsequent information that is emerging. The SC process was briefly discussed.

6. Nick Rose would undertake to get more information on;
 - Inclusion of the Board in the design group; it had been agreed that there would be local consultation on the design of buildings relating to HS2;
 - Mitigation that goes beyond the Bill;
 - Including the Board in the ministerial roundtable discussions and
 - That the Community Mitigation fund of £30m is not enough for all the mitigation that HS2 is promising.

The Chair thanked Nick Rose for his report.

7. The Board had met with HS2 on 11th August to discuss non-tunnel mitigation and other matters.

The Committee discussed the above points and some of the wider HS2 issues.

1. The Committee NOTED the update.

216. Great Western Mainline Rail Electrification

The Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee on a substantial project being undertaken by Network Rail to electrify the Great Western Mainline, part of which runs through the Chilterns AONB.

1. The installation work of the electrification was started in the spring and is progressing. Much of the work is being carried out under permitted development rights; some of the work to bridges requires a prior notification process/permission. This means that the use of planning conditions to safeguard and mitigate have not been applied in the normal way.
2. The Reading to Didcot stretch of the railway line is being used as a test track, running through the AONB.
3. The issue is whether the design conserves and enhances the natural beauty of the AONBs, to what extent Network Rail has considered the AONB as part of the specification and design process, and whether Network Rail has breached its duty under S85 of the CROW Act. In particular:
 - Its failure to test alternative designs
 - Its failure to consult with the CCB over detailed designs
 - Its failure to mitigate harm to AONB landscape on or off site.
4. Network Rail Environmental Statement has already concluded that “significant effects would be generated by the permanent presence of additional infrastructure”.
5. The installation of electrification will not only affect the Chilterns AONB, but also the North Downs and the Cotswolds AONBs.
6. The Board has written to Network Rail expressing its concerns, asking for the equipment to be removed and replaced, and the Planning Officer is setting up a meeting with Network Rail.

The Committee discussed the issues, looked at alternative designs and mitigation and provided a steer to the Planning Officer.

The Chair commended the Planning Officer for picking up on this issue.

The Planning Officer was advised to contact the National Trust, Natural England, Oxfordshire County Council and South Oxfordshire District Council. Off-site mitigation needs looking into.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the report and provided steer on next steps including approach to mitigation.**

217. Undergrounding of Overhead Electricity Wires-Turville example

The Planning Advisor informed the Committee about attempts to resolve a current issue at Turville about the planned location of a switching station and to learn lessons for future undergrounding projects. The Committee was provided with a powerpoint presentation of the visual impact and location of the switching station.

1. The previous Planning Officer had been fully engaged and supportive of the work to underground overhead electricity transmission lines in protective landscapes. This could bring significant landscape improvements for AONBs and represents a valuable opportunity.
2. There are some trade-off to consider when undergrounding wires, such as the need for installing an above ground switching station, to excavate a trench for the underground wires and disturbances to communities and habitats.
3. The previous Planning Officer had supported a location for the switching station, which had raised concerns with the Parish Council and some local residents.
4. An alternative location had been offered, which the Committee was asked to consider. The alternative location is at the rear of Turfelde Lane and faces open countryside next to a permissive right of way footpath, just outside the conservation area.
5. Scottish and Southern Energy, who are running the project, have confirmed that they propose a close boarded dark stained fencing enclosure for the switching station and will agree to suitable hedgerow planting.
6. Whilst the new location is more prominent, it would be very modest in size and with planting would be readily shielded from any wider visual impacts.
7. Were the Committee in agreement with the new location for the switching station SSE will progress further discussion with the parish council and community. The wider benefits of taking overhead lines out of the landscape provide a strong rationale for the Board to support this scheme. Removing the visual clutter of these lines enhances the relationship between Turville and the AONB.
8. Useful lessons for future project about assessing positive and negative impacts of undergrounding and making sure the community is fully consulted and engaged have emerged.

The Committee discussed the revised proposal, the wider benefits to the AONB and community engagement issues that had come forward.

- 1. The Committee AGREED that they were content with the new location for the switching station, subject to appropriate planting and dark staining of the close boarded fencing.**

218. AONB Management Plan-LPA endorsement

The Planning Officer updated the Committee about which Local Planning Authorities had endorsed the Chilterns AONB Management Plan as a material consideration in the exercise of their planning powers.

1. In December 2014 all thirteen planning authorities were asked to endorse the Chilterns AONB Management plan 2014-19.
2. To date Chilterns District Council and Dacorum Borough Council have endorsed the Management Plan. South Oxfordshire District Council are in the process of doing so.
3. Wycombe District Council determined on 27th July to acknowledge the Management Plan. The CCB have asked WDC to reconsider.
4. Arrangements have been set up for a CCB Planning Forum on 22nd October for officer representatives from all local planning authorities.
5. A training session for WDC Planning Officers has been arranged for 23rd September.

The Committee discussed the best way to progress the endorsement of the Chilterns AONB Management Plan. Raising the matter at the Planning Forum and at individual training sessions was considered. Local Authorities duty to co-operate was considered.

- 1. The Committee discussed the best way to progress the issue of endorsement of the Chiltern AONB Management Plan and provided a steer for the Planning Officer.**

219. Development Plan Responses

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that no deadlines had fallen since the last Planning Committee meeting on 30th July and no responses had been sent in connection with the public consultation exercises on development plan documents.

- 1. The Committee NOTED that no responses had been sent.**

220. Planning Applications Update

The Planning Advisor informed the Committee about and sought approval for, the responses that have been made under delegated powers in connection with planning applications as detailed in the appendix to the agenda

1. Since the last Planning Committee meeting 30th July 2015 the Board has made 10 formal representations on planning applications of which 4 were objections and 6 were a comment.
2. A suggestion was tabled for a change to the format of presentation of the planning applications listed with the agenda. The current layout is not easily compatible with tablet layout. Following brief discussion the Planning Advisor could implement the suggested changes.

The reposes were discussed and where available updates were provided.

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

221. Any Urgent Business

- The Planning Officer asked the Committee if the use of asbestos waste for infill was a planning matter for the CCB. The Chair commented that any impact on the aquifer would be a CCB issue, but otherwise it was a safeguarding issue.
- Reminder that the 50th Anniversary will be celebrated on 25th November.

222. Date of the next meeting Wednesday 2nd December 2015, 10.00am at the Lodge, 90 Station Road, Chinnor OX39 4HA.

The Chairman.....

Date.....

Item 6 Update on Rail Electrification

Author: Lucy Murfett Planning Officer

Lead Organisations: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time

Summary: Following the Board meeting on 8th October actions have been undertaken to make representations to Network Rail, the Minister and the Rail Regulator to take action to reduce the visual impact of the overhead line equipment being installed through the Goring Gap as part of the electrification of the Great Western Mainline. Network Rail has agreed to launch a public consultation on alternative structures.

Purpose of report: To update the committee

Background

1. The Board considered a report on this at the 8th October 2015 meeting and gave strong support to pressing Network Rail to remove and replace the overhead line equipment being installed in the AONB in the Goring and South Stoke area.
2. After the Board meeting, all the actions were carried out and the following took place:
 - Letter sent to Network Rail in conjunction with the local campaign group (the Railway Action Group) raising the legal action avenue - 13th October
 - Reply received from Network Rail containing a Statement of Intent to consult on alternatives - 19th October
 - CCB in the Press and social media on BBC Radio Berkshire, BBC Radio Oxford, BBC South Today, BBC News online, The Henley Standard- week commencing 19th October
 - Further letter sent from Chilterns Conservation Board and the North Wessex Downs AONB asking for Statement of Intent to be strengthened - 21st October
 - Network Rail held public drop-in event at South Stoke Village Hall, promising a consultation in the new year, 700 people attend - 23rd October
 - CCB's Chalk and Trees magazine published with article on the gantries - 23rd October
 - Letters sent from Chilterns Conservation Board and the North Wessex Downs AONB to Transport Minister Patrick McLoughlin asking for action and a meeting – 23rd October
 - Letter sent from Chilterns Conservation Board and the North Wessex Downs AONB to Rail Regulator – 23rd October

- Follow up email to Network Rail asking for a meeting and a reply to letter of 21st October- 19th November
 - Reply received from Department of Transport but no meeting offered – 20th November
3. The next steps are:
- To meet with Network Rail (jointly with North Wessex Downs AONB) in December to discuss the scope of Network Rail's consultation in the new year (alternative designs and area where retrofitting is needed)
 - To consider a reply to Minister
 - To continue to support the local group proactively
 - To continue to consider legal action in conjunction with the campaign group if progress stalls
 - For Countryside Officer Neil Jackson to participate at a Network Rail workshop in January to identify mitigation projects which Network Rail could undertake or fund to address residual harms in addition to replacing the overhead line equipment.

Recommendation

1. **That the Planning Committee notes the update.**

Item 7 Workshop on CCB's planning role, planning committee working arrangements

Author: Lucy Murfett Planning Officer

Lead Organisations: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time

Summary: This is to continue developing the discussion how best to fulfil CCB's planning function, what to prioritise, how the Planning Committee want to be involved, and the timing and style of the Planning Committee meetings.

Purpose of report: To seek a steer from the Committee about ongoing work to review the working arrangements and priorities of the planning role and planning committee.

Background

1. Item 11 on the agenda at the 30th July 2015 Planning Committee was as follows but there was not enough time to complete the discussion, so the item is being revisited at the current meeting:
2. The papers for that meeting were as follows:
 1. The Chilterns Conservation Board Annual General Meeting on 25th June 2015 saw a number of new members welcomed to the Board and changes in the membership of the Planning Committee.
 2. Colin White, who was the Board's Planning Officer since its inception, left at Easter after many years of outstanding service. The new Planning Officer Lucy Murfett joined CCB from the planning policy team at South Oxfordshire District Council and is working part-time 3 days a week. The remaining 2 days a week are still to be filled, with the decision being deferred until the new Chief Officer is in post in the autumn. In the interim a slightly reduced planning function is operating, with assistance being provided one day a week from Mike Stubbs as a Planning Advisor.
3. With the Chilterns covering 13 planning authorities and with over 3000 planning applications a year in AONB, together with around 60 development plan consultations a year (and rising with neighbourhood plans), and threats such as HS2, electrification of the Great Western Mainline, opportunities such as project work to bid for undergrounding of overhead power lines, and the calendar of

planning events promoting the Board's planning messages, where to best focus the Board's limited planning resources is an issue that merits some discussion.

For discussion

4. CCB planning committee members are requested to reflect on what works/ doesn't work and any changes that might improve the operation of the planning function and Planning Committee. Matters for discussion might include:
 - i. What should be the threshold (if any) or guiding principles for deciding which planning applications CCB comments on?
 - ii. Do standard responses need agreeing/ reviewing for various types of enquiries or applications.
 - iii. How much do Planning Committee members want to be involved in day to day casework, and by what means (emails/ phone conferences/ site visits), or is reporting comments to Planning Committee retrospectively still the best way?
 - iv. What input should the Planning Officer have in neighbourhood plans, and providing advice to Parish Councils, campaign group and individuals who are either applying for planning permission or opposing it?

The outcome of the item in the July 2015 meeting minutes was as follows:

The Committee briefly discussed the planning function, but considered it would be better to wait for the outcome of the Management Review before entering in detailed discussion.

1. **The Committee AGREED to await the outcome of the Management Review before discussing the Planning function and the Planning Committee's working arrangements.**

Recommendation

1. **That the Committee provides a steer on the way forward through the workshop.**

Item 8 Introduction of pre-application chargeable advice service

Author: Lucy Murfett Planning Officer

Lead Organisations: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time

Summary: Charging developers and their agents for pre-application planning advice could provide a small new income stream to support the cost of the planning function and has advantages of providing guidance early enough to shape and improve planning proposals in or affecting the AONB.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about the proposal for a new service and seek approval of the scale of charges.

Background

1. A small but significant amount of Planning staff time is spent advising developers and their agents about the acceptability of schemes proposed in the AONB and its setting before they apply for planning permission. The Board has previously been able to offer this planning advice free of charge. With pressures on future funding and the reduced amount of staff time now available (moving from a full-time to a part-time planning officer) it seems the right time to introduce pre-application charges for developers and their agents.
2. There are advantages for developers in that they receive CCB feedback on schemes while they are still being designed, potentially addressing issues and avoiding later objections from CCB (if all matters of concern are resolved). Advice might cover a range of matters, such as the principle of whether the scheme could ever be acceptable in the location proposed, to impacts, layout, lighting, harm, mitigation and how to improve the design of a scheme to meet the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and technical notes. CCB will provide a written letter a developer can choose to submit as part of their planning application documentation. For CCB the chance to input early can reduce the need to object, and follows the 'prevention is better than cure' principle. It also provides a useful opportunity to propose mitigation and a net gain for landscape or biodiversity to address any residual impacts (once the mitigation hierarchy of avoid, reduce, mitigate/ compensate has been followed). CCB will still comment (support or object) to proposals at the planning application stage if there remain issues that require it.
3. Local authorities and statutory consultees such as Natural England already routinely charge for pre-application planning advice, as do some other AONBs.

4. The proposed scale of charges, based on Natural England's tariff, is in Appendix 2.
5. Issues to discuss include whether the paid-for advice would be confidential to the applicant, shared with the local authority, subject to FOI and whether it would be reported verbatim in the Planning Committee papers.
6. Free advice to Local Planning Authorities, Parish Councils, Neighbourhood Plan groups and, to a limited extent, to individuals commenting on planning proposals will continue.

Recommendation

1. **That the Committee approves the scale of charges in appendix 2 for a pre-application advice service.**

Appendix 2**Chilterns Conservation Board Proposed Scale of Charges for Pre-Application Advice**

Chilterns Conservation Board charge of £110 per hour for its service.

Costs depend on the complexity of the case and are based on the estimated or actual time taken to complete the work, depending on which contract option you've chosen.

Chilterns Conservation Board will provide you with a quotation to include:

- fixed minimum prices - for meetings and site visits
- estimated prices - based upon number of hours to complete the work
- hourly charge (to include work and travel) - for more complex requests and undefined scope contracts

Meeting and travel costs

- £500 per adviser for a 90 minute meeting at:
 - The Chilterns Conservation Board office or via conference call
 - your office or development site
- £110 per hour per adviser for each additional hour

Meeting costs include:

- 1 hour preparation time
- consultation with colleagues
- written summary of advice

If an adviser needs to travel to your office or development site you'll pay:

- adviser's travel costs at 45p per mile
- public transport, tolls and expenses over and above the mileage at cost
- adviser's travel time as part of the hourly rate

Item 9 Development Plans Responses**Author:** Lucy Murfett Planning Officer**Lead Organisations:** Chilterns Conservation Board**Resources:** Staff time**Summary:** Representations have been submitted on 6 development plan documents and on Network Rail's East West proposals.**Purpose of report:** To update the Committee about development plan documents.**Background**

Responses sent:

Consultation document	Consulted by	Response	CCB response date
Joint Henley and Harpsden NDP submission version	SODC	<p>1. The Board is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the Joint Henley and Harpsden Neighbourhood Development Plan Final Submission Version.</p> <p>2. Page 25 – The Board generally welcomes and supports the primary objectives relating to the 'Environment, Sustainability and Design Quality Vision' (particularly EO1, EO3, EO5 and EO7), however, the Board considers, that first sentence of objective EO1 should be drafted to read 'To prioritise the conservation and enhancement of the following features' (rather than 'protection and enhancement'). This is so that when making reference to the Chilterns AONB, the text complies with the National Park and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 which use the words 'conserve and enhance'.</p> <p>3. Page 35 – The Board considers that Policy H2 (design brief) should require that a full public consultation exercise should be undertaken in connection with any design briefs and that the policy should be amended to refer to the need to comply with the advice in the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development/buildings-design-guidance.html and the Supplementary Technical Notes on local building materials (Chilterns Brick, Chilterns Flint and Roofing Materials) for sites in the AONB or its setting.</p> <p>4. Page 60 – The Board welcomes the inclusion of the reference to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and the Supplementary Technical Notes on local building materials within the text of Policy DQS1 (local character).</p> <p>5. Page 60 – Although the Board supports Policy DSQ4 (local sourcing of construction materials and labour), it considers that the principles should apply to all developments rather than just those for 10 dwellings or more or for premises greater than 500 square metres.</p>	18.09.15

	<p>6. Page 62 - Policy SP1 Highlands Farm and Policy SP12 Reserve Site Highlands Farm. The Highland Farm site sits entirely within the Chilterns AONB. The principle of redevelopment of this brownfield site is not objected to; the Board accepts that certain parts of the site would lend themselves to redevelopment and indeed this could enhance its present rundown appearance. However, the way in which this is done will require the utmost care and careful policy wording to control.</p> <p>7. Not all of the site at Highlands Farm should be developed. This is supported by the NPPF which states that 'it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage' of previously developed sites should be developed. The development area shown on the Indicative Land Use Plan (page 80) is too extensive. Included below is an aerial view of the site to show the extent of the developed and undeveloped areas: Google earth image of Highlands Farm</p> <p>For comparison, this is the development area shown on the JHHNP Indicative Land Use Plan (page 80):</p> <p>8. Development should be pulled back from the western boundary to maintain the tree screening. The southern boundary should be kept open. The Design Brief process will inform an appropriate layout. At the moment there is an inconsistency with the Key Diagram (pages 30-31) which shows a black shaded area as an 'L' shape for Highlands Farm, rather than the 'U' shape shown on the Indicative Land Use Diagram:</p> <p>Extract from JHHNP Key Diagram</p> <p>9. Less than 2ha of the previously developed part of the site is currently occupied by buildings. About 4.5ha of the site is occupied by car parking, hardstanding and other elements that have no substantial built form on them. Full account must be taken of the constraints on the site including 0.6ha (approximately) of SSSI (which includes a Scheduled Monument), 0.4ha (approximately) of woodland to the west of the site. If the core part of the site occupied by buildings were to be redeveloped at an appropriate density (no more than 25 dwellings per hectare) then it may be that no more than 100 dwellings could be accommodated, when taking account of the areas required for the proposed B1 and community hub uses. A suburban level of development would be out of keeping with the AONB and would not comply with the policy criteria.</p> <p>10. Criterion (f) of the policy which requires that (among other things) 'the development has, as a minimum, no greater impact of (sic) the AONB than the existing development on the site' appears to be the only part of the policy that takes any account of the fact that the site is within the AONB and is therefore subject to the requirement to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the AONB.</p> <p>11. Rather than jumbling together the AONB with landscaping and green infrastructure points in Policy SP1 criterion (f), the Board recommends that these should be separated and expanded as follows:</p> <p>f) "Ensured that the development has, at a minimum, no greater impact on the AONB than the existing development of the site by being no greater in volume/footprint than that which is on the site already;</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>only primarily taking place on the previously developed part of the site occupied by buildings (drives, roads, parking areas and paths should be excluded as there is no substantial built form on them), and taking full account of the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and the Supplementary Technical Notes on local building materials (flint, brick and roofing materials);</p> <p>g) Assessed the impact of the proposed development on the landscape through undertaking a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment;</p> <p>h) Incorporated and reinforced or reprovided the existing landscaping; pitches; green infrastructure; and biodiversity features, particularly along the site's southern and western boundary edges;</p> <p>i) (New) Secured the ongoing maintenance of the open spaces;</p> <p>j) Delivered new and improved cycle...."</p> <p>12. The supporting text at para 8.5 has been altered since the previous consultation version. The missing text should be reinstated to read: "Para 8.5 Given the size of the allocation, the location of the site within the Chilterns AONB and the presence of the SSSI and SAM within the site, the policy criteria set out a number of principles that must be followed when designing the development. Whilst the gross..."</p> <p>13. The details of any Design Brief will be vital and the Board expects to be able to play a full role in its formulation. Use of the Chilterns Building Design Guide principles will inform appropriate housing numbers, building heights, design, layout, material and planting. In January 2015 the Chilterns Conservation Board's Planning Committee visited Highlands Farm and provided feedback to the developer to help shape the proposals, which is attached for information at Appendix 3. The Board expects an ongoing process to take place to ensure that the conservation and enhancement of Highlands Farm can be delivered successfully; a development which as a major development in an AONB would not normally be acceptable under paras 115 and 116 of the NPPF unless stringent tests of exceptional circumstances and public interest are met.</p> <p>14. Page 80 - Indicative Land Use Diagram. The Board seeks clarification about the status of this diagram, which comes in advance of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment required by Policy SP1 criterion (g). Furthermore it would be beneficial to add walking and cycling routes to the Highlands Farm indicative diagram (as shown for Fair Mile), given the importance of proving green links to Gillotts and Henley to improve the sustainability of this site.</p> <p>Presentational points</p> <p>15. Reference to the protected landscape should use the acronym 'AONB' and not 'ANOB' as shown in paras 4.31 and 8.23.</p> <p>16. Remove apostrophe in Chilterns AONB (it should not read Chiltern's AONB) at paras 7.54 and 8.2.</p> <p>17. Pages 30-31 – The Board considers that the Key Diagram should show the whole extent of the Chilterns AONB in the Neighbourhood Area – at present there are various areas annotated over the AONB wash (allocations, Registered Parks and Gardens, SSSI and woodland for example) and it is therefore difficult to tell exactly where the AONB boundary is and what the extent of the AONB is. It would be better to have the AONB annotated with hatching which should be placed over all other annotations. In addition, it would also be useful if</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>the Key Diagram was on a separate sheet at a bigger scale as it is difficult to read when printed on two sheets of A4 paper.</p> <p>18. Page 62 – policy text SP1 typo in criterion f) which should read ‘...no greater impact on the AONB...’ rather than ‘...no greater impact of the AONB...’</p> <p>19. Page 62 – policy text SP1 the words ‘Site M1’ have been cut off at the end of this policy, it should read: “m). Does not prejudice the delivery of adjacent Site M1.”</p> <p>20. The Board wishes Henley and Harpsden well in the examination of their plan.</p>	
<p>Dacorum Focused changes to the pre-submission Site Allocations</p>	<p>Dacorum BC</p>	<p>SC7: The Chilterns Conservation Board objects to the proposed allocation of LA5 for the reasons previously stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No recognition has been given to the likely impacts on the nationally protected Chilterns AONB that would arise from the proposals. • The Chilterns AONB and its boundary have not been clearly annotated on all plans to ensure that all readers of the associated documents are aware of what is being proposed and where. • The increase in the number of dwellings appears to have led to some elements of the proposed development being pushed out of the main developable area, without any justification for this action being given and without any consideration of the likely implications for the Chilterns AONB. • The Board considers that none of the proposed developments that have been identified within the Chilterns AONB (cemetery, play area and traveller site) would conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB and these elements are therefore contrary to national planning policy, the Chilterns AONB Management Plan and the Council’s own development plan. • The proposed open space is unlikely to be used to any great extent unless it is much more formal in nature (playing pitches for example) and the Board considers that such a change in use would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. • The employment allocation that has been made appears to be too small to be worthwhile. • The allocation of a traveller site remote from the main developable area is inconsistent when compared to the other allocations that also include such provision (in each case the traveller site is clearly identified within the development area). • The proposed cemetery extension is not an extension to the main site because it is remote from the main site. As it is removed from the main cemetery the Board considers that its use would ultimately lead to demands for car parking and ancillary buildings which would not be appropriate within the Chilterns AONB. <p>The changes now proposed in SC7 fail to address the points we raised. The change in the Green Belt boundary to remove the traveller site from the Green Belt appears to circumvent the clear and recently restated message in Government policy that traveller pitches are inappropriate development in the Green Belt (see updated Planning Policy for Travellers August 2015 paragraphs 4d, 16 and 17). The recent changes to the Government Planning Policy for Travellers to the definition of travellers in Annex 1 to exclude those who have permanently ceased to travel should trigger a review and update of</p>	<p>23.09.15</p>

		<p>the Traveller Needs Assessment by ORS to assess whether the need for pitches remains the same under the new definition of travellers. If the need for additional pitches is lowered, this LA5 proposal in the AONB and Green Belt should be the first to be deleted.</p> <p>The Board considers that the following changes should be made to the Site Allocations document in order to make it sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend the text of the allocation to refer to the Chilterns AONB and what the likely implications are (the majority of the site is within the setting of the AONB and part of the site is within the AONB). • Include the AONB and its boundary on all plans and maps associated with the proposed allocation. • Reduce the number of dwellings on the site to a level that will ensure that no developments are proposed within the Chilterns AONB and will allow: an extension to the cemetery in line with the Concept Masterplan Option 1 (immediately to the north and west of the existing cemetery); the NEAP to be placed within the development area where it would be more likely to be used; the traveller site (if still required following an update of Traveller Needs Assessment) to be identified as part of the development area which would be consistent with the other proposed allocation sites, and an extension to the proposed employment allocation that would be more worthwhile. • Ensure that the text of the document is explicit that the western fields should only ever be used for informal open space or left in agricultural use. <p>MC63 The Chilterns Conservation Board objects to the statement that:</p> <p>“The use and management of most of the western fields for open space will enhance the appearance and enjoyment of the Chilterns AONB.”</p> <p>The use of most of the western fields for open space is unlikely to enhance the appearance of the Chilterns AONB given that the land is currently open farmland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the text of the document is explicit that the western fields should only ever be used for informal open space or left in agricultural use. 	
<p>Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document</p>	<p>OCC</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Board is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Part 1 Core Strategy proposed submission document. 2. The south eastern parts of South Oxfordshire lie within the Chilterns AONB. As a protected landscape of equal planning status to National Parks, great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (NPPF para 115). 3. The Board welcomes and supports the introductory paragraphs to the landscape section (paras 6.41 and 6.43), and the recognition of the Council's statutory duties to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of 	<p>30.9.15</p>

		<p>outstanding natural beauty. Adding a footnote reference to section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 would be helpful here.</p> <p>4. The Board considers that in Policy C8 this sentence “Major developments within AONBs will not be permitted except where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest” needs correcting to ensure it is compliant with the NPPF. As it stands the policy is unsound. The NPPF test is not a test of whether a proposal is in the public interest. The sentence should be expanded to reflect not just public interest but all three of the tests for major development in AONBs set out in the NPPF para 116:</p> <p>Para 116 NPPF “Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy; - the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and - any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.” <p>8. Policy C8 should therefore be reworded to cover national interest, the cost/scope for developing elsewhere and any detrimental effects on the environment, landscape and recreational opportunities. This would ensure that great weight should be afforded to AONBs, and that for AONBs major development should be refused as a starting point, before consideration is given to the exceptional reasons why a different conclusion may be reached.</p> <p>9. Similarly, Policy M7 in relation to oil and gas as drafted is too permissive and is not currently in line with national policy: “The commercial production of oil and gas will be supported in the following circumstances...For major development in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty it is clearly demonstrated that the proposal is in the public interest, including in terms of national considerations.” This should be expanded to reflect not just public interest but all three of the three tests for major development in AONBs set out in the NPPF para 116. Policy M7 should be reworded to cover national interest, the cost/scope for developing elsewhere and any detrimental effects on the environment, landscape and recreational opportunities.</p> <p>10. The Board objects to the changes in this version of the plan which strengthens the protection of Green Belt land and weakens the wording concerning AONBs. For instance the removal of the text formerly in para 5.53 “The Cotswolds, North Wessex Downs and Chilterns Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty lie close to towns where growth is expected and additional waste will be produced. Any new waste facilities that are required should if possible be located in or close to these towns, outside of the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Proposals for waste development within or in proximity to Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty will be considered against policy C8.” In this proposed submission version this now reads “5.45 Where proposed waste management sites lie within or would affect an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the proposal will be considered against policy C8. (See also paragraph 6.43 on siting of waste</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>management facilities and AONBs.)” This original text should be reinstated to address OCC’s statutory duties regarding the AONB. 11. The Board wishes you well in the finalisation of your plan for submission and examination by an independent Examiner.</p>	
<p>Hertfordshire Minerals Local Plan Initial Consultation</p>	<p>HCC</p>	<p>1. The Board is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the Hertfordshire Minerals Local Plan initial consultation document. 2. The Chiltern Hills cross the north western part of Hertfordshire and also covers a small area of the west of the county. This land is designated as the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). As a protected landscape of equal planning status to National Parks, great weight should be given to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (National Planning Policy Framework para 115). 3. The Minerals Local Plan consultation documents contains only two brief references to the AONB, very late on in the plan on pages 60 and in the appendix on page 69. This is not enough emphasis on a national designation. More weight should be given to the Chilterns AONB. This would reflect your statutory duty under section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000: “Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 Section 85. General duty of public bodies etc. In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty.” It would also help the Herts Minerals Local Plan comply with the National Planning Policy Framework: Para 110 NPPF: “In preparing plans to meet development needs, the aim should be to minimise pollution and other adverse effects on the local and natural environment. Plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value, where consistent with other policies in this Framework.” Para 115 NPPF: “Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.” Para 116 NPPF: “Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of: • the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy; • the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and • any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.” 4. Suggested amendments are shown in the table below.</p>	<p>4.11.15</p>

		<p>Section Suggested amendment (new text in bold) Draft Vision pages 11 and 13 Add reference to Chilterns AONB in the vision eg “Mineral extraction will respect the rural character of Hertfordshire with its Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, large expanse of Green Belt...”</p> <p>The vision should introduce a sequential approach by avoiding or reducing harm, before you consider mitigating it, by adding wording as follows: “The sustainable and beneficial use of materials will seek to avoid, reduce and mitigate against impacts”</p> <p>Draft Objectives page 18 Add reference to the national designated Chilterns AONB in objective 5.</p> <p>Draft Objectives page 16 Add new paragraph of lower case text below 5.5 as follows: “When formulating plan policy or considering proposals for minerals development in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) the County Council has a statutory duty under section 85 of the Countryside and Rights and Way Act 2000 to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of that area”.</p> <p>Sieve 2 constraints page 30 AONB is a major constraint so be included in the list of sieve 2 constraints.</p> <p>Sieve 2 constraints page 30 Add explanatory paragraph of lower case text below 8.14: “Hertfordshire County Council has a statutory duty to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Government policy in the NPPF requires that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs, which have the highest status of protection in planning, equal to National Parks (para 115). Major development should not take place in AONBs unless there are exceptional circumstances (para 116). Land of the least environmental or amenity value should be allocated when plan making (para 110), so AONB land has been removed at sieve 2 from consideration. The setting of and views associated with the Chilterns AONB should also be taken into account in assessing land for allocation. Development within AONBs shall normally only be small-scale, to meet local needs and should be sensitively located and designed, for instance clay at traditional brickworks to provide handmade bricks for building in the vernacular style and for the repair of historic buildings.”</p> <p>Sieve 3 constraints page 31 and appendix 1 page 69 AONB should be promoted to sieve 2 and removed from sieve 3. Since the traffic light system in appendix 1 identifies sites entirely within the AONB as red (i.e. not for taking forward) time and money will be saved by eliminating it at the sieve 2 stage.</p> <p>Appendix 1 table landscape designations page 69 This does not give enough weight to AONBs or properly reflect the policy tests in NPPF para 116. AONB land should be promoted to sieve 2 (see above). Remove text suggesting that designated landscapes can be enhanced through mineral working, and that this can be left to the planning application stage.</p> <p>Policies used to determine applications para 14.15, page 60 The text ‘highlight the importance of valued landscapes’ does not give enough weight to AONBs or reflect the clear government policy in the NPPF about the status of AONBs (para 115) and that major developments in AONB should be refused unless there are exceptional circumstances (para 116).</p>	
--	--	--	--

		5. The Board wishes you well in the preparation of your plan and if we can be of further assistance please let us know.	
Bledlow cum Saunderton NP Area designation	WDC	<p>1. The Board is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Bledlow-cum-Saunderton neighbourhood area. It covers the whole parish which is the preferred unit for a neighbourhood area in a parished area under 61G(4) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. We note that over half of the proposed neighbourhood area (south of the Midshires Way and south of the Icknield Way) falls within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and the area that is not designated AONB forms part of the setting of the Chilterns AONB. We also note that neighbourhood development plans are being prepared for the adjacent rural parishes of Chinnor to the west (in South Oxfordshire) and Longwick to the east.</p> <p>2. The area overlaps (and is larger than) the area proposed for a Saunderton Village Plan (Area Action Plan), currently being tested by Wycombe District Council's Task and Finish Group. The Board does not consider that it makes sense to progress both plans simultaneously and would be happy to input to the Task and Finish Group's deliberations on this matter.</p> <p>3. At this initial stage, we would like to offer some standard advice to the neighbourhood plan group about the purposes of AONB designation and the government policies that apply here. As a protected landscape, with equal planning status to National Parks, great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (set out in the Government's National Planning Policy Framework para 115). Paragraphs 116 of the NPPF explains that: "Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy; • the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and • any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated." <p>4. The Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Plan needs to have regard to national policy, including policy on AONBs, and be in general conformity with the strategic policies in Wycombe District Council's development plan, as these form some of the basic conditions against which neighbourhood plans are tested at examination.</p> <p>5. Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council, like Wycombe District Council, is a public body subject to the duty in the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 Section 85 that "In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty".</p> 	1.10.15

		<p>6. The Chilterns Conservation Board will wish to stay involved and assist in the future with plan proposals as they develop, and comment on planning applications as they are submitted on any proposed allocated sites, to ensure that full and proper account is taken of the need to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB. For more information and advice please contact the Chilterns Conservation Board at lmurfett@chilternsaonb.org.</p> <p>7. We wish Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish Council all the best for the preparation of their Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	
Saunderton AAP Comments for the task and finish group	WDC	<p>1. The Board considers that the priority for Wycombe District Council's policy team is to progress the district wide Wycombe Local Plan. The Task and Finish Group's review of the proposal for a Saunderton AAP is an exercise in 'planning to plan' and has wasted valuable months.</p> <p>2. A new Local Plan is needed to set a new housing requirement against which 5 year housing land supply can be assessed, in order to protect the district from harmful speculative housing schemes. A new Local Plan will be a strategic plan setting out the quantity and appropriate distribution of growth. The process of preparing it will allow the testing of housing need evidence in the emerging HEDNA against constraints (such as Green Belt and AONB) and opportunities to cooperate with neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>3. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance makes clear that the Government's preferred approach is for each local planning authority to prepare a single Local Plan for its area (or a joint document with neighbouring areas). While additional Local Plans can be produced, for example a separate site allocations document or Area Action Plan, there should be a clear justification for doing so.</p> <p>4. None of the adopted plans for Wycombe (the Local Plan 2004, the Core Strategy 2008 and the Delivery and Site Allocations Plan 2013) identify Saunderton as a location for strategic scale growth. The Wycombe District Local Plan Options consultation document January 2014 identified Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Parish as being in the most rural part of the district where development is largely constrained, and ruled out the option of growth at Saunderton (option 7) as not realistic and not appropriate, with major growth likely to fundamentally change the character of the village. This conclusion was welcomed by the Board.</p> <p>5. As there is no adopted strategic plan in place setting a housing number for Saunderton, producing an Area Action Plan to plan for a 'Greater Saunderton' would not be appropriate. The NPPF explains in paragraph 110 that in preparing plans to meet development needs, local plans should allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value. It would be wrong to allocate land in the AONB without having tested non-AONB options through a plan-led process.</p> <p>6. The Board questions the concept of using an AAP to create a 'Greater Saunderton' and to coordinate the development of brownfield sites. There can be no sensible justification for allocating greenfield land in the AONB and Green Belt in order to make the residential re-use of brownfield land in the AONB and Green Belt more sustainable. It is illogical and would not pass the required tests in the NPPF so would be unlikely to be successful at Local Plan examination.</p> <p>7. The application for a Bledlow-cum-Saunderton Neighbourhood Development Plan is a new factor since proposals for a Saunderton AAP were published in the Local Development Scheme. It would not</p>	7.10.15

		<p>make sense to prepare an Area Action Plan and a Neighbourhood Plan in parallel, being neither an efficient use of public resources nor conducive to community goodwill. An AAP would not constitute a strategic policy in a development plan with which the Neighbourhood Plan would be required to be in general conformity with (see the basic conditions at Localism Act 2011 section 61E 4B http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/schedule/10/enacted).</p> <p>The neighbourhood plan should be given space to proceed. It could include, if the community wishes to do so, policies for re-using the brownfield sites in a way that the local community wishes to see. This would respect the core principle of planning set out in NPPF paragraph 17 that planning should: “be genuinely plan-led, empowering local people to shape their surroundings, with succinct local and neighbourhood plans setting out a positive vision for the future of the area”.</p> <p>8. Finally, as a reminder, AONBs are nationally protected landscapes, land in AONBs is equal in status to National Parks, and great weight should be given to protecting it. Government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework is that:</p> <p>“115. Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. The conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage are important considerations in all these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads.</p> <p>116. Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy; • the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and • any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.” <p>9. As a public body, there is a legal duty on Wycombe District Council under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 section 85 as follows:</p> <p>“General duty of public bodies etc “(1) In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty.”</p> <p>10. The Board is grateful for the opportunity to make these written comments and wishes the Task and Finish Group well in their deliberations on these matters.</p> 	
East West Rail Phase 2 Stakeholder Consultation	Network Rail	<p>1. The Board is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the East West Rail Phase 2 consultation pack.</p> <p>2. The Chiltern Hills run east-west across the centre of Buckinghamshire and are designated as the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). As a protected landscape of</p>	25.11.15

	<p>equal planning status to National Parks, great weight should be given to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (as set out in the Government's National Planning Policy Framework para 115).</p> <p>Para 115 NPPF: "Great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty."</p> <p>3. The East West railway line is within and adjacent to the AONB. The line forms the northern boundary of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty between Monks Risborough and Little Kimble. The railway is adjacent to the AONB boundary just south of Princes Risborough station. It also runs through the setting of the AONB, overlooked from high ground from some key visitor viewpoints within the designated landscape: Whiteleaf Hill, Grangelands, Beacon Hill, Cymbeline's Castle and Coombe Hill. These important viewpoints from the chalk escarpment, together with the Ridgeway National Trail, are high sensitivity visual receptors.</p> <p>4. Despite this, the East West Rail Phase 2 consultation pack makes no reference at all to the statutorily designated Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in the document. The only reference is on two poorly annotated maps (the Environmental Features Plan sheet 15 of 16 and 16 of 16) on which the AONB boundary (shown as a thin brown line) does not show up properly because it is overlain with other designations and is labelled erroneously in the key as 'ANOB'. For future iterations it would help if the AONB boundary was shown clearly (perhaps using hatching or a colour wash to show which side of the line it covers) and labelled correctly. As it stands there is not enough emphasis on this national designation; more weight should be given to the Chilterns AONB. This would reflect your legal duty under section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000: "Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 Section 85. General duty of public bodies etc. In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, a relevant authority shall have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty."</p> <p>5. A key concern we have which we would like you to address are the landscape and visual impacts of the East West Rail proposals in the AONB or in the setting of the AONB. Works which are likely to concern us are line widening, new footbridges, parapet height increases on existing bridges, changes to the character and appearance of any attractive historic bridges, expansion of rural stations, increase in lighting affecting dark skies and the introduction of overhead line equipment for rail electrification. The Board would welcome early participation in the design of any such structures and the testing of alternative designs in order to ensure the best outcomes. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment carried out in accordance with the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition (GLVIA) would be the recommended starting point for assessing impacts.</p> <p>6. The specification and design brief for new structures and works to the railway should include as requirements minimisation of harm to</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Including this from the outset will help you demonstrate compliance with your duties under section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (see above).</p> <p>7. We recommend the application of a mitigation hierarchy to: 1. Avoid, 2. Reduce, 3. Mitigate/ compensate harm to landscape, biodiversity and the historic environment. The scope of mitigation should include landscape enhancements to offset harm to the AONB and its setting on a net gain basis.</p> <p>8. The diversion or closure of Public Rights of Way in the AONB or that provide routes to the AONB would concern the Board as it could reduce recreation, sustainable travel and the opportunity for the public to access and enjoy the AONB. The closure of level crossings and their replacement with footbridges raises concerns about access for all.</p> <p>9. The Board wishes you well in the preparation of your plans and if we can be of further assistance please let us know.</p>	
--	--	--	--

Current consultations:

Consultation document	Consulted by	Weblink	Deadline for CCB responses
Longwick NP Submission Plan	WDC	http://www.wycombe.gov.uk/council-services/planning-and-buildings/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/longwick-cum-ilmer-neighbourhood-plan.aspx	30.11.15
Sonning Common PC Amended Plan	SODC		4.12.15
Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan	AVDC	http://www.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/vale-aylesbury-local-plan-%E2%80%93-issues-and-options-consultation	4.12.15
Buckland NP	AVDC		No?
Luton Local Plan Reg 19	LBC	www.luton.gov.uk/localplan	7.12.15
Bucks HEDNA comments to WDC	WDC		
Iver NP Area designation	South Bucks DC		27.11.15
Pitstone NP Submission plan	AVDC	http://www.aylesburyvaledc.gov.uk/pitstone-neighbourhood-plan	22.12.15

Recommendation

1. That the Committee approves the responses sent, notes the current consultations on development plans and provides comments to the Planning Officer as appropriate.

Item 11 **Planning Applications Update**

Author: Mike Stubbs Planning Advisor

Lead Organisations: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time

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

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about, and seek approval of, the responses that have been made under delegated powers in connection with the planning applications as listed and to update the Committee on any outcomes.

Background

1. Since the last Planning Committee papers for the 9th September 2015 meeting, the Board has made 9 formal representations on planning applications, of which 6 are objections and 3 were comments. The formal representations are detailed in Appendix 3.

Recommendations

1. **That the Committee notes and approves the responses made in connection with the applications listed in Appendix 3.**

Location	LPA	Development	Ref. No.	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Old Reservoir Site, Greenmore, Woodcote Reference	SODC	Conversion of existing pump house into a dwelling and erection of 19 new dwellings and formation of a new access, driveway and parking.	P15/S268 5/FUL	Pending	<p>Comments only</p> <p>Design amendments and/or justification would benefit this application, to address rearward development which does not appear to follow the design ethos of the frontage. CCB recommend an explanation and review of the design thinking with regard to the Chilterns Building Design Guide and associated supplementary technical notes.</p> <p>Note for CCB Committee: appropriate references to Design Guides, as applies.</p>	11/09 /15
Outline application with all matters reserved	SODC	Development of land for the provision of 7 Custom Build dwellings with associated access, parking provision.	P15/S293 3/O	Withdrawn 28 th August 2015	<p>Objection</p> <p>The proposals by virtue of the scale, design and layout of the proposals harms the AONB and fails to deliver the necessary conservation and enhancement of this landscape due to its inappropriate nature of development</p> <p>The submitted design and access statement pays no regard to the policy environment, as affects the AONB and historic buildings affected.</p>	21/08/ 15

Land at Ley Hill Chesham -	Bucks CC Environment Agency	Application to the Environment Agency for non-hazardous and asbestos waste landfilling with a capacity for up to 25,000 t excluding inert waste.	EA Reference EPR/ZP31 96NA/V003	Pending	<p>Objection</p> <p>Inappropriateness of such a proposal within a source protection zone 3, as applies in this case. Objection on grounds of both the previous planning history for restoration and location within the source protection zone. This application runs contrary to past planning permissions and to the EAs own guidance on groundwater protection and the presence of a geological barrier. No planning consent exists to permit asbestos to be landfilled.</p> <p>Note for CCB Committee:</p> <p>EA application and as a public body has duty of regard to CROW Act.</p>	14/09/15
A355 East Of Beaconsfield	Bucks CC	Request for a Scoping Opinion for the development of a new relief road between the A355 Amersham Road in the vicinity of Maxwell Road, to the Wilton Park Site at Minerva Way to the east of Beaconsfield	SCOP/09/15	n/a	<p>Comment: Environmental Statement Scoping opinion. New road is outside AONB.</p> <p>Key issues of lighting and impact on the landscape. CCB sought a detailed assessment of <i>The likely significant adverse or beneficial changes in environmental conditions that could arise from the scheme</i> and a reporting of both avoidance (through alternatives) or mitigation (by detailed design, lighting and screening and other matters) as would be required by the application of key principles as set out in Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations 2011.</p> <p>Notes for CCB Committee:</p> <p>Potential wider impact of lighting on AONB to be addressed when application is made.</p>	18/09/15

High Heavens Waste Transfer Facility –	Bucks CC	Change of Use of former agricultural building to waste transfer station.	CM/38/15	Pending	<p>Objection</p> <p>CCB would ask BCC to apply the policy tests in CS21 of the Core Strategy (November 2012) and principally that <u>'exceptionally</u> a waste transfer station will be permitted within the Chilterns AONB at the High Heavens Waste Complex in order to deliver the County's waste strategy (our emphasis). The policy continues with the citation of exceptional criteria, in respect of (a) supporting local communities and (b) including opportunities to enhance the character and appearance of the AONB. If the application is outside the existing High Heavens operation, which it appears to be then CS21 (a) and (b) would apply. It does not appear that these policy requirements are dealt with nor satisfied. CCB recommend the application is refused.</p> <p>Notes for CCB Committee:</p> <p>Application outside defined waste area and without exceptional circumstances must be wholly contrary to policy.</p>	18/09/15
Trailers End Buckland, Aston Clinton	AVDC	Variation of condition to remove personal condition to temporary dwelling	14/02118/APP	Pending	<p>No Comments</p> <p>Notes for CCB Committee Correspondence received.</p>	n/a

Amersham and Little Chalfont Hockey Club –	CDC	New clubhouse and floodlit pitches.	CH/2014/2274/FA	Refused	No Comments / outside AONB and no impact. Notes for CCB Committee Correspondence received.	n/a
Land N of Marlow Landfill Site, Little Marlow	WDC	Construction of solar energy park to include panels, security fencing, transformer housing, access and other works.	15/07001/FU LEA	Pending	<p>Comment only</p> <p>In view of the proposed 260 panels covering some 12 hectares at 2.4m to highest point, CCB proposed that in the event that the LPA were minded to grant consent here, that a carefully constructed suite of planning conditions is deployed to address screening, footpath links, biodiversity gains and the impacts of security features.</p> <p>Refer to CCB position statement on setting – (Paragraph 11) that wider land management practices beyond the statutory boundary of the Chilterns, do exert an impact. CCB would seek that boundary treatment is the subject of a planning condition, to reinforce the visual screen by use of an appropriate mix. Further that a footpath link connecting the village to the AONB would increase opportunities for enjoying the countryside, and the area on which panels are not proposed could be enhanced with habitat creation to secure biodiversity gains (pond, grassland management, appropriate native planting etc.) Additionally, that any security features (including</p>	27/10/15

					<p>fencing and CCTV, if required) are very carefully concealed from wider visual impacts.</p> <p>Notes for CCB Committee:</p> <p>Tightly worded conditions sought. Site area is large but outside AONB, if abuts boundary. CCB Position statement on setting applies.</p>	
<p>Dropshort Barn, Missenden Road, Butlers Cross</p>	<p>WDC</p>	<p>Demolition of dilapidated brick and metal roof building and erection of 2 x two storey 5-bed detached dwellings with attached 3-bay car port/garages to front with associated parking & landscaping</p>	<p>15/07353/ FUL</p>	<p>Pending</p>	<p>Objection</p> <p>This is an extremely sensitive site in the AONB, very prominent on the open rural landscape. We wrote to Wycombe DC in November 2004 and January 2006 to explain that the existing derelict agricultural building “represents a significant visual detractor in the vicinity of Coombe Hill, Beacon Hill and Cymbeline’s Mount and neither conserves or enhances the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB. Its physical presence actually detracts from the public’s enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB. The Conservation Board would be most concerned if proposals for redevelopment of the site were to be submitted and it feels that the best thing would be for the site to be cleared and reinstated to agriculture or grassland.” The design of the subsequent permitted schemes for a single earth sheltered dwelling managed to address some of the issues, as did (to a lesser extent) the</p>	<p>12.1 1.15</p>

				<p>single storey sunken dwelling. However the Board objects to the current application for two detached 5 bed dwellings because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scheme does not conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB nor respect its special qualities. • No GLVIA3 compliant landscape and visual impact assessment is provided to allow testing of the impacts. • The contemporary design does not conserve and enhance the special qualities of the AONB, does not implement the Chilterns Building Design Guide, and makes no reference to the attractive brick and flint thatched Jasmine Cottage opposite which sits harmoniously in the landscape. • The external standing seam metal roof is not acceptable, a proper green (not sedum) roof or earth sheltered building would be considerably better. The site is visible from height and particularly from viewpoints Coombe Hill, the Ridgeway National Trail, Cymbeline's Castle and from Beacon Hill. Getting the roofing design right is essential. • The scheme contains large areas of glazing, particularly on the south western elevation, which would cause reflection from the public viewpoints and light spill, impacting on dark skies and tranquillity. • The presence of two separate
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>domestic driveways would be an urbanising feature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscaping at this site should be absolutely minimal and should ultimately result in the creation of chalk grassland. The site contains semi-improved chalk grassland with the presence of, among other species, bee and pyramidal orchids. This scheme tries to combine domestic gardens containing ornamental planting with a 'meadow garden'. However it seems unlikely that the occupants would choose to site in the 'private garden' at the roadside rather than utilise the 'meadow garden' to the south west. Over time this would be likely to become formalised into a residential garden. Avoiding domestic clutter, parking and residential paraphernalia is essential, the current two dwelling proposal provides no safeguards against this and through duplication is worse than a single dwelling scheme. A 'meadow garden' is not the same as habitat management to provide a net gain of chalk grassland, and being within a residential curtilage, does not safeguard the land from ever becoming incorporated in the domestic sphere. 	
Park Hill Farm Princes Risborough	WDC	Outline application at for 500 dwellings with public open	15/07825/OUTEA	Pending	<p>Objections (qualified)</p> <p>Qualified objections in respect strategic planning, cumulative impacts and</p>	17/1 1/15

		space and landscaping			<p>appropriate mitigation to resolve the application before determination.</p> <p>CCB recommend the use of a s106 or CIL funded project to mitigate the harm to the natural beauty and enjoyment of the Chilterns AONB. As well as detriment to the views, the Ridgeway National Trail and the enjoyment of Whiteleaf are likely to be affected by additional recreational pressures as public access will inevitably impact on footpaths, habitats, fencing and car parks for example. We would welcome a dialogue to nominate a sum for identified green infrastructure capital funding, information and interpretation boards, and habitat management actions that promotes appropriate conservation and enhancement measures that are fairly and reasonably linked in scale and kind.</p> <p>Notes for CCB Committee:</p> <p>Discussion of policy needs for mitigation of increased recreational pressures. Application is 'premature' being before the Local Plan consultations expected in 2016. Natural England has now objected (17/11/15).</p>	
Demolition of existing buildings	SODC	91 dwellings (in full) and new CABI	P15/S338 7/FUL.	Pending	Objection CCB seek a reconsideration of the	TBC

<p>and creation of a new headquarters for CABI, near Wallingford</p>		<p>Headquarters Building (in outline) with all matters reserved.</p>		<p>exceptional circumstances case as accepted in the 2014 grant of PP on this site and that far greater weight is given to the AONB duty of conservation and enhancement of the AONB landscape.</p> <p>CCB seek an acknowledgment that a mostly market housing led scheme cannot be deemed an exceptional case under NPPF 116.</p> <p>CCB ask that far greater weight be given to the AONB Management Plan 2014-19 and to SODC Core Strategy Policy CSEN1 Landscape.</p> <p>CCB seek an independent review of the enabling case, to verify the financial case that is now put in support of development that is itself contrary to AONB objectives.</p> <p>CCB seek acknowledgement of Paragraph 14 and footnote 9 of the NPPF which obviates any consideration of the housing need case when considering development within the AONB.</p> <p>If the application progresses CCB seek substantial revisions are required to the amount of market housing and its configuration to open up landscape buffers around the site and view corridors across the site, to protect the wider AONB character here and create smaller clusters of development that protect the landscape</p>
--	--	--	--	---

					<p>of the area. Tangible public benefits will need to be identified.</p> <p>Notes for CCB Committee:</p> <p>That a 2014 consent is material but that far greater weight is required for key policies in the AONB and the 'enabling' case requires detailed verification if it is to be taken into account here.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--