

APPENDIX A: Consultation Responses and Representations

Councillor Comments

Councillor Jackson Ng:

I would like to call in this planning application because the residents feel strongly against it and I believe it warrants further scrutiny

Councillor Anita Cranmer:

I wish to call in this application in view of the considerable number of objections raised by residents covering many issues of contention. This is an amendment/revival to an old planning application and has many aspects of concern.

Councillor Alison Wheelhouse:

In light of significant public interest in this application and changes to the original scheme, this application warrants scrutiny by the planning committee and I would like to call this in. I understand that this will be a 3 Member call-in

MP Letters

Two letters were received from the Member of Parliament for Beaconsfield, Joy Morrissey MP which brings to the attention concerns from two constituents who have responded to the planning application.

Beaconsfield Town Council Comments

The Committee RESOLVED to OBJECT stating that they do not believe what has been submitted is sufficient for the release of conditions of variation (6). Furthermore, they expressed concern for the lack of transportation studies, ecological reports and lack of consideration to Longbottom Lane, noting previous fatalities.

Policy TR5 - Accesses, Highway Works and Traffic Generation

Policy R9 - Golf Courses (with respect to the potential need of an ecological assessment).

Consultation Responses

Buckinghamshire Council Highways Development Management – dated 2nd February 2023

Thank you for your letter dated 16th January with regard to the above planning application.

Longbottom Lane is a 'C' class road which in this location is subject to a speed restriction of 40mph. Proposals include the variation of condition 6 of planning permission 98/01200/OUT to allow for a revised visibility splay.

Since the previous consent was granted, the posted speed limit on Longbottom Lane has been reduced from the National Speed Limit to 40mph, and as such the visibility splay requirements have also been reduced, in line with Manual for Streets guidance. I can confirm that the proposed visibility splays as shown on the drawing are acceptable.

However, having discussed with the Highways Development Management Delivery section, I note that the Section 184 application has not received technical approval and will need to be progressed. I would ask that the applicant contacts the Delivery team for further information.

Mindful of the above, I have no objection to the variation of condition 6 of planning permission 98/01200/OUT

Buckinghamshire Council Tree Officer – dated 19th January 2023

I have not visited site and based on desk top assessment of information submitted the three oak trees subject to a TPO known as no.21, 1996 are in close vicinity to access so I recommend planning conditions ST3, ST4 and ST12.

Representations

Amenity Societies/Residents Associations

The Beaconsfield Society:

I would like to submit an objection on behalf of The Beaconsfield Society to planning ref PL/22/4395/VRC. I believe the new proposals are unsuitable for a VRC application, and as such merit the submission a completely new application.

Chiltern Society:

The Chiltern Society objects to variation of condition 6. We are concerned the proposal will be detrimental to the local biodiversity on this land, which is designated as Green Belt, is adjacent to the Chilterns Area of Natural Beauty (AONB) and is within 100 metres of Ancient Woodland designated as Priority Habitat Inventory - Deciduous Woodland.

Our objections are as follows:

1 Longbottom Lane is significantly busier than when the scheme was first proposed. The revised access to the site exacerbates the potential traffic hazard particularly towards the junction with the Amersham Road.

2 The plans show an earth track leading to parking provision for 30 cars. We are concerned that the likely volume of traffic and the size and weight of modern-day vehicles using the earth track will cause damage detrimental to the viability of the trees, hedgerow and flora bordering the access track. We note that 3 oak trees have Protection Orders.

3 The plan (NEW ACCESS ARRANGEMENTS 5253-001 REV C) shows a barbed wire fence on the boundaries of the site as well as separating the earth track that provides access to the proposed car park. We are concerned that this will constrain the biodiversity on the site which is currently open grassland and close to Ancient Woodland.

We note that this scheme for a practice golf facility on 11 hectares of land designated as Green Belt has not progressed for almost 25 years. In that time both environmental standards and planning policy to protect vital green space and support net gain in bio-

diversity have been enhanced to protect our vital landscape, particularly within the Green Belt and AONB.

Given that the scheme will require significant earthworks to this existing open grass landscape as well as material changes to both the access road junction with a busy main road and the onsite road and parking, we believe the scheme merits re-examination by the Planning Authority.

Other Representations

35 letters of objections were received in response to the planning application. The contents of which are summarised as follows:

- Concerns regarding impact on the Green Belt
- Back door application to allow further inappropriate development in the Green Belt
- Golf course would be inappropriate use of Green Belt land
- Revised access would be detrimental to the Green Belt
- Impact on the character of the area
- Impact on adjacent Listed Buildings
- Impact of revised impact on protected trees and hedgerows
- Ecology concerns
- Residential amenity impacts in terms of views
- Safety concerns for highway and public footpath users (i.e. golf ball strikes)
- Traffic impacts on Longbottom Lane and area in general
- Traffic and safety impacts in relation to the reduced visibility
- Flooding and drainage concerns
- No justification for new golf course
- Area does not require further golf courses
- Application for new golf course should not be permitted to be resurrected
- Substantial and material changes since the application was approved
- New application is required due to material changes which have occurred
- 2004 certificate of lawfulness is invalid
- 2004 certificate of lawfulness should be cancelled
- Discrepancies with previously approved plans
- Insufficient details to assess the current revisions sought