



**Planning Committee**

**10.00 a.m. Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> November 2013**  
**The Chilterns Conservation Board office,**  
**90 Station Road, Chinnor**

**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. High Speed 2 – update	10.20 – 10.40
7. AONB Management Plan Review	10.40 – 11.00
8. Events	11.00 – 11.10
9. Conservation Board Position Statements	11.10 – 11.40
10. Solar Farms	11.40 – 12.00
11. Development Plans responses	12.00 – 12.20
12. Planning Applications – update	12.20 – 12.25
13. Any urgent business	12.25 – 12.30
14. Date of Next and Future Meetings	12.30 – 12.35

Next meeting: **Wednesday 12<sup>th</sup> February 2014** at **The Village Centre, High Street, Chinnor, OX39 4DH**

Proposed future meetings: 2014 – Wednesdays 14<sup>th</sup> May, 10<sup>th</sup> September and 26<sup>th</sup> November

**Item 3**                    **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**Author:**                    Colin White   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 5<sup>th</sup> September 2013 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 5<sup>th</sup> September 2013.**



**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CHILTERN CONSERVATION BOARD PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON THURSDAY 5<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER 2013 AT THE CHILTERN CONSERVATION BOARD OFFICE, STATION ROAD, CHINNOR, COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM AND CONCLUDING AT 12.53 PM.**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

**Member**

**Appointing Body**

**Nominated by Local Authorities**

Cllr Brian Norman	Three Rivers District
Cllr Chris Richards	Aylesbury Vale District Council
Cllr Jeremy Ryman	Chiltern District Council
Cllr Alan Walters	South Buckinghamshire District Council

**Appointed by the Secretary of State**

Bettina Kirkham ( Chairman)	Secretary of State
Helen Tuffs	Secretary of State

**Elected by Parish Councils**

Cllr Margaret Jarrett	Hertfordshire Parish Councils
-----------------------	-------------------------------

**OTHERS PRESENT**

**Co-opted Members**

John Willson	CCB, Secretary of State
--------------	-------------------------

**Officers**

Colin White	Chilterns Conservation Board
-------------	------------------------------

**Others**

Deirdre Hansen	Minute taker
----------------	--------------

**96. Election of Chairman**

Bettina Kirkham was nominated and unanimously elected Chairman following the AGM on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2013.

**97. Apologies**

Cllr David Barnard (North Hertfordshire District Council), Mike Fox (Chairman of the Board), Cllr Barbara Wallis (Buckinghamshire Parish Councils), Gill Gowing (Strategic Planning Adviser to The Chiltern Society) and Mike Stubbs The National Trust.

The new members were welcomed and John Willson was welcomed in his new role as co-opted member. The Committee agreed that Roger Emmett will be much missed. The Chair had sent his widow a card of condolence.

**98. Declarations of Interest**

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

**99. Minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes were approved and signed by the Chairman as a true record.

**100. Matters Arising from the minutes**

Item 91: the Planning Officer had contacted a student from a local university, who had undertaken research on applications not determined in line with the Board's comments. The Planning Officer needs to interpret the data obtained and will report a later meeting.

Item 92: the Planning Officer has been informed by Natural England that they will be looking at their protocol imminently. The Planning Officer will report at a later meeting.

**101. Public question time**

There were no members of the public present.

**102. High Speed 2 – update**

The Planning Officer updated the Committee about the latest developments in connection with a possible high speed rail route through the Chilterns.

The Committee was informed about the following: the meetings held that involved input from the Board; the submission of the Board's response on the Draft Environmental Statement which ran to 100 pages; the submission by HS2 Action Alliance of its case to the Supreme Court; the continued press coverage of HS2; the review of the "Buckinghamshire Blueprint" for mitigating HS2; the Community Forums are due to start again later in September; representatives of the Board have been involved in producing a document that will try and deal with the non-market effects of the construction of HS2, and the Wider Chilterns HS2 Group continues to meet.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the report.**
- 2. The Committee RESOLVED to ask the Board to seek the help of a local MP in requesting information about spoil (quantity and possible routes and destinations for disposal).**
- 3. The Committee RESOLVED to ask the Board to discuss the issue of spoil**

**disposal at a future meeting.****103. AONB Management Plan Review**

The Planning Officer informed the members about the latest developments in connection with the emerging 2014-2019 Management Plan.

The Draft SEA Scoping Report was subject to a consultation period in May and June, the draft Management Plan policies have been prepared, the draft Management Plan will be published for comments later in September and a timetable for the Management Plan review was provided. The consultation documents will be available on the Board's web site.

Progress with the review will be reported to subsequent meetings of the Planning Committee and members were asked to input as and when required.

The Committee commented that it had been impressed with the work undertaken by the officers of the Board; their efforts had eased the members' workload considerably.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the feedback from the consultation on the Draft SEA Scoping Report and the Draft Project Plan.**
- 2. The Committee PROVIDED comments on the draft Management Plan and the draft Environmental Statement.**
- 3. The Committee NOTED the programme of production of the Management Plan 2014-2019.**

**104. Events**

The Planning Officer provided feedback from the recent AONB Planning Forum, the Design Awards and the Planning Committee Tour. A further Planning Forum is due to take place in November. The next AONB Planning Conference will take place on Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> October.

The AONB Planning Forum was well attended by various planning authorities and other bodies. Discussion had focussed on the first year of the NPPF and recent Government additions to the NPPF in connection with waste and changes to permitted development rights. The AONB Management Plan had also been discussed.

The Design Awards ceremony had taken place in June and the overall winner was a new dance studio at the Tring Park School for the Performing Arts. Awards were also given for a new office near Henley, a development on the canal at Berkhamsted and a new house at Kings Langley. A meeting will take place shortly with the co-sponsors, the Chiltern Society, to consider ways to take this event forward. It has been given out annually for the last 15 years. The Planning Officer gave a slide presentation of the winning designs.

The Planning Committee Tour visited the area to the south of the A505 (east of Luton) in connection with a possible boundary and to gain some familiarity with the area. The Planning Officer gave a powerpoint presentation of the pictures taken on the day showing the area visited. The Committee discussed the area visited and agreed that the tour had been useful.

The next AONB Planning Conference will take place on 9<sup>th</sup> October 2013. Invitations and the programme have been issued. Members were asked to circulate the programme and invite as widely as possible to encourage attendance. The delegate fees will be £30 for town and parish councillors, charities and similar organisations and £45 for all other delegates.

The next Planning Forum will take place week commencing 4<sup>th</sup> November. A doodle poll will be organised with suggested dates. It was proposed that the focus of the Forum should be the draft AONB Management Plan and the draft Environmental Statement

1. **The Committee NOTED the feedback from the various events that have recently take place.**
2. **The Committee PROVIDED further feedback to the meeting.**
3. **The Committee NOTED and APPROVED the arrangements for the AONB Planning Conference and WOULD promote the event widely.**
4. **The Committee NOTED and APPROVED the arrangement for the next Planning Forum and WOULD inform the Planning Officer if they wish to attend.**

#### **105. Planning Policy Guidance**

The Planning Officer sought the Committee's approval of the draft of the first in a series of planning policy guidance documents. The production of which had been approved at the previous meeting. The first draft dealing with renewable energy had been circulated.

The Committee discussed and commented on the draft document. The Planning Officer noted the various suggestions (see below) and requested that further comments be sent to him as soon as possible.

Key issues noted – title should change to 'position statement'; the purpose of the document should be made clearer; consider including reference to LPA planning policies; paragraph 7 should move closer to the start of the introduction; greater emphasis on Board's wish to see a reduction in energy use before the generation of more energy; ensure the Board is engaged in larger cases (paragraph 16); check paragraph 17 and quoted sizes to ensure peer review; consider noise impacts (paragraph 21); need to take care with non-designated heritage assets (paragraph 33); check latter part of paragraph 34 and consider adding paragraphs on removal of installations and consideration of new technologies.

It was proposed that the next topic to be addressed should be telecommunications.

1. **The Committee APPROVED, subject to the suggested changes, the draft of the renewable energy position statement document for consultation purposes.**

#### **106. Solar Farms – pre-application proposals**

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that the Board had become aware of two

recent proposals for solar farms at Bledlow and west of Hemel Hempstead. Both are outside the AONB, but are likely to have significant impacts on the AONB. It was proposed that a sub-group of the Planning Committee be formed to assess both sites and to undertake site visits. Bettina Kirkham, Barbara Wallis, Brian Norman and Alan Walters were prepared to form a sub-group.

The Committee discussed various aspect and implications of solar farms and was given a short presentation by the Planning Officer.

- 1. The Committee APPROVED the establishment of a sub-group to assess the proposals for solar farms.**
- 2. The Committee PROVIDED initial feedback on the proposals presented.**

#### **107. Development Plans Responses**

The Planning Officer informed and sought approval from the Committee for the responses that have been sent in and made under delegated powers in connection with the public consultation exercises on the following development plan documents:

South Oxfordshire DC proposed SA of Scoping Report for Local Plan Sites and General Policies; Chiltern DC Delivery Development Plan Document public participation; Woodcote Parish Council Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan 2013-2027; Aylesbury Vale DC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Strategy Proposed Submission; Central Beds Council Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan; North Hertfordshire DC Housing additional location options; South Oxfordshire DC consultation on Sites and General Policies and Wycombe DC Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Draft Scoping Report.

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

#### **108. Planning Applications Update**

The Planning Officer informed the Committee about and sought approval for the responses that have been made under delegated powers in connection with planning applications, appeals and a number of previous cases that have been determined.

Since 1<sup>st</sup> April the Board has been consulted on 57 applications and has responded to most of these. There have been 10 formal representations so far this year.

It was noted that at present 55% of planning application are decided in line with the Board's comments.

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

**109. Any Urgent Business**

There was no urgent business.

**110. Date of the next meeting**

**Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> November 2013** at the office of the Chilterns Conservation Board, 90 Station Road, Chinnor commencing at 10.00 am.

**Future meetings: Wednesdays 12<sup>th</sup> February, 14<sup>th</sup> May, 10<sup>th</sup> September and 26<sup>th</sup> November 2014.**

The meeting closed at 12.53pm.

**The Chairman .....**

**Date .....**



**Item 6      High Speed 2 update**

**Author:** Colin White Planning Officer

**Lead Organisation:** Chilterns Conservation Board

**Resources:** Staff time.

**Summary:** A number of events have been held, the Supreme Court hearing has taken place, various documents are being prepared, Hybrid Bill and final Environmental Statement are due for publication on 25<sup>th</sup> November, petitioning will follow in early 2014 and Community Forum meetings have been suspended.

**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. There continues to be a lot of activity and the Board has been represented at a number of recent meetings including: a regular liaison meeting with HS2 Ltd for Bucks and Herts; the national ecology technical group; a further landscape meeting with Natural England; a meeting about the emerging Bucks Blueprint Version 2 (which was also discussed at a 51M/Bucks CC summit dealing with the Hybrid Bill and petitioning), and a meeting with David Lidington MP in connection with the compensation and the final environmental statement consultations.
2. The Committee was previously informed about the results of the various Judicial Reviews and that one case was given leave to appeal to the Supreme Court from the High Court. The Supreme Court hearing (in connection with the need to prepare a Strategic Environmental Assessment of HS2) has now been heard and the ruling in this is understood to be imminent. The Committee will be updated verbally if there is anything further to report.
3. The previously published 'Buckinghamshire's Blueprint for Mitigating HS2' has been reviewed and was launched in draft at the recent 51M/Bucks CC summit. It is understood that the Blueprint Version 2 document will be formally launched shortly. The many comments about mitigation that are included stem from responses that were made to the draft HS2 Environmental Statement consultation earlier this year.
4. Representatives of the Board continue to be involved in producing a document that will try and deal with the non-market effects of the construction of HS2. This is closely linked to ongoing work on a fully bored tunnel and it is understood that the intention is that this should be launched in the Houses of Parliament in early December.
5. The Board understands that the Hybrid Bill is due to be deposited along with the final Environmental Statement on 25<sup>th</sup> November. This would result in a consultation on the Environmental Statement lasting from 2<sup>nd</sup> December to 27<sup>th</sup> January. Bucks CC advice has been to concentrate on key issues of local interest but ensure that comments are made about any issue that would later be covered in a petition. If the

Hybrid Bill is deposited on 25<sup>th</sup> November the earliest date for Second Reading would be the 18<sup>th</sup> March 2014. This would then trigger a likely petitioning period which would run from 18<sup>th</sup> March until 1<sup>st</sup> April. The Board is intending to submit a petition based on the need for a fully bored tunnel. Further advice is being sought and a meeting is taking place shortly with barristers and others to discuss the issue.

6. The previously suspended Community Forums met once late in September and have once again been suspended. It is understood that HS2 Ltd staff are now working on giving petitioning advice.
7. The Wider Chilterns HS2 Group continues to meet, is still very well attended and provides an opportunity to discuss relevant issues. Any change in the situation will be reported to the Committee in the future.

### **Recommendation**

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

**Item 7      AONB Management Plan Review**

**Author:** Colin White Planning Officer

**Lead Organisation:** Chilterns Conservation Board

**Resources:** Staff time.

**Summary:** The draft Management Plan was published for comment in September, the Environmental Report was published for comment in November and a timetable for the Management Plan review is included for information.

**Purpose of report:** To inform the Committee about the latest developments in connection with the emerging 2014-2019 Management Plan and to encourage engagement and continuing feedback.

**Background**

1. As previously reported, the review of the current AONB Management Plan is now well-advanced. This Committee has contributed to the preparation of the draft Plan and with a good level of feedback a number of suggested changes were taken on board prior to the draft Management Plan being published for public consultation on 20<sup>th</sup> September.
2. The consultation period for the Management Plan runs until 13<sup>th</sup> December and reminders are being sent to ensure that the Board gets as many responses as possible, but particularly from statutory consultees and key partners.
3. The preparation of the draft Environmental Statement followed on from the Board meeting in October where comments on the draft SEA Scoping Report and responses to these were considered and approved. The draft Environmental Statement was published for comment from 18<sup>th</sup> November 2013 to 10<sup>th</sup> January 2014.
4. The documents for both draft Management Plan and the draft Environmental Statement are available on the Board's website (see the following [link](#)). Limited numbers of the draft Management Plan have been printed and all documents can be sent out in electronic form. If Members have any comments at this stage these should be forwarded to the Planning Officer.
5. At the time of writing there have been limited comments on the documents that are subject to consultation. A full report of the consultation will be considered at the Board meeting in January 2014.
6. The Committee is asked to note the current timetable for the production of the Management Plan as detailed below. This will involve the following key tasks:
  - Consultation on draft Management Plan (from 20<sup>th</sup> September to 13<sup>th</sup> December 2013 for 12 weeks) and draft Environmental Statement (from 18<sup>th</sup> November 2013 to 10<sup>th</sup> January 2014 for 8 weeks).
  - A review of the consultation feedback will be considered in a report to the Board on 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2014.

- Final approval of the Plan will be considered by the Board at its meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2014.
  - The reviewed Management Plan will be published in April 2014.
7. Progress with the review will be reported to subsequent meetings of the Planning Committee and Members are asked to input as and when required.

### **Recommendations**

1. **That the Committee provides any comments on the draft Management Plan and draft Environmental Statement to the Planning Officer.**
2. **That the Committee notes the programme for the production of the Management Plan 2014-19.**

**Item 8      Events****Author:**                      Colin White   Planning Officer**Lead Organisation:** Chilterns Conservation Board**Resources:**                Staff time and budget of £900 for Planning Conference.**Summary:**                The AONB Planning Conference recently took place, the next Planning Forum will take place in early December, Member involvement in the Design Awards judging is considered, the Committee's attention is drawn to next year's training programmed for Parish and Town Councils as well as next year's Planning Conference and the May Planning Forum. Feedback is provided and some details for forthcoming events require approval.**Purpose of report:** To consider feedback from recent events and approve the details for the forthcoming events.**Background**Feedback from eventsAONB Planning Conference

1.      This year's AONB Planning Conference took place on Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> October 2013 at the Princes Risborough Golf Club. Nearly 70 delegates attended and heard a stimulating and very well-received set of talks which focussed on recent planning reforms, local enterprise partnerships and neighbourhood planning. Income from the event should be £1,665.
2.      37 different organisations were represented which included 5 of the Chilterns local authorities. There were 24 parish or town council attendees. The feedback provided via the feedback forms is generally very good with good scores for speakers and the conference content. Virtually all those that responded favoured keeping the event the same for next year and some topics were suggested for future discussion (engagement in the development process, detail of strategic planning issues, water issues, role of AONB Management Plan in decision-making and linkage between local strategic and local enterprise partnerships). The only negative comments related to the catering with the main comments being about a lack of biscuits at the break. The issues raised will be considered in the preparation for next year's conference.

Forthcoming eventsAONB Planning Forum

3.      The next AONB Planning Forum is scheduled to take place from 2.00 to 4.30pm on 5<sup>th</sup> December at the Wycombe District Council offices in High Wycombe. The draft AONB Management Plan review, HS2 environmental statement and petitioning, draft Conservation Board position statement on renewable energy and possible review of

the AONB boundary are all going to be discussed. Feedback from this event will be provided at the next Planning Committee meeting and arrangements for the subsequent Forum (May 2014) will also be discussed then.

### Design Awards

4. As the Committee knows the Chilterns Buildings Design Awards is held on an annual basis. This year was the 15<sup>th</sup> time the awards have been given out. The awards scheme is being taken into a new era and work is ongoing with the Chiltern Society to bring this about. It is intended that: more publicity will be given to the awards; it should receive a greater profile; sponsorship will be sought; the logo will be examined and the prizes offered will be considered. As this is a collaborative event with the Chiltern Society the Board is taking an active role. One of the aspects that is being looked at is the make-up of the judging panel. It is suggested that one of the Board's Planning Committee members should sit on the panel and a nomination is therefore sought. Any changes will be brought to the Committee's attention.

### Parish and Town Council planning training 2014

5. The Board organises and runs a short series of training events for Parish and Town Councils every two years. The events normally take place in late June and early July and are scheduled to occur once again in 2014. One issue that has recently been raised is how the Board reacts to and monitors the loss of local facilities like shops and pubs. This may be subject to a new state of the environment indicator and is being investigated. In some rural parishes when a facility is lost the sustainability of the settlement is detrimentally affected. It is suggested that the next training session could address settlement sustainability and that prior engagement with the Parish and Town Councils could bring about survey work to show how their settlements have changed over the last few years. This could be in both positive (farm diversifications for example) and negative (loss of pub or shop for example) ways and information could be circulated prior to the training sessions. The role of Assets of Community Value could also be discussed. Other topics will also need to be included and the Committee's thoughts on these are invited.

### AONB Planning Conference 2014

6. The Planning Conference takes place in early October each year. It is proposed that next year's event takes place on Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> October. If approved the date will be circulated. Any initial thoughts that the Committee has about possible venues, topics and speakers would be welcome.

### Recommendations

1. **That the Committee notes the feedback from the AONB Planning Conference.**
2. **That the Committee notes and approves the arrangements for the forthcoming Planning Forum.**
3. **That the Committee nominates one of its members to take part in the Design Awards judging panel.**
4. **That the Committee notes the suggestions made for the Parish and Town Council training and approves the date for the AONB Planning Conference for 2014 and provides the Planning Officer with any further suggestions.**

**Item 9**                    **Conservation Board Position Statements**

**Author:**                    Colin White   Planning Officer

**Lead Organisations:** Chilterns Conservation Board

**Resources:**                Staff time.

**Summary:**                The Committee has previously approved the production of a series of documents detailing the Board's position on various issues. The draft position statement dealing with renewable energy is currently out for comment. The next position statement will address telecommunications and thoughts are invited on the key issues for inclusion.

**Purpose of report:** To inform the Committee about any responses made on the renewable energy position statement and to seek confirmation of key issues to address in the next position statement on telecommunications.

**Background**

1. At its last meeting the Committee approved the publication of the renewable energy position statement. The draft of this was subsequently reported to the full Board meeting in October 2013 and following this a series of amendments were made.
2. The draft renewable energy position statement was published for comment on 14<sup>th</sup> November. The document can be viewed and downloaded from the AONB website from the following [link](#). The document has also been included on the National Association for AONBs Basecamp intranet with promotion to all AONBs nationally.
3. Comments have been invited with the consultation period closing on Friday 17<sup>th</sup> January 2014. Thus far comments have been received from BBOWT and the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB. The full results of the consultation will be reported to the next Planning Committee meeting and any proposed changes can be dealt with then. At that time it is proposed that additional images should be included and the document designed to fit with the Board's house style.
4. The Committee agreed that the next position statement to be prepared should deal with telecommunications. As with the previous statement any similar documents produced by AONBs and other similar bodies will be examined to provide guidance on the topic.
5. It is proposed that the draft position statement on telecommunications should incorporate the following key topics:
  - telecommunications mast siting/location and design;
  - poles and cables siting/location, design and undergrounding;
  - cabinet siting/location and design;
  - NPPF and Management Plan policy;
  - DCMS cabinet and pole siting code, and
  - equipment removal.

6. The Committee is asked to consider the key topics listed for inclusion in the draft position statement on telecommunications and to suggest any alterations or additions. It is proposed that the draft document will be prepared and then to a report to the next Planning Committee.

### **Recommendations**

1. **That the Committee notes the progress made in connection with the draft renewable energy position statement.**
2. **That the Committee provides suggestions for any additions or alterations to the key topics to be addressed by the draft telecommunications position statement.**



**Item 10     Solar farms**

**Author:**                    Colin White   Planning Officer

**Lead Organisation:** Chilterns Conservation Board

**Resources:**                Staff time.

**Summary:**                The Committee previously approved the setting up of a sub-group to assess a number of proposed solar farms. The sub-group has met and visited three sites recently and feedback is provided.

**Purpose of report:** To inform the Committee about the outcome from recent site visits undertaken by the solar farm sub-group.

**Background**

1.     The Committee was previously made aware of three proposals for solar farms at Bledlow, Ivinghoe and west of Hemel Hempstead. All of the sites are outside the AONB. The scale of the proposals means that they should be subject to very close examination in order to fully assess the likely impacts on the AONB.
2.     At its last meeting the Committee approved the setting up of a sub-group and this met in late October to undertake site visits to view the three sites listed above.
3.     In all three cases the sub-group felt that full landscape and visual impact assessments (LVIAs) should be undertaken which should include viewpoints from within the Chilterns AONB and which ought to demonstrate the likely impacts on the AONB and its enjoyment. Such assessments should also include viewpoints from outside the AONB but looking towards it. This is too late for the Ivinghoe proposal as this was actually subject to a planning application, which had not included a full and proper LVIA. Objection was made to this application. The Board sought the production of a full EIA for both the Bledlow and Hemel Hempstead proposals. Although it is understood that one will be required for the Hemel Hempstead proposal one was not requested for the Bledlow site.
4.     Neither of the sites at Bledlow and Hemel Hempstead is subject to a current planning application. However, should any be submitted the sub-group will be informed.
5.     A powerpoint presentation will be done to show the pictures that were taken on the visits to the sites of the proposed solar farms to try and illustrate the likely impacts.

**Recommendation**

1.     **That the Committee notes the outcome of the recent site visits made by the solar farm sub-group.**

**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 the public consultation exercises on the following development plan documents: **Department for Transport** consultation on Guidance to the CAA on Environmental Objectives Relating to the Exercise of its Air Navigation Functions; **National Grid** – Visual Impact Provision – Consultation on National Grid’s proposed approach to existing transmission lines in National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty; **Dacorum BC** West of Tring Masterplanning; **Aylesbury Vale DC** Vale of Aylesbury Plan Scope of Development Management Policies; **Chiltern DC** Delivery DPD Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople site options; **Oxfordshire CC** Local List of Information Requirements and **Chiltern DC** Draft Heritage Strategy September 2013.

**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 development plan documents as listed.

**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 as listed.

**Department for Transport consultation on Guidance to the CAA on Environmental Objectives Relating to the Exercise of its Air Navigation Functions**

1.        Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this consultation the Board’s response will follow those questions that are considered to be relevant.
2.        **Q1. Do you agree that 4,000 feet is a reasonable altitude below which can be considered “in the immediate vicinity” of the airport?** No. The change in altitude from below 4,000 feet above mean sea level (amsl) to above 4,000 feet amsl is not subject to some unseen process that results in the perception of noise from an aircraft disappearing. It is more than likely that the noise will still be perceived and will still cause significant community disturbance. It should also be noted that departures from many UK airports (including Luton which is located immediately adjacent to the Chilterns AONB) start about 500 feet amsl. In addition, some airports are affected by local airspace limitations (for example arrival stacks and departure flight paths for other airports which affect Luton) which mean that continuous climb departures are not possible. The Board considers that the document fails to demonstrate how 4,000 feet amsl can be regarded as an acceptable level. The Board also considers that there is no agreed medium of exchange between noisiness and emissions, such that an equitable trade-off between those factors at

levels between 4,000 feet amsl and 7,000 feet amsl could be demonstrated.

Therefore, the Board considers that the priorities listed after paragraph 4.1 require amendment as follows (where text shown ~~thus~~ should be deleted and text shown **thus** should be added):

- a. in the airspace from the ground to ~~4,000~~ **7,000** feet (amsl) the Government's environmental priority is to minimise the noise impact of aircraft and the number of people on the ground significantly affected by it;
  - b. where options for route design ~~below 4,000 feet (amsl)~~ are similar in terms of impact on densely populated areas, the value of maintaining legacy arrangements should be ~~taken into~~ **the overriding** consideration;
  - ~~c. in the airspace from 4,000 feet (amsl) to 7,000 feet (amsl), the focus should continue to be minimising the impact of aviation noise on densely populated areas, but the CAA may also balance this requirement by taking into account the need for an efficient and expeditious flow of traffic that minimises emissions;~~
  - d. in the airspace above 7,000 feet (amsl), the CAA should promote the most efficient use of airspace with a view to minimising aircraft emissions, and mitigating the impact of noise is no longer ~~a~~ **the principal** priority;
  - e. where practicable, and without a significant detrimental impact on efficient aircraft operations or noise impact on populated areas, airspace routes below 7,000 feet (amsl) should, where possible, be avoided over Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and National Parks as per Chapter 8.1 of this Guidance; and
  - f. all changes below 7,000 feet (amsl) should take into account local circumstances in the development of airspace structures.
3. **Q2. Do you think the altitude-based priorities will provide the necessary clarity for those proposing airspace changes?** Yes, but only after the relevant text has been amended by the responses to other questions as detailed above and below.
  4. **Q3. Do paragraphs 5.1 to 5.9 represent a reasonable understanding of the current and future use of NPRs?** The use of Noise Preferential Routes (NPRs) differs from the description given in paragraphs 5.1 to 5.9. Aircraft departing Luton seldom follow the NPR for any meaningful distance from the runway and are often vectored away from the official swathe. This results in departing aircraft being flown and heard over a very wide area, resulting in disturbance for more communities. For NPRs to achieve the objective of meaningful noise control, departing aircraft should follow the NPR for a significant distance from the airport.
  5. **Q4. Should the CAA consider any other factors when dealing with airspace change proposals involving NPRs (paragraph 5.10)?** The Board is of the opinion that greater consideration should be given ensuring that airports operate in accordance with consistent regulations that relate to length, maximum height of operability, included angle of the NPR swathe and its point of origin. The Board would wish to see the included angle reduced to 10° now (20° is cited elsewhere) and applicable up to a height of 7,000 feet amsl to all airports' departure routes using conventional navigation rules. For Performance Based Navigation (PBN) routes, where the design is predicated on the significantly better track-keeping that is achievable by GPS-based navigation systems, the Board suggests that a 10° included angle should be applicable up to a height of 7,000 feet amsl and with a swathe width of 1km maximum; any flight outside that swathe at below 7,000 feet

amsl should be regarded as potentially off-track. As a result of this the Board considers that amendments could usefully be made to sub-paragraphs d and e of paragraph 5.10 as follows (where text shown **thus** should be added):

- d. that NPRs should, within operational constraints, be designed to minimise the noise impact for those living near the vicinity of the airport **as defined in 4.1 (a)**;
  - e. that the size of NPR swathes and the length of the NPR should be commensurate with ensuring a high degree of compliance by operators and **demonstrably** reflect the performance characteristics of modern aircraft;
6. **Q5. Is the process for approving SIDs using PBN at designated airports appropriate and proportionate? And Q6. Is this process for changing NPRs at the designated airports reasonable?** In respect of both of these questions, the Board sees no good reason why the same criteria and processes should not apply to all airports, or at the least to all airports with more than 50,000 air traffic movements per year.
  7. **Q7. Should the Secretary of State continue to have an approval role, as envisioned in the guidance, or should the CAA have a greater role?** The CAA can, as it already does, provide guidance but the Board considers that the Secretary of State should continue to have the approval role.
  8. **Q8. Should consideration of respite be encouraged more?** The Board considers that the problem with introducing respite for one community is that there will be a consequent increase in noise for another community, resulting in more people being subject to the detrimental impacts of noise. The Board believes that the key objective should be to reduce the noise impact for all. This could be achieved by a number of different measures including the banning of night flights, limitations being place on the number of flights and the employment of quieter flying techniques.
  9. **Q9. Given the difficulties in balancing the Government's policy on minimising over-flight of populated areas with protecting National Parks and AONB, does the guidance reflect a pragmatic and practical way forward for the CAA?** The Board considers that the guidance only reflects a pragmatic and practical way forward up to a point. The draft guidance appears to reflect the general thrust of the previous guidance to the CAA (2002). However, paragraph 8.2 states that 'In line with the altitude-based priorities, the noise impact of flights above 7,000 feet (amsl) is unlikely to be significant and so no consultation is required on their noise impact at above this level'. As many National Parks and AONBs include large amounts of land at many hundreds of feet above mean sea level the Board considers that the paragraph should be reworded to refer to 7,000 feet above ground level rather than amsl.
  10. **Q10. Does the consultation process as outlined in Chapter 9 of the guidance ensure airspace change consultations remain proportionate and appropriate?** The Board considers that where any changes are likely to result in impacts on a National Park or AONB then the relevant protected landscape body (National Park Authority, AONB Conservation Board or AONB Joint Committee) should be directly consulted and that the necessary changes should be made to the sub-paragraphs in paragraph 9.2. Similarly, those Parish and Town Councils likely to be affected by any changes should also be directly consulted, with consequent changes being made to the sub-paragraphs in paragraph 9.2.

**National Grid – Visual Impact Provision Consultation on a proposed approach to existing transmission lines in National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty**

11. The Chilterns Conservation Board welcomes the production of the consultation document as part of the price controls and incentives for the 2013-2021 period. The Board considers that this is an important step towards National Grid and OFGEM meeting the requirements of Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (for relevant authorities to have due regard to the purpose of AONB designation).
12. The Board welcomes the provision of £500 million for electricity transmission owners to mitigate the visual impact of existing electricity infrastructure in nationally protected landscapes in Great Britain. The Board considers that the provision will help to support greater consideration of the impacts on visual amenity of existing infrastructure in National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) and will have a positive influence on the development of new lines and infrastructure.
13. The Board generally supports the document which sets out an approach to achieving landscape improvement and which includes the identification of a set of guiding principles.
14. **03: How we will use the Visual Impact Provision** - The 5 guiding principles are generally supported, however the Board considers that further detail is required to explain how schemes which will result in the greatest landscape enhancement benefits will be identified. The Board is pleased to see that landscape and visual assessments will inform the selection process. It is important that best use is made of existing landscape character assessments in AONBs and that only recognised landscape assessment techniques are drawn upon. It is important to note that landscape assessments should, where possible, include an assessment of adverse impacts on the special qualities of protected landscapes.
15. The Board has a query about the comparison and evaluation. The first criterion of the guiding principles in section 03 talks about the appointment of a qualified landscape architect to compare and evaluate the relative impacts of National Grid lines in National Parks and AONBs. This implies that all lines would be evaluated. However, section 05 (second line of flow chart) states that the assessment will be undertaken in priority areas. In order to arrive at a prioritised set of proposals that result in the greatest landscape enhancement benefits the Board considers that:
  - National Grid should set out a clear process of prioritisation using the expertise of independent landscape architects to help prioritise potential schemes.
  - As part of any prioritisation it should be possible for candidate schemes to be identified locally and submitted to National Grid for consideration. If this were the case, then advice should be provided about what preliminary work should be carried out locally to help the determination process.
  - A scoring mechanism should be agreed between National Grid and key stakeholders as soon as possible.
  - The analysis and scoring mechanism should include the likely beneficial impact of the proposal on any features of cultural and historic significance. Another

factor that could add weight to a proposal is the demonstrable willingness to support a scheme locally (by communities or local authorities).

- The level of public consultation that will be involved in the preliminary phase of identifying schemes should be identified.
  - All schemes will have some merit because pylons and overhead infrastructure in a protected landscape always have a negative visual impact. However, advice should be provided about how these potential schemes will be reduced in number before moving on to the next phase of assessment (i.e. before considering the other four guiding principles). There will be a requirement for any advice to be clear about weighting and how visual impact assessments will be carried out for example.
16. **04: Stakeholder engagement** - The Board welcomes the emphasis on the role played by national and local stakeholders in delivering successful landscape improvement projects and supports the principle of establishing a stakeholder advisory group. The Board would welcome sight of the terms of reference for this group when these are published. The Board considers that amenity groups appear to be well represented in the proposed group. However, some interest groups appear to be under-represented, for example landowners, rural businesses and local authorities who are most likely to be affected by the proposal. National Grid should consider inclusion of groups such as the National Farmers' Union, the Country Land and Business Association, Local Government Association and the Environment Agency for example. The Board notes the inclusion of The National Trust, but wonders why organisation such as the RSPB and Wildlife Trusts (who also own land and have an interest in protected landscapes, rural areas and their use) are not.
17. It will be important for the National Stakeholder Group to ensure that the provision doesn't just focus on 'easy to deliver' projects and that equal weight is given to more complex projects that may take time but will achieve significant visual improvements across a greater number of designated landscapes.
18. **05: The process** - The Board supports early engagement to ensure that there is sufficient time to deliver schemes within the price control period. However, it is not clear how the first stage of the 'identification of initial priorities by Advisory Group' will be carried out. It is not clear on what basis these initial priorities will be identified. It should also be made clear in this section that the Landscape and Visual Impact assessment should be carried out by a qualified landscape architect (as set out in section 03), using recognised landscape assessment techniques.
19. **06: Working with other transmission and distribution owners** - The Board supports a collaborative approach with distribution network operators to maximise the benefits of current funding streams where there are transmission and distribution networks creating a complex 'wirescape' through a protected landscape.
20. The final document should provide clarity in connection with how schemes in England and Wales will be dealt with compared to proposals in Scotland, given that the £500m is a shared allowance for all transmission operators within Great Britain.
21. **07: Review of this document** - The Board wonders why a schedule of the maintenance information and replacement priorities of the lines in National Parks and AONBs would need to be issued with the policy. Such works would be undertaken without the provision and the Board considers that the inclusion of such a schedule

will have an undue influence over which schemes are likely to be implemented. In addition, the Board requests that clarity is provided in connection with whether the RIIO T1 allowance can be called upon in the scenario where a line needs replacement, but also scores highly as a potential visual impact provision scheme.

### **Dacorum BC West of Tring Masterplanning**

22. At various points in the document reference is made to the 'open space in the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty'. The Board would be particularly concerned if the provision of any open space led to a change in the character of the land within the AONB. Therefore, any open space should be designed and implemented with this as a key aim. If such open space were formal in nature this may change the character of the landscape quite markedly. The Masterplan should ensure that this does not happen.
23. Final bullet point of 'Landscape Aims and Opportunities' should include reference to the need to carefully plan the interface with the AONB as well as with existing development, the cemetery and open space (which may be within or outside the AONB).
24. Under the vision part of 'A The Vision', the use and management of the western fields for open space should also conserve the appearance and enjoyment of the Chilterns AONB, although it is recognised in this instance that the 'enhance' test would probably be a higher bar.
25. Under the design part of 'B The Development Principles' mention is made of limiting buildings to two storeys except where a higher element would create interest and focal points. Care is needed with this issue and the suggestion that any buildings taller than two storeys could be accommodated on the site should only come about after a full landscape and visual impact assessment of any proposals. Tall buildings on high parts of the site may well lead to much greater prominence of the site unless very carefully treated.
26. Under the open space part of 'B The Development Principles' mention is made in the second bullet point of the provision of a mix of parkland and informal open space in the AONB. The Board considers that this should be amended, to properly reflect the purposes of the AONB, to read – 'Provide a mix of parkland and informal open space which conserves and enhances the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB'.
27. Under the countryside part of 'B The Development Principles' mention is made of the provision of native tree planting along the area's boundaries. Planting should take place throughout the site, not just on the boundaries. This section also mentions avoiding artificial lighting in the open space in the AONB. Careful consideration should also be given to the provision of any lighting that is within the site but which could be visible from within the AONB and thus detrimentally affect tranquillity in the area.
28. Plan – the AONB boundary should be included on the plan.

### **Aylesbury Vale DC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Scope of Development Management Policies**

29. The Board welcomes the fact that the Council has identified that the Delivery Policies document should include a policy on design and that local distinctiveness will form part of this. Within the Chilterns AONB and its setting the Board considers that the

principles within the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and the supplementary technical notes on Chilterns building materials (flint, brick and roofing materials) should be applied alongside this policy and any district-wide design advice. It would therefore be useful to include reference to these publications as part of the policy and to ensure that the advice is given due weight it would also be helpful to ensure that it is endorsed by the Council for use in the development management process, if not already the case. This could also be mentioned in the text. The policy should also stress that design is a vitally important element in connection with all development.

30. The Board is aware that the Vale of Aylesbury Plan Strategy includes a proposed policy (VS11) that deals with environmental and heritage assets, including the Chilterns AONB. The Board has welcomed this, though suggested changes to ensure that it complies with the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and the National Planning Policy Framework as they apply to AONBs. The Council has identified that the Delivery Policies document should also include a policy on protection of environmental and heritage assets (including biodiversity, landscape and heritage). The proposed policy would include criteria for assessing proposals. The Board welcomes the inclusion of this proposed policy and would like to ensure that the requirement to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB is properly addressed (this is the purpose of the AONB and is set down in law). The need to comply with the statutory AONB Management Plan should be specifically mentioned. Consideration should also be given to including mention of the Board's design advice as mentioned above, as well as the Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Highways in the Chilterns as many of the principles in this document apply to many developments.

### **Chiltern District Council – Delivery DPD Gypsy, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople site options**

31. Site 1 (Waggoners Bit, Whielden Lane, Amersham) is identified as an existing site within the Chilterns AONB and could accommodate an additional pitch according to the consultation document. The Board considers that if any additional pitches were to be placed on this site then the requirement for a full landscape and visual impact assessment to be undertaken should be incorporated into any further iteration of the development plan document (this could usefully be incorporated as part of Appendix 1). Furthermore, the existing hedgerows and any screening planting should be retained, maintained and enhanced and this should be suitably conditioned in the future.
32. Site 5 (Green Acres, Earl Howe Road, Holmer Green) does not have any constraints identified at present. However, the site is immediately adjacent to the Chilterns AONB and this should be recognised as part of the development plan document. Great care will be needed with the treatment of the site as it sits within the setting of the AONB.
33. Site 6 (land off Rushmore Lane, Ashley Green) is located in an area that is currently being investigated in connection with a possible AONB boundary review. Care will be needed with the treatment of this site bearing this in mind.
34. Site 7 (south of railway, Lodge Lane, Little Chalfont) is located within the Chilterns AONB and this should be reflected in any further iteration of the development plan document. The Board considers that if any pitches were to be considered for this site then the requirement for a full landscape and visual impact assessment to be



undertaken should be incorporated into any further iteration of the development plan document (as previously mentioned this could usefully be incorporated as part of Appendix 1). Furthermore, any existing hedgerows and any screening planting should be retained, maintained and enhanced and this should be suitably conditioned in the future.

35. Site 8 (south of Top Farm, The Lagger, Chalfont St Giles) is located in an area that is currently being investigated in connection with a possible AONB boundary review. Care will be needed with the treatment of this site bearing this in mind.
36. Area 1 (south of Lye Green Road, Chesham) is located in an area that is currently being investigated in connection with a possible AONB boundary review. Care will be needed with the treatment of this area bearing this in mind.
37. The eastern part of Area 3 (Honors Yard, Lodge Lane, Little Chalfont) is located immediately adjacent to the Chilterns AONB and this should be recognised as part of the development plan document. Great care will be needed with the treatment of the site as it sits within the setting of the AONB.
38. Appendix 1 lists a series of broad criteria, detailed criteria and scored criteria. Sites are filtered through these criteria in that order. The Chilterns AONB forms part of the second tier detailed criteria. The Board would prefer to see the nationally designated Chilterns AONB as a significant constraint to development and this would more properly be reflected by the AONB part of the sieving being included in the broad criteria alongside things such as conservation areas and areas of little change. Failing this, the Board considers that the text that exists could usefully be amended to reflect the statutory purpose of the AONB (the requirement for development to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area) and the need to ensure that such development could only be located in the AONB if it did not cause harm to the natural beauty of the area. This should be demonstrated through the requirement for full and proper landscape and visual impact assessments to be undertaken to demonstrate the likely impacts of all schemes. Only if acceptable should mitigation be considered and then any landscaping should benefit the environment generally as well as the site locally and include appropriate native species.

### **Oxfordshire CC Local List of Information Requirements**

39. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this consultation. The Chilterns Conservation Board supports the requirement for the submission of design and access statements in connection with relevant planning applications.
40. The Board welcomes and supports the requirement for the preparation and submission of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments in connection with developments within or visible from the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty within the County.
41. The Board also supports the requirement for the provision of details of any external lighting when proposed.
42. The Board supports the need for the submission of a Noise Impacts Assessment in connection with proposals that raise issues of disturbance to the locality due to noise.

43. General comment – the document is lacklustre and would benefit greatly from the inclusion of illustrations, maps and pictures to highlight specific points.
44. General comment – the document appears to stress the importance of listing buildings as being greater than the adoption of a more proactive approach to identifying and conserving assets, particularly those that are not nationally protected.
45. General comment – the strategy makes no mention of the importance of the setting of heritage assets and this should be addressed.
46. General comment – the strategy includes the use of various terms to describe ‘heritage assets’. It would be useful if a consistent approach was taken and a single term used throughout (preferably ‘heritage assets’).
47. The ‘Introduction to Chiltern District’, paragraph 2.1, could usefully include a specific reference to the primary purpose of the Chilterns AONB – the need to ensure the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the area.
48. The document includes a narrow definition of what a landscape heritage asset is at (principally in paragraph 3.2). Other forms of planting, such as orchards, are key features of the landscape which have great historical importance and are worthy of mention. Surviving historic landscapes (not just individual elements within them) should also be considered. The definitions provided by English Heritage are considered to be more inclusive and should form the basis of the Council’s approach to definitions.
49. The first sentence of paragraph 6.2 appears to be either in the wrong place or incomplete.
50. Paragraph 7.1 requires updating as this year’s Heritage at Risk register includes the Barn at the rear of the George Public House in Great Missenden.
51. The Board welcomes the fact that the Council will aim to work with owners of at risk buildings to try and reach acceptable solutions so that the risks can be removed (paragraph 7.1).
52. It would be helpful, under paragraph 9.2, to explain why Sites of Special Scientific Interest are included in the list.
53. The detail of the Heritage Strategy is contained within paragraphs 10.1 and 10.2. Though these are vital sections they contain very little detail. The Board presumes that paragraph 10.2 in particular will be expanded and strengthened as this contains the key actions arising from the strategy. It would help understanding if the key actions are highlighted throughout the strategy and given numbers of letters where they occur.

### **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 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 1<sup>st</sup> April this year the Board has been consulted on 80 applications and has responded to most of these. There have been 17 formal representations so far this year.
2.     The applications that have resulted in formal representations in 2013/14 include:

**Objections**

- 8 pitch travellers' site, Caddington with later revised plans (approved)
  - Anaerobic digestion plan, Mapledurham (withdrawn)
  - Stables, hardstanding and access track, Ibstone (withdrawn)
  - Access track and hardstanding, Stokenchurch (approved)
  - Replacement of existing temporary mobile home with permanent dwelling, Sarratt (two applications – one withdrawn, one refused)
  - Amendments to change of use of buildings to industrial and storage, Watlington (not yet decided)
  - Crematorium and associated development, Little Kimble (refused)
  - Redevelopment of site with assisted living community, Stokenchurch (not yet decided)
  - 23 dwellings following demolition of buildings on site, Studham (not yet decided though understood to be recommended for approval)
  - 16 dwellings following demolition of buildings on site, Uplands, Cryers Hill (refused)
  - Additional static and mobile caravans and dayroom, Wooburn Moor (not yet decided)
  - 1,050 dwellings and associated development east of Luton (not yet decided)
  - 8 dwellings, Studham (withdrawn)
  - 3Mw solar farm, Ivinghoe (not yet decided)
  - Additional caravans, Dagnall (not yet decided)
3.     The outstanding formal representations are detailed in Appendix 2, and where decisions have been made by the local planning authorities these are detailed.

4. The Committee noted previously that in 2012/13 the number of applications being decided in line with the Board's comments had been less than 40%. Since the last Committee this figure has changed to 55% with 5 applications still to be determined. This situation will continue to be monitored.

**Recommendation**

1. **That the Committee notes and approves the responses made in connection with the applications listed in Appendix 2.**

**APPENDIX 2**

<b>Location</b>	<b>LPA</b>	<b>Development</b>	<b>Ref. No.</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)</b>	<b>Date</b>
Caversham Quarry, Sonning Eye	Oxon CC	Quarry extension	MW.0158 /11	Pending	Object – although outside the AONB the site is within its setting and is clearly visible from the Thames valley sides. The development would involve mineral extraction and site restoration with inert waste over a considerable period of time. There would be lorry movements on roads that lead into the AONB. The LVIA has not taken proper account of the need to consider the setting of the AONB.	26.01.12
Long Meadow Farm, Horton Road, Ivinghoe	AVDC	3Mw photovoltaic solar farm	13/02392 /APP	Pending	Object – application does not contain adequate information by which to judge the likely impacts, LVIA should be submitted (which includes assessment of sites/receptors in the AONB), proposal would have detrimental impacts on users of the AONB, proposal would be industrial scale out of keeping with the area, the proposal could not be screened, glint and glare would be experienced within the AONB, proposal is considered to be contrary to the NPPF, if minded to approve Council should carefully consider the landscaping of the site and the use of matt black finishes for frameworks and supporting structures.	15.10.13
Bell Farm, Studham	CBC	23 dwellings following demolition of buildings on site	CB/13/02 733/FUL L	Pending	Object - The Board considers that the proposal does not accord with the development plan and is considered to be inappropriate in the Green Belt. The scale and form of the development would be likely to have a significantly greater visual impact on the Conservation Area and the Green Belt. This	23.08.13

					would represent a significant adverse impact on the visual amenities of the Chilterns AONB and the Green Belt. The proposed development would extend development onto currently open, undeveloped land. The Board questions the conclusions of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The Board also considers that the design of many of the proposed buildings is bland and that the proposed hipped and half-hipped roofs would not conform to the advice in the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide. It is also considered that a number of the roofs would add to the dominance of the proposal by virtue of the fact that they do not incorporate chimneys. The Board therefore recommends that the Council should refuse this particular planning application.	
Bell Cottages, Studham	CBC	8 dwellings	CB/13/03 212/FUL L	<b>Withdrawn</b> – <b>04.11.13</b>	Object – the proposal does not accord with the development plan, the development is inappropriate in the Green Belt and contrary to policy and no exceptional circumstances have been cited which would override the policy, the development would extend development into open countryside and would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB, no LVIA has been submitted, the site forms an important part of the landscape setting of the Conservation Area, the proposed houses would be on a larger scale than existing development and would impact on the hedgerow on the western boundary of the site and the design of the dwellings is bland and does not conform to advice in the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide.	11.10.13
Valley View, Hemel	CBC	One additional static caravan	CB/13/03 219/FUL	Pending	Object – application is very similar to previous applications and dismissed appeal, no detail is	16.10.13

Hempstead Road, Dagnall		and two additional touring caravans	L		given about the proposed buildings, the development would have a materially greater impact on the AONB, hedge planting is proposed (no detail but site currently has Cypress hedging and extension of this would lead to a further loss in the character of the area) and the development neither conserves nor enhances the natural beauty of the AONB.	
Newland Park, Gorelands Lane, Chalfont St Giles	CDC	Redevelopment of site to provide 326 dwellings, fitness and sports facilities and energy / recycling centre	CH/2010/0976/FA	Pending	Object – the Board does not object to the principle of the proposal and a redevelopment of parts of the site would bring about enhancement of the AONB if undertaken in the most sensitive manner, using the best designs and most appropriate materials. There are elements of detail the Board objects to including: the design and materials for various buildings, the lack of provision of solar pv and solar hot water, provision of extra lighting, the lack of provision of affordable housing, lack of facilities such as shops and employment and lack of public transport provision thus leading to significant amounts of car traffic on minor local roads and the likely impacts of large numbers of lorries on the same roads during construction (to bring materials in and take spoil away).  Revisions to design – object – the revisions do not address the Board’s concerns, in fact despite the changes to the appearance the buildings are all taller and more bulky, also object to inclusion of basements in some buildings (spoil issue) and other objections remain from previous response.	03.11.10  24.01.12
Geary’s Hill, Wigginton Bottom,	DBC	Detached dwelling and annex	4/00490/FUL	<b>Refused</b> <b>22.10.13</b> –	Object – the proposed dwelling is not isolated and is located on a site of about 0.9 hectare, it is considered that the proposal fails to meet the tests	09.04.13

Wigginton					<p>of the NPPF for isolated dwellings in the English country house tradition. The apparent size of the site is further reduced when account is taken of the two rights of way that are within the site. No detail is given about any proposed changes to the. The proposal will neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB, is considered to be contrary to the development plan and AONB Management Plan will not increase the understanding or enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB.</p>	
Luton Airport, Airport Way, Luton	LBC	Proposed alterations and extensions to terminal buildings, car parks and new taxiway	12/01400 /FUL	Pending	<p>Object - the proposal is for development that would allow a doubling in passenger numbers. The upper limit appears to be contrived in order to limit the likely expansion to less than 10mppa and thus negate the need for the application to be considered as a NSIP. The Board is concerned about the future use of London Luton Airport, particularly arising from the overflying of aircraft over the Chilterns AONB, and its setting, both during the day and at night. The application is premature because the proposed form of development and the likely implications have not been incorporated into an adopted national aviation strategy. A significant increase in the number of flights would mean that there would be a significant increase in the frequency of flights leading to a significant decrease in the intervening quiet periods. Average noise levels are likely to rise. The Board is not convinced that the expansion would be taken forward in an environmentally sensitive and sustainable way. The likely impacts on traffic flows on roads within the AONB arising from the traffic associated with</p>	05.02.13



					additional passengers and development pressures cause concern.	
Land south of Cockernhoe and east of Wigmore, east of Luton	NHDC	Mixed use development of up to 1,050 dwellings, retail, education, community facilities, roads, open space and green infrastructure.	13/02000 /1	Pending	Object - The site is extensive and includes parts of two previously identified archaeological areas, is close to a registered historic park and garden and a local wildlife site. The site is within Green Belt and on land previously designated as both countryside and landscape conservation areas. The LVIA that has been undertaken does not properly consider the likely impacts on the area to the east. The playing fields are located in an area that is wholly divorced from the rest of the site and it is likely that lighting would be requested which would lead to detrimental impacts on tranquillity in the area whilst also being clearly visible from within the Chilterns AONB and its setting. The Council has previously recognised the high landscape value of the site and its surroundings. Because the area has high landscape value and a wealth of archaeological and ecological sites of importance it is the subject of consideration as part of a wider area in connection with a possible extension of the Chilterns AONB (which is in close proximity to the area). The LVIA should take account of the possible wider impacts before any decision is made on the application. The current proposal would result in a significant level of development which would fundamentally change the character and appearance of the area to the detriment of the wider landscape. Should the application be approved then the area could not be considered as part of any candidate area for extension of the Chilterns AONB.	07.10.13

Betts Farm, Old Reading Road, Crowmarsh Gifford	SODC	Variation of condition 2 (soft and hard landscaping of P11/W0190)	P11/W19 65	<b>Refused</b> <b>13.11.13</b>	– Object – the proposal would lead to a huge decrease in both the number of trees and the number of shrubs provided as part of the approved development which in turn would mean that the development would be much more prominent in the landscape to the detriment of the natural beauty of the AONB. The original condition was imposed presumably following discussion and was not appealed against. It should therefore be implemented.	20.01.12
Carmel College, Mongewell Park, Mongewell	SODC	Redevelopment to provide 166 dwellings, refurbishment of listed buildings and provision of restaurant, café and swimming pool	P11/W23 57	Pending	Object – proper account is not taken of the NPPF, there is confusion between the many documents that accompany the application, the application does not include a full design and access statement, the design of many of the buildings is inappropriate in the AONB and fails to enhance the natural beauty of the area, the scale and mass of many of the buildings would be greater than the buildings they replace, only previously developed parts of the site should be considered for new buildings, the transport assessment does not take account of the NPPF and fails to deliver a modal shift away from the private car, public transport provision is inadequate, ‘upgrading’ of rights of way are likely to lead to detrimental impacts on users and their enjoyment, closure of the Ridgeway National Trail is objected to, the lighting plan is confusing and likely to lead to an increase in light emissions from the site, there will be significant numbers of HGV movements to the detriment of the character of the narrow local roads, renewable energy generation is not adequately addressed, the proposal does not conform to the Local Plan or emerging Core	02.08.12



					consider that users of the ancient right of way should be displaced into a field for 500m for the sake of the commercial benefit of Lys Mill. The existing right of way along the Icknield Way should therefore remain and its condition and character should not deteriorate any further.	
The Mulberry Bush, Dawes Lane, Sarratt	TRDC	Permanent agricultural workers' dwelling	13/1345/ FUL	<b>Refused</b> <b>25.10.13</b>	– Object – should an agricultural workers' dwelling be considered appropriate then careful thought should be given to the siting and design. Previous advice has been given about this but has not been taken on board. The Board objects to: the scale of the dwelling which would be prominent (it should be reduced in height to no more than 5m); the height of the building could be reduced by using slate and lowering the roof height; there is confusion in the application documents as the use of flint is referred to in a letter but not detailed in plans or in the design statement (any flintwork should dominate the façade that it is part of and the flintwork should adhere to the Board's technical note on flint); excavation and land raising are proposed but insufficient detail is provided to enable the implications to be assessed.	08.08.13
Doe Hill Farm, Little Kimble	WDC	Crematorium, access road, parking and garden areas	13/06615 /FUL	<b>Refused</b> <b>29.10.13</b>	– Object - The proposal would lead to the urbanisation of an area of currently undeveloped open countryside well beyond the confines of any settlement, to the detriment of the landscape and the users of the many public rights of way in the vicinity of the site. This is the wrong development on the wrong site. The proposal would lead to the destruction of a significant number of very important and mature trees as well as a significant length of hedgerow. The use of the site would lead to significant detrimental impacts on other users of	08.08.13

					the local highway. Should the council determine that the application should be approved then various conditions ought to be applied including - the requirement for any flint work to be undertaken in accordance with the Board's technical advice; the requirement for any lighting to be the absolute minimum required for the safe use of the site and which should be fully assessed and adequately controlled, and any trees and hedgerow lost should be replaced with a significant number of appropriate alternatives which should be subject to long term, adequately funded, maintenance. An archaeological assessment should be undertaken.	
Uplands House Hotel, Four Ashes Road, Cryers Hill	WDC	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 16 dwellings	13/06432 /FUL	<b>Refused 07.11.13</b> –	Object - The buildings respect the site and surroundings, have documented historic and architectural interest, are worthy of retention in their own right and should be considered as non-designated heritage assets. They could be sympathetically refurbished and/or redeveloped for a number of different uses, which should all be thoroughly investigated and reported. The design of the proposed buildings does not accord with the principles established in the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and the Supplementary Technical Notes on Chilterns building materials. Little detail is given about potential lighting. The proposed development would lead to a reduction in the openness of the Green Belt and would result in a significant change in the character of the site. The Board objects to the loss of employment and the consequent loss of the associated community and tourist facility. The current use should be subject to marketing once again. The site is remote and its development would lead to a significant number of	10.09.13

					car-borne journeys. Should the application be approved then various conditions ought to be applied including the following: flint work should be undertaken in accordance with the Board's technical advice; brick work should be undertaken using a brick bond other than stretcher bond; lighting should be the absolute minimum required for the safe use of the site, and any trees and hedgerow lost should be replaced with a significant number of appropriate alternatives which should be subject to long term, adequately funded, maintenance.	
The Wycliffe Centre, Horsleys Green	WDC	Demolition of existing buildings and erection of supported living community	13/06772 /FUL	Pending	Object - The siting and bulk of the clubhouse and siting of the dementia suite will lead to detrimental impacts on users of the adjacent public right of way. The bulk could be reduced by removing one of the floors and moving both buildings to the east. Many of the replacement buildings are significantly taller than the buildings that they will replace due to extra floors being included. A 44% increase in gross external area leads to detrimental impacts on the landscape. The development would not conform with Policy GB9 of the Local Plan. The Board objects to the balconies that are featured on block A, as they would be incongruous, and the use of clay pantiles. Objection is made to the use of flint as no detail is given about the form or appearance of the flintwork. There is limited detail about the form and location of lighting, which should be kept to the absolute minimum for safety purposes and strictly controlled. The removal of trees and hedge plants should be carefully assessed and adequate replacement trees and hedge plants should be included as part of the	20.09.13

					proposal. Should the council determine that the application should be approved then various conditions ought to be applied including the following: flintwork should be undertaken in accordance with the Board's technical; any lighting should be the absolute minimum required for the safe use of the site and adequately controlled, and any trees and hedgerow lost should be replaced with a significant number of appropriate alternatives which should be subject to long term, adequately funded, maintenance.	
Sanfoin Farm, Riding Lane, Wooburn Moor	WDC	1 additional static caravan, 1 additional touring caravan, day room and land forming works	13/06927 /FUL	Pending	Object – The proposed caravans and building have no architectural merit and take no account of the local distinctiveness of the AONB, do not conform to the advice in the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. The development does not accord with local plan policy, the NPPF, the Council's Core Strategy and the AONB Management Plan. The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the enjoyment of users of the AONB and their appreciation of the protected landscape. The Council should seek information about the proposed levelling of part of the site and the importation of topsoil.	20.09.13