



Planning Committee

10.00 a.m. Wednesday 30th November 2011
The Chilterns Conservation Board office,
90 Station Road, Chinnor

Agenda

1. Election of Chairman
2. Apologies
3. Public Question Time
4. Declarations of Interest
5. Minutes of Previous Meeting
6. Matters Arising
7. High Speed 2 – update
8. Planning Conference – feedback
9. Planning Forum – feedback and update on visits to authorities
10. Planning Training for Parish and Town Councils
11. Student research project (internet land sales) – update
12. Development Plans Responses
13. Planning Applications – update
14. Any Urgent Business
15. Date of Next Meeting

Wednesday 8th February 2012 at The Chilterns Conservation Board office, 90 Station Road, Chinnor, OX39 4HA

Future meetings – **16th May, 5th September and 28th November 2012**

Item 1 **Election of Chairman**

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisations: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Special allowance of £816 per year.

Summary: The Planning Committee is required to elect a chairman. The re-appointment for this position will take place annually following the Board's Annual General Meeting.

Purpose or report: To elect a Chairman.

Background

1. The Planning Committee should elect a chairman at its first meeting following the Annual General Meeting (which took place on 19th October 2011). Until the chairman is elected the Planning Officer will chair the meeting.
2. Nominations can be made either before the meeting, by notifying the Planning Officer, or at the meeting itself. If there is more than one nomination there will be a ballot of the Board members present. The Standing Order on regulating meetings states that votes should be determined by a show of hands.
3. In the event of a tie names will be drawn from a hat by the Planning Officer.
4. The Standing Orders do not require the appointment of a Vice Chairman. Should it be necessary for a temporary (deputy) Chairman to be appointed for any particular meeting, the election can place at that meeting.

Recommendation

1. **That the Planning Committee nominates and elects a chairman to serve until the Board's next Annual General Meeting.**

Item 5 Minutes of Previous Meeting

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisations: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Approximately £600 a year for minute-taker plus staff time

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

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

Background

1. The draft minutes from the meeting on 7th September 2011 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 7th September 2011.**



**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CHILTERNES CONSERVATION BOARD
PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON WEDNESDAY 7TH SEPTEMBER 2011 AT THE
CHILTERNES CONSERVATION BOARD OFFICE, STATION ROAD, CHINNOR,
COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM AND CONCLUDING AT 12.40 PM**

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Member

Appointing Body

Appointed by Local Authorities

Cllr Roger Emmett	Wycombe District Council
Cllr Brian Norman	Three Rivers District Council
Cllr Ian Reay	Dacorum Borough Council (observing)
Cllr Chris Richards	Aylesbury Vale District Council
Cllr Bill Storey	Hertfordshire County Council

Appointed by the Secretary of State

Mike Fox	(Chairman of the Board, observing)
Bettina Kirkham	
Ray Payne	(observing)

Elected by Parish Councils

Cllr Barbara Wallis (Chairman)	Buckinghamshire Parish Councils
--------------------------------	---------------------------------

OTHERS PRESENT

Co-opted Members

Gill Gowing	Retired planner
Mike Stubbs	The National Trust

Officers

Steve Rodrick	Chilterns Conservation Board (observing)
Colin White	Chilterns Conservation Board

Others

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

1. Apologies

Cllr David Barnard, North Herts District Council, Cllr Margaret Jarrett, Hertfordshire Parish Councils and John Willson, Secretary of State appointee (Board Members).

2. Public Question Time

No members of the public were present.

3. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

4. Minutes of the previous meeting

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

5. Matters Arising from the minutes

- The Planning Policy Guidelines will remain as an agenda item for the foreseeable future.
- Item 7 – The position statement on development affecting the setting of the AONB was adopted by the Board in June. Wycombe District Council has mentioned that although it is not a statutory document, it is a material consideration and where appropriate it will be used alongside existing policies to assess planning applications affecting the setting of the Chilterns AONB.
- Item 10 – The Design Award Ceremony went well.
- Item 13 – The Planning Committee Tour visited Sonning and went on a boat trip, which gave a different view of the AONB. In Goring they were given an update on the hydro project. They also visited the Wellesbourne site in High Wycombe, this site is not in the AONB, but abuts it. The tour was very useful and put the issues of boundaries into context.

6. Draft National Planning Policy Framework

The Planning Officer reported the proposed response to the consultation on the Draft National Planning Policy Framework, which will replace current Planning Policy and Minerals Policy statements and Planning Policy Guidance notes.

The policy texts have been significantly reduced though some important details have been lost. A number of areas are specifically commented on in the proposed response. This has been circulated to other AONBs and the Planning Officer will contribute to a NAAONB response. The draft NPPF had previously been circulated to members. The draft responses made were in the context of the AONB.

The meeting debated the responses and the Planning Officer will update his text to incorporate individual comments in connection with paragraphs 14, 16, 17, 19, 55 and 81 and will circulate the revised draft response for comments.

One of the issues that arose in discussion was the implication for the AONB and its boundary of an increase in development pressures in the setting of the AONB. It was considered that this should be looked at in some detail by a sub-group of the Committee.

- 1. The Committee APPROVED the proposed response to the Draft National Planning Policy Framework consultation as amended following discussions at the Committee.**
- 2. The Committee APPROVED the creation of a sub-group of the Committee to assess the likely implications arising from the NPPF and any potential AONB boundary review.**
- 3. The Committee NOTED that the Draft NPPF will be considered by the Board at its next meeting.**

7. High Speed 2 - update

There continues to be a significant amount of activity in connection with the HS2 proposal following the public consultation exercise, a response was sent in connection with this. The Chief Officer and Ray Payne reported on the presentation made to the Transport Select Committee on the 6th September.

The Planning Officer also updated the Committee on some of the other latest developments and recent activity in connection with HS2.

A lobby day will be held in London in late November or early December. A government response to the consultation is expected late this year or early next year.

A new e-petition was mentioned as well as a website that could be used to send messages to MPs. The links for these are:

<http://epetitions.direct.gov.uk/petitions/353> and <http://www.highspeedrail.org.uk/>

The Chairman thanked the Chief Officer and Ray Payne for their contributions.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the report and updates given.**

8. Chilterns AONB Planning Forum

The next Chilterns AONB Planning Forum will take place on 18th November at Aylesbury Vale DC offices.

To re-invigorate the Forum it is intended that the Chairman and the Planning Officer do a tour of the Chilterns local planning authorities to try and encourage the local authorities to attend. There would be a focus on those authorities that have not sent officers recently.

It was considered appropriate to badge the event as CPD compliant and to encourage officers accordingly.

With the publication of the Draft NPPF it would be appropriate to take stock and define a common message from local planning authorities within the Chilterns. There will also be an opportunity to discuss the associated issues of the Localism Bill, neighbourhood planning, the new green spaces designation and the role of the design guide.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the arrangements for the next Chilterns AONB Planning Forum which take place on Friday 18th November 2011 at the Aylesbury Vale DC Gateway offices in Aylesbury.**
- 2. The Committee AGREED that the Chairman and the Planning Officer should do a tour of the Chilterns local authorities to re-invigorate the Forum.**

9. Chilterns AONB Planning Conference 2011

The Planning Officer reported that the 9th Annual Chilterns AONB Planning Conference will be taking place on Wednesday 5th October at Berkhamsted Civic Centre.

Speakers will focus on hydro-power, various renewable energy initiatives, some over-arching national renewable energy issues, sustainability measures at a National Trust property, wood fuel and the problem of extracting wood in protected landscapes and a detailed talk about renewable energy in protected landscapes. The Planning Officer asked Committee members to promote the event. The programme and booking forms will be widely circulated.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the arrangements for the 9th AONB Planning Conference.**
- 2. The Committee to AGREED to promote the conference as widely as possible.**

10. Proposed student research project – implications of internet land sales

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that in the past the Board had been made aware of a number of large agricultural sites where land had been sold off in small plots. With numerous owners, management becomes much more difficult and there are various implications that could be closely examined as part of a student research project.

Some possible sites that could be investigated were mentioned including Lodge Lane at Little Chalfont (Tracey Francis is the contact at Chiltern DC) and Rocky Lane at Wendover (next to a vacated employment site).

Oxford Brookes University has been approached and an appropriate student would be approached at the start of the coming academic year and invited to

undertake a project for an MSc.

The Planning Officer will provide an update at the next planning committee and the matter will be reported at the next Board meeting.

- 1. The Committee APPROVED the setting up of a student project to assess the implications for the AONB of the subdivision of agricultural land on large sites into smaller plots.**
- 2. The Committee NOTED that it would be updated at its next meeting and that the matter would be reported to the next Board meeting.**

11. Development Plans Responses

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that one response had been sent in connection with the DCLG public consultation on Planning for Travellers Sites.

- 1. The Committee NOTED and APPROVED the response already made on behalf of the Board in connection with the consultation exercise on the development plan document as detailed above.**

12. Planning Applications Update

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

This year details of 76 planning applications or appeals were brought to the attention of, or requested by, the Planning Officer. 63 of these had been responded to, with 8 formal representations (7 objections and 1 support). Of the 4 applications thus far determined 2 are in line with the Board's comments and 2 are not in line.

Following the previous Committee meeting it is understood that Wycombe District Council has now distanced itself from the proposals for the stadium and associated sports village development at High Wycombe. Councillor Emmett (Wycombe District Council) gave a brief update on the position.

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

13. Any Urgent Business

There was no urgent business.

14. Date of the next meeting

Wednesday 30th November 2011 at the office of the Chilterns Conservation Board, 90 Station Rd, Chinnor commencing at 10.00 am.

Future meetings: 7th March, 16th May (please note change of date) and 5th September 2012

The meeting closed 12.40

The Chairman

Date

Item 7 High Speed 2 update

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: The Transport Select Committee has published its report on HS2, this was discussed at the wider HS2 group meeting and the Government's decision about how to proceed is awaited.

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. Though the consultation period on HS2 closed a number of weeks ago there is still much activity in connection with HS2.
2. The Government appointed a new Secretary of State for Transport (Justine Greening) on 14th October. She has been contacted by local groups in connection with HS2, the need for a national transport strategy and aviation issues.
3. Following a number of hearing sessions (one of which was attended by the Board's Chief Officer on 6th September) the Transport Select Committee published its report on 8th November.
4. The wider HS2 Group met on 8th November and the discussion focussed on the Select Committee's report. The following comments and recommendations from the report were discussed:
 - Though the Committee concluded that a high speed rail network should be developed this should be part of a national transport strategy which details how HS2 fits into the Government's wider aviation strategy.
 - Any investment in HS2 should not be at the cost of investment in other parts of the rail network.
 - If high speed rail is to realise its full potential the Government's plans for HS2 must be accompanied by complementary regional and local strategies for transport, housing, skills and employment.
 - Much more detail and evidence is needed on the financial case for HS2.
 - The emphasis on a very high speed line has ruled out other options including the opportunity to follow existing transport corridors.
 - The economic case that is the basis for HS2 is not universally accepted and the updated economic case should provide a comparative assessment on the basis of reduced crowding with a lower value attached to time savings.
 - The claim that HS2 would reduce carbon emissions is rejected.

- There is a recommendation that the second phase (the 'Y' network north of Birmingham) should be subject to an urgent strategic appraisal before a final decision is made on the first phase.
 - Because detailed assessments have not been undertaken it is difficult to be clear about the precise scale of the environmental impacts or the effectiveness of mitigation measures. The revised business plan should take account of the new approach to economic appraisal which places a monetary value on natural capital.
 - More work is needed on the spur or direct link via Heathrow to better understand the pros and cons of different options.
 - If the Government decides to proceed with HS2 it must explain in detail not just why it favours a particular scheme but why that scheme is better than others (including those put forward by its own advisers).
 - The Government should publish full details of the technical basis for its assertion that 18 trains per hour, or more, is feasible.
 - The formal minutes for the Committee clearly show that it was split on many issues.
5. The Government will make a decision about which way to proceed with HS2 in the coming weeks. In the meantime the survey and interpretation work that the Board has been undertaking will continue. This will be vital if the decision is to proceed to a hybrid bill.
 6. Any change in the situation will be reported to the Committee in the future.

Recommendation

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

Item 8 Chilterns AONB Planning Conference – Feedback

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: £1,200 and staff time.

Summary: The Chilterns AONB Planning Conference took place recently and feedback has been provided.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about the feedback from the Chilterns AONB Planning Conference and to propose a date for the 2012 Conference.

Background

1. The 9th Chilterns AONB Planning Conference took place on Wednesday 5th October at the Berkhamsted Civic Centre. A series of talks were given in connection with the following theme – ‘Renewable energy and protected landscapes – a conflict of interests?’ A visit was also made to the HG Matthews brickyard at Bellingdon to see how various sustainability measures have been put into practice.
2. Feedback forms were issued as part of the information that was given out to delegates. In all there were 45 attendees from various organisations including: 14 parish and town councils; 4 Chiltern local planning authorities; Natural England, The National Trust; CPRE and 2 other AONBs as well as Board members and speakers. 24 different organisations were represented.
3. The feedback that was given was very positive overall. The following specific comments were made:
 - *Is there a venue that is easier to get to by public transport?* The venue for the conference is chosen each year and moved around the Chilterns to try and give a good geographic coverage from one year to the next. There are not many places that can be chosen that do not have some sort of access issue – this year the car parking issue was highlighted when confirmations were sent out and encouragement was given for using public transport (Berkhamsted is well served by public transport).
 - *The very negative introduction was re-balanced by an excellent mix of presentations which took a positive approach to renewable energy whilst not conceding the challenges and disbenefits.* Comments are noted though it is considered that the introduction that was given was in itself balanced when taking account of the purpose of the AONB.
 - *The price is reaching prohibitive levels for self-funding individuals.* The Board has charged roughly the same fee each year since at least 2006. This was £35 for all delegates in 2006 (which increased to £50 in 2007 then dropped to £40 in 2008) compared to £30 for Parish and Town Councils and £45 for others plus a £5 contribution to the cost of a coach in 2011. When compared to similar events organised by others including the RTPPI the cost of the Board’s conference is only about 10%. This is considered to represent very good value for money.

- *How is the price calculated, how are costs broken down, is it intended to break even and are speaker's costs significant?* The price has been worked up based on the need to try and break even, and if possible generate a small amount of income. The conference has a budget of £1,200 and this year it is understood that £1,150 will have been generated in income compared to about £1,050 in costs. Speaker costs are not significant and usually only cover expenses when requested. Other costs cover venue hire, catering and coach hire (the fee for which never covers costs).
 - *Very useful for networking with Councils and others.* This comment is welcomed and noted.
 - *Name badges would have been useful.* This comment is noted and will be acted on for next year when it is suggested that we simply print out labels with name and organisation on.
 - The field trip comments were all very positive with many making the point that they found the trip inspirational and fascinating, though it could have been linked more closely to the theme of the day. The field trip was chosen because it was considered to address some of the points that were likely to have been raised during the morning session.
4. Various suggestions were made for new topics including the rural economy and business, conservation and agri-environment schemes linked to biodiversity, local regeneration issues, local food production and farm diversification. These will be borne in mind when preparing for next year's conference.
 5. Each year delegates are asked about the frequency and format of the conference. Nearly all people suggested that the conference should be held each year (with a couple of people suggesting that it should be every two years and one suggesting that it should be every 6 months). Based on the level of support for keeping the frequency as it is, it is proposed that the 10th Annual Chilterns AONB Planning Conference should be held on Wednesday 3rd October 2012 (all other details to be finalised in the future).
 6. Most people who answered the question about the format of the conference suggested that it should be kept the same. Two people thought that there should be speakers only with no site visits. The site visits have always been regarded as very useful (this year in particular) and it is considered that they should remain in the future.

Recommendations

1. **That the Committee notes the feedback from the Planning Conference and that the issues raised in paragraph 3 are addressed for any future conference.**
2. **That the Committee agrees that the 10th Annual Chilterns AONB Planning Conference should take place on Wednesday 3rd October 2012.**

Item 9 Chilterns Planning Forum – Feedback

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: The most recent AONB Planning Forum took place on 18th November. Feedback is provided from this event and also from the recent visits that the Chairman of the Committee and Planning Officer have made to several of the Chilterns local planning authorities.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about the feedback from the recent AONB Planning Forum and visits made to local planning authorities.

Background

1. The most recent AONB Planning Forum took place on Friday 18th November at the Aylesbury Vale District Council's Gateway Offices in Aylesbury. The District Council kindly allowed us to use a room and provided refreshments without charge to the Board.
2. The Forum was attended by 14 people with 8 of the Chilterns local planning authorities being represented. Those present discussed the format and attendance at the forum, the terms of reference that had been circulated, the implications of the draft national planning policy framework, the Localism Act (in particular neighbourhood planning, green space and role of the Design Guide), future events and the proposed position statement on renewable energy.
3. The key points arising from the discussions are as follows:
 - The forum represented a good opportunity to exchange views with the Board and with other local authorities.
 - The Terms of Reference were appropriate but with the struggle to get people at both the Planning Forum and the Environment Forum it was felt that forthcoming discussions about merging the two forums should dictate the way forward.
 - There was overwhelming support for a combined 'Planning and Environment' forum which could meet about 3 times a year with one meeting possibly including an element of learning via a field trip. This would enable more officers and members to commit to attending.
 - It was stressed that councillors should be attending the annual Chilterns AONB Forum.
 - It was felt that it would be useful to hear about what each local planning authority is doing in connection with development plans as they are all at different stages and could learn from each other. It was proposed that a schedule be circulated for discussion.
 - It would also be easy to circulate such information electronically via a 'virtual' forum.

- Some issues arising from the draft NPPF were discussed including the weight that may be given to various stages of a plan, the need for a period of grace to allow authorities to get plans in place (it may be two years from adoption of the NPPF), the lack of policy in connection with the use of landscape character assessments for those areas that were previously covered by local landscape designations and are not covered by designated landscapes and the lack of a proper definition of what sustainable development actually is.
 - There are various places that are pushing ahead with neighbourhood plans including Woodcote, Caddington and Slip End, Thame, Buckingham and an area in Hemel Hempstead. Other areas have also expressed an interest including Berkhamsted, Tring and Sarratt though have not progressed thus far. There appears to be some confusion about what the intentions are and when there is more knowledge about the likely push for greater growth being required the desire diminishes. Various organisations have been set up to help communities get involved and others are helping where they can (CPRE for instance). Broadland District Council has produced a note that is useful (see <http://www.eelga.gov.uk/documents/Policy%20and%20Priorities/Broadland%20DC%20Neighbourhood%20Planning%20Guidance.pdf> for more information).
 - In connection with the new green spaces designation it was felt that a number of authorities are already protecting these and that there is unlikely to be a massive change. The confusion over not allowing such a designation in the green belt was also highlighted.
 - It was generally felt that the use of the Chilterns Buildings Design would continue and it was likely to be all right even though there is a push for less guidance and control.
 - The proposed renewable energy position statement was discussed in some detail. A comment was made that it should be a balanced approach and should not be too negative. This is clearly the way that the statement would be drafted but it must be in accordance with the purpose of the AONB and the Management Plan. It was felt that some kind of assessment of capacity would be useful though it was recognised that this was unlikely due to prohibitive costs. It was suggested that a countywide study in Hertfordshire should be referred to as well as other advice that may be available.
 - The proposed guidance on building design and adaptation for climate change was also discussed. Various pieces of advice and websites were suggested as sources of information that should be investigated prior to drafting.
 - It was felt that should the forum continue then a meeting in May would probably be appropriate.
4. The number of local authorities represented at this forum was good. This may have been in part due to the visits that the Chairman and Planning Officer have been making. Thus far Hertfordshire County Council, Central Bedfordshire Council, Three Rivers District Council and Dacorum Borough Council have been visited with a meeting scheduled for Wycombe District Council.
 5. Some of the key issues raised at those meetings were discussed at the forum, in particular the need to consider combining the Planning and Environment forums (this is to be discussed separately and the outcomes will be reported to the Committee at the

meeting) and the fact that the authorities are all struggling with resources and the time taken for such meetings is hard to find.

6. The importance of the Board's forum meetings is accepted and the authorities seen so far have all agreed to send officers and members when able to do so. The offer of the Board's planning officer undertaking member or officer training was made to all authorities and in some cases this is likely to happen shortly.
7. The 'duty to cooperate' emerging from the NPPF and Localism Act was discussed and it was recognised that the forums presented ideal opportunities to meet with neighbouring authorities to discuss common issues that may be relevant.
8. In order to try and get authorities engaged it was felt that it may be advantageous to host a future event and that if this was moved amongst the authorities it would help those that consider themselves to be more peripheral to attend. Another way would be by asking an officer to do something specific.
9. Useful updates were provided about the various local authority development plans.
10. The AONB boundary was also discussed with a request being made that any information about possible reviews be sent through to the Planning Officer.
11. Visits are still to be arranged for most of the local planning authorities and these will be sorted out shortly and should take place early in 2012.

Recommendations

1. **That the Committee notes the feedback from the AONB Planning Forum and discussion about the combining of the Planning and Environment Forums.**
2. **That the Committee notes the outcomes of the recent visits made to Chilterns local planning authorities by the Chairman and Planning Officer.**

Item 10 Planning Training for Parish and Town Councils

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: The Board has offered planning training for Parish and Town Councils on two occasions in the past and it is considered appropriate for this to happen once again in 2012.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about the proposals for a short series of events to bring about planning training for Parish and Town Councils in the AONB in the summer of 2012.

Background

1. The Board offered to undertake planning training for Parish and Town Councils in 2008 and 2010. The feedback from those events (3 were held in 2008 and 2 in 2010) was that the training was very worthwhile and should be continued. The feedback that was previously given will be investigated prior to the events to ensure any key issues are addressed.
2. It is proposed that training events be organised in the southern, central and northern sections of the AONB to take place during three evenings between 26th June and 5th July 2012.
3. The Planning Officer will investigate the availability of village halls and make bookings accordingly, though any suggestions for locations made by the Committee would be welcomed. If members of the Committee have preferences for particular dates these can be taken account of. Other Board members will also be approached for help in introducing the events as well as setting up and clearing up.
4. It is suggested that the events should be based on the format of previous events with two presentations being made (one from the Board's Planning Officer and one from a local authority Planning Officer) either side of a break and with plenty of opportunities for questions and discussion. The sessions should start at 6.45pm with refreshments and end at 9.00pm.
5. The Planning Officer will approach key local planning authority officers and any help from members of the Committee in organising the events and setting up on the days would be gratefully received.
6. With the enactment of the Localism Act and likelihood of adoption of the National Planning Policy Framework there will be a number of different subjects that will be of particular relevance to the intended audience. These include neighbourhood planning, protection of green spaces and use of the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide in particular.
7. The Board is also likely to have started the process of review of the Management Plan and this could also be discussed. If the Committee has any additional or alternative suggestions these can be taken account of in the programming.

8. The events will have to be self-financing and it is proposed that a nominal charge (probably about £10 per attendee) be made to cover the costs of hire of village halls and refreshments (tea, coffee, fruit juice, water and biscuits only). In previous years the issue of charging was raised and this did not produce a negative response.
9. It is proposed that greater detail be provided at the next meeting of the Committee so that the events can be promoted accordingly.

Recommendations

1. **That the Committee approves the setting up of a series of three training events for Parish and Town Councils in the AONB for early summer 2012.**
2. **That the Committee suggests possible locations, topics and presenters for the events.**

Item 11 **Proposed student research project – implications of internet land sales**

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: The implications of internet land sales have previously been discussed by the Committee and the setting up of a proposed student research project was approved at the last Committee.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about progress with a proposed student research project which would assess the implications of the sub-division of plots of land which are then sold on to numerous individuals.

Background

1. At the last Planning Committee it was resolved that a proposed student research project should be set up to investigate the implications of internet land sales on the natural beauty of the AONB.
2. The Planning Officer had previously approached Oxford Brookes University and it is understood that students were going to be invited to undertake such a project towards the award of a planning related M.Sc.
3. As a result of the previous approaches Phil Turner from Oxford Brookes was understood to have been seeing students on 22nd November. However, to date he has not informed the Planning Officer about any possible names. A verbal update will be given to the Committee when it meets.
4. Should a suitable student be found to undertake the research the Planning Officer will meet them (with Phil Turner and possibly Mike Stubbs) to take this forward. Any updates will be given to future meetings of the Committee.

Recommendation

1. **That the Committee notes the current position in connection with the proposed student research project.**

Item 12 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: **Wycombe DC** LDF Draft Delivery and Site Allocations DPD and Position Statement on Housing and Land for Business (July 2011), **Buckinghamshire** Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Submission DPD and **Oxfordshire** Draft Minerals and Waste Plans.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about, and approve, 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.

Wycombe DC – LDF Draft Delivery and Site Allocations DPD and Position Statement on Housing and Land for Business (July 2011)

Draft Delivery and Site Allocations Document

1. Page 19 – The Board supports Policy DSA9 on Green Networks and Infrastructure.
2. Page 22 – The Board supports Policies DSA10 (Green Spaces) and DSA11 (Protection and Enhancement of Sites, Habitats and Species of Biodiversity and Geodiversity Importance).
3. Page 24 – The Board supports Policy DSA12 Biodiversity in Development.
4. Page 25 – The Board supports Policy DSA13 Protection and Enhancement of River and Stream Corridors.
5. Various pages – The Board welcomes and supports Policies HWTC1 (Delivering the Town Centre Vision), HWTC3 (Public Realm), HWTC12 (Swan Frontage), HWTC18 (Oxford Road Roundabout), HWTC20 (Baker Street), HW1 (Desborough Delivery and Design Framework), HW2 (Delivering New Open Space and River Corridor Improvements) particularly as they apply to the de-culverting and improvement of the River Wye and its corridor.

Position Statement on Housing and Land for Business

6. The Board accepts that the position statement is not a consultation document in itself but has the following comments to make on the text as currently drafted.

7. The Board welcomes the many references to the Chilterns AONB and the requirement to ensure that the natural beauty of the area is properly taken account of. However, in connection with PS8 (RAF Daws Hill) on page 20, and as stated in connection with previous consultations on the subject, the Board would be very concerned about any widening and other perceived 'improvements' (including passing places) to Winchbottom Lane as these are likely to lead to a fundamental change in the character of the road and an increase in the incidence of rat running. The Board cannot see how changes could be introduced without detrimental impacts on that character.
8. Pages 22 and 23 – The Board welcomes the references to the need to minimise impacts on the Chilterns AONB arising from the developments at Cressex Island (PS9 page 22) and Handy Cross Sports Centre (PS10 page 23).
9. Page 26 – In connection with PS13 (Picts Lane, Princes Risborough), the Board welcomes the requirement that the development should incorporate high quality building design respecting the location of the site adjacent to the AONB. This should apply to all development on the site, not just the housing element.
10. Pages 28 and 29 – PS14 (Springbank House, Lane End) and PS15 (T and L works) are concerned with developments in Lane End. This settlement is wholly within the Chilterns AONB and any development should conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. This requirement is not reflected in the text on pages 28 and 29, though is incorporated into the text for PS16 (Culver Graphics) which is also in Lane End and PS17 (Molins, Saunderton) which are also within the AONB.
11. Page 32 – PS19 (Former Stokenchurch First School, Stokenchurch) is another site that is in a settlement that is wholly within the AONB, and again the development should conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. This requirement is not reflected in the text on page 32.

Buckinghamshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy Submission DPD

Response of the Chilterns Conservation Board

12. Vision (page 15) – The Board generally welcomes the vision though considers that the County's environment and environmental assets should be 'conserved and enhanced' rather than 'protected and enhanced' in order to comply with the terminology applicable to AONBs as detailed in the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and Planning Policy Statement 7. The Board considers that this should be changed and that it is likely to require consequent changes for other sections of the Core Strategy.
13. Strategic Objectives (page 17) – The Board considers that Strategic Objectives 9 (Protection of the Green Belt and AONB) and 10 (Protecting and Enhancing the Environment) collectively fail to properly address the Council's statutory duties in connection with the Chilterns AONB. The Board therefore suggests that a specific Strategic Objective should be included which seeks the 'conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB' in connection with any minerals and waste development within the AONB or its setting. This would then ensure compliance with the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and Planning Policy Statement 7. The Board considers that this should be changed and that it is likely to require consequent changes for other sections of the Core Strategy where the Strategic Objectives are referred to.

14. The Minerals Planning Strategy (page 21) and Policy CS3 (Non-Aggregate Minerals Working) (page 28) – The Board welcomes the fact that the Council is seeking to continue to support the Chiltern brick industry in maintaining a supply of material to meet the demand for traditional Chiltern Bricks. Paragraphs 3.17 to 3.19 on page 27 and 3.22 on page 28, which cover the same issue, are also welcomed. Please note that footnote 28 at the bottom of page 27 should refer to the ‘Chilterns AONB Management Plan’ not ‘Chiltern AONB Management Plan’ and should equally refer to the ‘Chilterns Conservation Board’ not ‘Chilterns conservation Board’.
15. Map 3 (page 24) and Policy CS1 (Minerals Safeguarding, page 25) – The Board accepts that sand and gravel can only be won from where they are located. However, the Board objects to the simplified drawing of the Minerals Safeguarding Area in the south of the County due to the fact that a large part of this (in the north and north west) is located within the Chilterns AONB. Extraction of minerals should be avoided in this location (and MPS1 clearly recognises the importance of nationally protected landscapes, see paragraphs 9 and 14) and for the avoidance of confusion and doubt the Board recommends that the MSA should be re-drawn to exclude that part of the Chilterns AONB which is currently covered. The inclusion of this area is at odds with the text that appears in paragraph 5.27 (page 70) which states that ‘it is not anticipated that development will take place in this part of the AONB and there is no presumption that planning permission for winning or working of mineral resources will be granted’. The Board considers that Map 3 and Policy CS1 do not comply with the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, Minerals Policy Statement 1 and Planning Policy Statement 7 and that they should be amended accordingly. Should the County Council require definitive AONB Boundary information then either the Conservation Board or Natural England can provide the necessary definitive maps.
16. Policy CS5 (Preferred Areas) (page 31) – The Board welcomes the stance taken by the Council in connection with preferred areas and the Chilterns AONB (the avoidance of locations within or in conflict with the objectives of the AONB). However, to comply with terminology used in the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and Planning Policy Statement 7 the word ‘objectives’ should be deleted and replaced by ‘purposes’. The Board considers that this should be changed.
17. The Waste Planning Strategy (page 35), paragraphs 4.55 and 4.56 (page 53) and Policies CS12 (page 55) and CS20 (page 69) – The Board had previously expressed support for the waste option that involved Calvert and Wapseys Wood rather than an intensification of uses at High Heavens and London Road, Amersham (which are both within the AONB) and College Road North, Aston Clinton (which is outside the AONB but visible from it) because it was considered that the latter alternative would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB and could not be delivered without significant detrimental impacts on the AONB and its enjoyment that could not be overcome. The Board has recently been notified of planning applications at both High Heavens and London Road. The two sites are markedly different and whilst the High Heavens proposal is not considered to have a significant detrimental impact on the natural beauty of the AONB and was therefore not commented on by the Board, the proposal for London Road, Amersham would involve a very large, utilitarian building with a significant level of traffic generation neither of which would conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. The Board cannot see how the detrimental impact of these

issues could be addressed whilst retaining such a facility at this site and considers that these matters would not be addressed through application of the relevant policy in the Core Strategy (CS21). This serves to illustrate the point that without significant levels of detail some principles could be established that do not meet the purposes of the AONB. The Board therefore objects to the waste transfer station at London Road, Amersham on the basis that its development: would not be consistent with Policy CS21; would be in conflict with the purposes of the AONB and would not comply with the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and Planning Policy Statement 7. Whilst the Core Strategy identifies that there would be detrimental impacts on the AONB it does not say how these could be addressed. The Board is aware that a number of different sites were considered but feels that options for development outside and not affecting the AONB not have been fully considered. The Board is also concerned about the potential cumulative impact arising from this proposal when taken with the possibility that there could be numerous new local sites for recycling and composting (Policy CS10).

18. Paragraphs 5.24 to 5.30 (pages 69 to 71) and Policy CS21 (page 71) – These are all concerned with the Chilterns AONB. The Board welcomes the inclusion of the policy and supporting text. However, as stated in comments made in connection with other paragraphs and policies there is a need for the Council and its Core Strategy to have due regard to the purpose of the AONB (conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the area) and for consistency in the use of terminology. Therefore, the Board considers that this section should be entitled ‘Conservation and enhancement of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty’ rather than ‘Protection of’ the AONB. In addition, paragraph 5.24 should directly refer to the duty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. The Board considers that, in order to be consistent in the use of terminology applicable to the AONB, in the two introductory parts of Policy CS21 (the first and third paragraphs regarding minerals then waste) the text should state that ‘proposals for mineral extraction/ waste development that would conflict with the purposes of designation will not be permitted within the Chilterns AONB’ rather than ‘conflict with the objectives of designation’. As detailed in other comments the Board objects to the proposal to identify a waste transfer station at London Road, Amersham (paragraph 4, which is in direct conflict with paragraph 3) and considers that if this remains as part of the Core Strategy then the principles detailed in connection with other proposals later in the policy should equally apply here. The Board considers that paragraph 5 of Policy CS21 should be amended to be more positive. It is suggested that this paragraph, which currently states that ‘other proposals for waste management facilities will only be permitted within or adjoining the Chilterns AONB if they address local recycling/composting needs and do not compromise the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty’, should be amended to read ‘other proposals for waste management facilities will only be permitted within or adjoining the Chilterns AONB if they address local recycling/composting needs and ensure the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the area’. The Board considers that changes are required to be made here in order to ensure compliance with the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and Planning Policy Statement 7.
19. Policy CS22 (pages 73 and 74) is concerned with design and climate change. The Board considers that the supporting text should include a reference to the need to comply with design guides that apply within the AONB and in particular the adopted Chilterns Buildings Design Guide (2010) and the building materials technical notes that

accompany this. The Board welcomes the recognition given to the need to ensure sensitivity in the massing and scale of buildings in the AONB but considers that this would be at odds with the proposal to identify London Road, Amersham as a waste transfer site with its accompanying buildings.

Draft Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Plans

20. Minerals Strategy

21. The Board considers the Strategy to be generally sound.

22. Policy M3 (strategy for the location of mineral working) – the Board considers that the potential sand and gravel sites at Cholsey (sites SG-33, SG-57 and SG-60) all lie in the narrow gap between the Chilterns and North Wessex Downs AONBs and therefore within the setting of both AONBs and that the site at Caversham (SG-11) lies within the setting of the Chilterns AONB. The Board's preference is for all of these sites to be deleted from the Strategy because of the likely impact on the AONBs and their settings. Failing this the sites should not proceed any further until detailed landscape and visual impact assessments have been prepared to assess the potential impacts on the settings of the two AONBs.

23. The Board is increasingly concerned about such developments and has recently adopted a Position Statement on 'Development Affecting the Setting of the Chilterns AONB'. A copy of this is attached to this representation.

24. The Board notes that there are many references to the AONBs within the County. However, although Policy C5 (landscape) has a good supporting paragraph (5.26) the Board considers that it fails to include the correct terminology in connection with AONBs and their settings. The Board therefore considers that the following modifications are required to the first part of this policy in particular in order to ensure compliance with the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949, the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and Planning Policy Statement 7: **'In particular pProposals for minerals and waste development should ensure the conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the County's AONBs and their settings and should also demonstrate that the development will protect and where possible enhance the wider landscape quality of Oxfordshire'**.

25. Waste Strategy

26. The Board considers the Strategy to be generally sound.

27. Policy W5 (provision of additional waste management facilities) seeks the provision of a permanent recycling plant for commercial and industrial waste at or close to Henley and additional facilities for recycling construction, demolition and excavation waste at or close to Wallingford. Though broad locations are supposed to be identified on the Key Diagram this does not show where such facilities might be located. Based on the severe constraints around both Henley and Wallingford the Board does not see how such facilities could be located without there being detrimental impacts on the Chilterns AONB and its setting and possibly also the North Wessex Downs AONB and its setting in connection with Wallingford.

28. The Board considers that the reference to sites within AONBs as part of Policy W6 (sites for waste management facilities) should be amended to read: 'Within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty **and their settings**, only ~~small-scale~~ waste management facilities **of a scale appropriate to their location and** to meet local waste needs will normally be permitted'. The Board suggests these amendments in order to ensure consistency with legislation and national planning policy, because the use of the words 'small-scale' has proved to be problematic on other occasions, particularly where no definition of 'small-scale' is provided, and because the word 'normally' introduces uncertainty into the application of the policy.

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 13 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 appeals and a number of previous cases have been determined.

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

Background

1. This year the Board has been consulted on 109 applications and has responded to 103 of these thus far. There have been 18 formal representations (2 support and 16 objections).
2. The applications that have resulted in formal representations so far include:

Support

- car park extension for a pub at Cadsden (refused) and variation of conditions at brickworks (not yet decided)

Object

- 426 ground mounted PV panels at Harpsden (approved)
- Relocation of Peppard CE Primary School (approved)
- 2Mw wind turbine at Aylesbury (non determination appeal in progress)
- 4 dwellings at Peppard Common (refused)
- Two mobile homes two touring caravans, hardstanding and day room, next to RAF Walters Ash (refused)
- The Arla Foods proposals at Aston Clinton (all applications not called in and approved)
- An agricultural workers dwelling at The Lee (refused)
- 115 dwellings at Woodcote (refused)
- Equestrian development at Skirmett (withdrawn)
- 13 pitch travelling showpeople site at Chalfont St Giles (not yet decided)
- Astro turf pitch, fencing and floodlights at Berkhamsted (not yet decided)
- Waste transfer station at Amersham (not yet decided)
- Retention of access, gates and trackway at Bix (not yet decided)
- Redevelopment of sheltered housing site at Goring (not yet decided)
- Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement at Great Missenden (refused)
- Wind turbine and solar pv array at Tring (refused)

3. Thus far 1 of the applications have been determined with 7 being in line with the Board's comments and 4 not in line.
4. The outstanding formal representations are detailed in Appendix 2, and where decisions have been made by the local planning authorities these are detailed.

Recommendation

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

APPENDIX 2

Location	LPA	Development	Ref. No.	Status	AONB Planning Officer's Response	Date
Meadhams Farm Brickworks	BCC	Variation of conditions	CH/2011/60 006/BCC	Pending	Support - Based on the need to continue to provide good quality local building materials into the future. Development conforms to AONB Management Plan (policies D3 and D4). The Board would be concerned if inappropriate waste was to be deposited in the voids that will be left and trusts that, should permission be granted, this will be adequately conditioned to ensure that it is carefully screened, closely monitored and involves totally inert waste due to the fact that the site is in close proximity to the River Chess and sits on the chalk aquifer.	28.09.11
County Highways Depot, London Road, Amersham	BCC	Waste Transfer Station and associated developments	CH/2011/60 005/BCC	Pending	Object – the proposal would involve a very large building and another smaller building as well as other buildings and structures which would be more visible and have a greater impact on the landscape, the design and materials of the buildings are out of keeping with the AONB and do not accord with the Buildings Design Guide, there would be a significant amount of traffic associated with the site and the depot, the former use of the site is landfill and this may cause problems with construction, the lighting proposed has no detail but would cause a significant increase in light when taken with the neighbouring site, there would be a significant amount of 3m high fencing and acoustic barriers (much associated with a bund up to 2m high), screening appears to want to hide the development, great care is needed in connection with the water environment (River Misbourne and aquifer) and proposal would be contrary to the	18.10.11

					purposes of the AONB and its Management Plan, PPS7 and SE Plan policy C3.	
Adjacent B481, Peppard	OCC	Relocation of primary school	R3.0065/11	Approved – 17.11.11	Object – principle of the development is acceptable though the Board objects to the proposed use of large, coloured, mineral fibre wall cladding panels (the drawings show blue, red and green). The Board considers that these should be replaced with materials that would be more in keeping with the local context (brick, traditionally constructed flint work or wood). In addition, care will need to be taken with the proposed use of light coloured render as this could quickly degrade and stain if not appropriately treated. It would be better to use a lime based render in this instance as it would weather better and would help to improve the environmental credentials of the building. There appear to be no firm commitments to provide renewable energy technologies as part of the development. Rather, the statement talks about options being considered and investigated. The Board considers that to make the scheme as sustainable as possible it should include roof mounted solar hot water and solar photovoltaics and a wood fuel heating system or ground source heat pump. The requirement to provide these should be subject to specific conditions should permission be granted. Other technologies are also mentioned and the Board would object strongly to any proposal to erect even small wind turbines on this site. It is also difficult to tell where the front and entrance of the building are.	16.06.11
Quarrendon Fields, Bicester Road, Aylesbury	AVDC	2Mw wind turbine	10/00136/A PP	Pending (appeal against non-determinatio	Object - 2Mw wind turbine that would be 149m to blade tip and 113.5m to the hub. Contrary to the assertions made in the environmental statement the Board considers that the proposal would	27.05.11

				n has been submitted, 04.07.11)	represent a significant vertical visual intrusion into the landscape of the Vale of Aylesbury and would be significantly taller than the County Hall building (approximately twice the height) and would be much more obvious due to the movement associated with the turbine blades. The consideration that has been given to the impacts on the setting and enjoyment of the Chilterns AONB suggests that any impacts will be neutral. The Board does not agree with this assessment and therefore objects to the development as a result. The Board considers that the development would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB, would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the AONB and that it would be dominant in views both from and to the AONB.	
College Road North and Buckland Road, Aston Clinton	AVDC	Proposed developments for Arla Foods Ltd.	11/00962/A PP, 11/00963/A OP, 11/00964/A OP and 11/00965/A OP	Approved – 27.10.11	Object – a lengthy objection was submitted to the 4 applications. The key reasons are as follows – impact on the setting of the AONB (views of the Vale of Aylesbury and effects on the public’s enjoyment of these views and effects on views of the AONB), impacts on the sense of remoteness and tranquillity in the area, lack of proper assessment of the effects of the proposals on interests of acknowledged importance including the use of only two receptors in the AONB, LVIA is challenged as a result, the proposals do not accord with development plan and other policies, the demand for the main site (milk processing plant) is questioned due to a decreasing market for milk, question jobs creation as proposal may result in taking jobs from other places and as a result the Board considers that the proposals would have a substantial and unacceptable impact on the setting	01.07.11

					and enjoyment of the AONB. If the Council were to approve the applications the Board would wish to be involved in any future decision-making due to the likely impacts.	
Newland Park, Gorelands Lane, Chalfont St Giles	CDC	Redevelopment of site to provide 326 dwellings, fitness and sports facilities and energy / recycling centre	CH/2010/09 76/FA	Pending	Object – (see copied information sent out for full details) 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 (both parkland dwellings and apartment blocks), the lack of provision of solar pv and solar hot water, provision of extra lighting (particularly in association with the playing pitches), 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).	03.11.10
Land adjacent The Old Mill, The Lee, Great Missenden	CDC	Provision of agricultural workers dwelling	CH/2011/09 71/FA	Refused – 26.08.11	Object – need for dwelling is questioned as there are many other properties that could be used locally, including that currently occupied by the proposed occupier of the dwelling and design is objected to as it fails to meet the principles of the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and Flint Technical Note.	25.08.11
Land adjacent to Misbourne Farm, Amersham	CDC	Proposed travelling showpeople's site for 13	CH/2011/09 30/FA	Pending	Object – the proposal would have a significant detrimental impact on the landscape of the AONB, the AONB received little consideration and the stringent tests from PPS7 are not met, the impact	15.09.11

Road, Chalfont St Giles		pitches			arises from: a total of up to 171 vehicles being on the 13 pitches, the creation of accesses and parking areas, fencing and lighting, the development would lead to urbanisation and domestication of a currently rural area, planting is proposed to screen the development (which should conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB and be good enough to approve), insufficient account has been taken of the River Misbourne, the proposal fails to accord with the AONB Management Plan and Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and the Board is concerned about the cumulative impact arising from this and nearby developments.	
The Lawns, Rignall Road, Great Missenden	CDC	Demolition of existing and erection of replacement dwelling and garage	CH/2011/10 46/FA	Refused 02.11.11	Object – the Board considers that the proposal represents a significant over development of the site, particularly as the proposed garage also includes a further two bedroomed dwelling in its roof, the form, scale and massing of the building all fail to take account of the context of the site and its surroundings, the design of the buildings neither takes account of the context of the site, being as it is located within the nationally designated Chilterns AONB, nor does it accord with the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide or the Board’s supplementary technical notes on Chilterns building materials and the proposal neither conserves nor enhances the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB and as such the application be refused.	21.10.11
Kitcheners Field, Berkhamsted	DBC	Astroturf pitch, fence and floodlights	4/00875/11/ MFA	Pending	Object – the Board wonders if there are more appropriate sites, the use of the pitch would result in an increase in traffic on local roads, particularly if community use outside school hours were to be permitted, the application stresses the community	06.10.11

				<p>use with the inference that the proposal is more about meeting a community need than meeting a school need, both the fencing and the 8 lighting columns with 22 fittings (up to 6 metres tall if retracted and 15 metres tall when in use) would be particularly intrusive features in the landscape and little account, if any, has been taken of the potential impacts, the use of the lighting would introduce an alien feature into this part of the AONB which would detrimentally affect the tranquillity of the AONB and would be exacerbated by the extended hours that are proposed, the resulting glare and reflection, particularly when wet or foggy weather occurs, would also exacerbate the detrimental impacts. The use of the lights will almost certainly have detrimental impacts on biodiversity, the construction of the fence is also likely to have detrimental impacts on wildlife because it will introduce an obstruction into a presently open area. The application proposes perimeter landscaping and 'enhanced planting' adjacent to the footpath that runs immediately adjacent to the site. The Board considers that this appears to be a method by which some of the elements of the proposal could be hidden but equally considers that planting alongside the footpath would lead to a greater sense of enclosure and would therefore have a detrimental impact on users of the right of way. It is difficult to see how the detrimental impacts of the planning application could be resolved without removing the fence and lights completely from the proposal. A lower fence using a more appropriate design and different materials may be more acceptable. The development would neither conserve nor enhance</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

					the natural beauty of the AONB and would not increase the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB.	
Marshcroft Farm, Marshcroft Lane, Tring	DBC	11 kW wind turbine and ground mounted solar PV arrays	4/01634/11/FUL	Refused – 17.11.11	Object – the proposal would be sited in a visually prominent position and would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB, it would be contrary to the AONB Management Plan, PPS7 and local plan policy, the turbine and solar PV array would be sited in very close proximity to a number of public rights of way and they would be clearly visible from them, this would be detrimental to the enjoyment of users of those rights of way and therefore contrary to the Board's statutory duty of seeking to increase the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB, the wind turbine would stand about 25m high (to blade tip) in a relatively open landscape and is considered to be an industrial form of development, much greater use should be made of other renewable technologies, the scale of the solar PV array causes concern, it would be clearly visible locally and, when taken with the incidence of reflection, would also be visible from further afield, it is quite feasible to install a domestic scale wood chip fired combined heat and power installation or other renewable technologies and energy saving measures before it would be necessary to consider a large scale wind turbine and large PV array as proposed, the turbine would be unlikely to generate a reasonable amount of energy and would be likely to be idle for much of the time.	21.10.11
Behoes Lane, Woodcote	SODC	Up to 115 dwellings,	P11/E1205/O	Refused – 01.11.11	Object – the application fails to contain adequate information and should be in full not outline; the	06.09.11

		leisure facilities and access			proposal is a major development which is contrary to the RSS, Local Plan and emerging Core Strategy, AONB Management Plan, SODC Design Guide and Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and supplementary technical notes on building materials; there are particular concerns about the design and access statement and landscape and visual assessment which are not considered to be adequate and do not address the interests of acknowledged importance; the site is not sustainable and there are more appropriate sites that could be developed locally that would not have the same impacts; there would be detrimental impacts on the local highway network and users of the local rights of way, and there would be detrimental impacts on the tranquillity of the AONB.	
Leys Stable Cottage, Old Bix Road, Bix	SODC	Retention of access, gates and trackway to stable yard	P11/E1039/RET-11	Pending	Object – the development that has taken place (removal of large section of hedge and bank, construction of access with hard surfacing, kerbing and gates and trackway) has had a significant detrimental impact on the AONB, there have been detrimental impacts on the character of the land and its users, the development does not conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB and does not increase the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB, the development does not comply with planning policies or the AONB Management Plan, the development should be removed and the land/hedge/bank made good with planting that is managed to maturity.	18.10.11
Icknield Place, Goring	SODC	Redevelopment of Sheltered Accommodation	P11/W1260	Pending	Object - The Board considers that the proposal represents a significant over development of the site, the form, scale and massing of the building all	21.10.11

		with Extra Care Apartments			fail to take account of the context of the site, the design of the building neither takes account of the context of the site nor does it accord with the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide or the Board's supplementary technical notes (particularly the Brick note), the proposal neither conserves nor enhances the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB.	
Grange Farm, Widmer End	WDC	Agricultural building to be used as potting shed	07/06948/F UL	Pending	Object - The proposal seeks to construct a very large (30m by 15m and 5.6m high) utilitarian, agricultural, building that will be clearly visible to users of the local rights of way. The principles of the AONB appear not to have been taken on board by the applicants. The development could not be assimilated into the Chilterns AONB. The proposal could create a dangerous precedent. The Board is mindful of the need to facilitate growth in the local economy and the evident importance of the applicant's business, however, it considers that the proposal would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB.	07.09.07
Wycombe Sports Centre, Handy Cross, High Wycombe	WDC	Coachway, park and ride, business development, car parking, hotel	09/07309/R 4OUT	Approved subject to S106 – 27.05.11	Object – Whilst not objecting to the principle of the development a number of concerns have been submitted. The development proposes the inclusion of a number of wind turbines that would almost certainly sit idle for most of the time based on their location within the development where the wind resource will be affected by both the topography and adjacent buildings. It would be better to investigate other forms of energy generation, particularly wood fuel (which should be conditioned should approval be given). Any lighting used should take full account of the site's proximity to the nationally protected Chilterns AONB. The Board objects to the bulk, mass and draft designs	06.01.10

					<p>for the hotel and headquarters buildings as these would be up to 8 storeys high and, despite the visual appraisals in the supporting information, the Board considers that they would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the Chilterns AONB. The Board has suggested that greater work is required on photomontages that show these prominent buildings in their setting and has yet to see this information. This objection would be removed if the scale, mass and bulk of these two buildings were significantly reduced. The Board is also concerned about the level of parking that is to be provided for the proposed office buildings. At the level proposed the Board considers that this will be unlikely to lead to modal shift. Increased bus provision and re-routing would also be required.</p> <p>Changes proposed – reduced height for prow building and hotel that would significantly lessen the potential impact on the setting of the AONB and on views from the AONB. If developed as proposed the changes, combined with the imposition of a proposed condition 12 and the inclusion of appropriate tree planting (not screening to hide the development), enable the Board to withdraw its previously stated objection.</p>	24.02.10
Sports Hall, RAF High Wycombe, Walters Ash	WDC	Demolish existing buildings and erect new sports hall, pavilion and two tennis courts	11/05494/F UL	Approved – 21.06.11	<p>Comments - the Board welcomes the changes to the original designs that have resulted in the application as submitted. However, whilst not objecting to the principle of the development (provided all other buildings are removed as per the details of the application), the Board considers that additional changes could be made to the scheme that would improve it further thus leading to a development that would meet the purposes of</p>	20.05.11

				<p>the AONB (conservation or enhancement of the natural beauty).</p> <p>Timber cladding – it may help to add some interest if one of the facades of the building was detailed with vertical timbers (possibly the eastern elevation). The detail shown in this drawing is not reflected in the Design and Access statement which talks about graduated colour panels (these are not considered to be appropriate).</p> <p>East elevation – this is one of the more dominant elevations from an AONB perspective and as drawn it shows little relief. Putting vertical timbers may provide some relief. This elevation would benefit from having 3 bigger doors than those shown which could be spread more evenly along the wall. This would make this building look more agricultural in its appearance.</p> <p>The plans accompanying the application show areas of cut/fill and bunding to the east of the sports building and around the proposed tennis courts. These appear alien in the landscape and are nearly 3m high in places. The reason for the bunds is unclear and the inference is that this is a method by which excavated material can be disposed of on the site. This is not acceptable and the bunds should be significantly reduced in height and the form changed, if needed at all, to be more natural.</p> <p>Tree planting is proposed associated with the bunds to the east of the sports building, there is no reason why the trees cannot be planted without the bund. All trees should be provided with sufficient space to grow to maturity and should be planted in clumps to allow partial screening of the corners of the sports building.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Those trees already on or adjacent to the site should all be retained wherever possible as they form an important part of the backdrop to the site. Although the drawings do not appear to show any flintwork the Design and Access statement refers to flint on page 36, paragraph 4.03. The Board would object in the strongest possible terms if flintwork of the type proposed were to be used. The materials mentioned are pre-cast concrete flintblocks which do not conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB (as clearly demonstrated by the examples given in the statement). These have no place in the AONB and should flintwork remain as a design element (and the Board does not think it should) then it should all be constructed on site by hand, using random flint sizes and lime mortar throughout in accordance with the Conservation Board's technical advice.</p> <p>No real details are provided in connection with lighting. The Design and Access statement talks only about building mounted external lighting on the sports building. The impact of lighting needs to be very carefully considered in what should be a dark and tranquil area. The floodlighting for the artificial grass court has a major detrimental impact and this should not be compounded by yet more lights. Any lighting should be kept to the absolute minimum and be properly directed and suitably cowled to avoid any spillage.</p> <p>Comments on changes – Building 1 east elevation – the Board notes the change to increase the area of brickwork around the doors in the middle of the façade and welcomes this change as it is considered that it will lessen the dominance of this</p>	09.06.11
--	--	--	--	--	----------

					part of the building. However, the Board still considers that 3 larger doors on this façade would create a better appearance. Bunding to the east of building 1 – the removal of the bunds and re-grading of the slope in a more natural way are both welcomed and the Board considers that this issue has now been resolved. Tree planting – the inclusion of more trees in limited numbers of clumps to the eastern corner of building 1 is also welcomed. Tennis courts – the plans and sections appear to show that there will be no bunding around the tennis courts and that the land will be more gently re-graded. This is welcomed and the Board considers that this issue has now been resolved. All other comments remain.	
Valentine Farm, Shogmoor Lane, Frieth	WDC	Demolish existing agricultural buildings and erect riding arena, stables, tack and other rooms, horse walker and store	11/06837/F UL	Withdrawn – 06.10.11	Object – would have preferred to see re-use of existing buildings, design does not accord with the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide (CBDG), concern about the scale and mass of the buildings for what is a personal use, buildings would be dominant in the landscape and out of keeping with the village, bulk could be lessened by breaking up roofs and facades to create three buildings rather than one and by using design features such as expressed elements and greater overhangs for the eaves, materials should be traditional and stipulated from the outset, design should accord with the CBDG and Brick note, sensitive planting of clumps of standard trees may help to lessen impact, careful use of conditions is needed to ensure it remains a private use (with obligation), also concerned about light pollution (conditions should be applied) and impact on users of The Chiltern Way.	14.09.11