

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 10 June 2019

REPORT OF THE OFFICERS

Background papers, if any, will be specified at the end of each item.

AGENDA ITEM No. 5

5 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS

5.1 Application reference PL/18/4593/RC (*Case Officer: Gary Murphy*)

Demolition of existing buildings known as Chiltern Pools, Drake Hall, Chiltern Youth Centre and Amersham Library (excl. Annex and Barn Hall) and construction of a replacement two-storey (plus part-lower ground floor) leisure, sports and community building (Use Classes D1 and D2), including 25m swimming pool, diving pool, multipurpose sports hall, squash courts, climbing walls, spa, library, community hall, fitness and gym studios, nursery and dedicated external sports equipment including MUGA and play areas alongside associated external car parking, coach drop off, cycling provision, alterations to vehicular access and landscaping.

Site of Chiltern Pools, Drake Hall, Community Centre, Amersham Library and Associated Car Parks and part of King George V Playing Fields, Chiltern Avenue and King George V Road, Amersham HP6 5AH

Matters for consideration

5.1.1 Members will be aware that this planning application was reported to the Planning Committee at the meeting of 14th February 2019. The original Case Officer's report is attached as appendix FP.01.

5.1.2 The application was deferred by the Committee in order for Officers to negotiate with the applicants further and for additional information to be provided in respect of the following:

1. Integration of design specifically external materials of the sports hall;
2. Lack of a Town Centre Impact Assessment on Amersham and neighbouring town centres;
3. Inadequate car parking provision and to investigate how additional car parking could be accommodated;
4. Location/provision of coach parking;
5. Noise levels;
6. Inadequate servicing area for the range of different service demands; and
7. Thermal rating of the building

5.1.3 Revised plans and new supporting information has since been submitted by the applicant in response to the above concerns.

Town Council

5.1.4 Members were pleased that the concerns of the Council's Planning Committee appear to have been addressed, with the provision of additional parking and changes to the elevations. No objection raised.

Representations

5.1.5 Following the 14th February Planning Committee, and prior to the re-consultation period nine letters of support and one further objection have been received.

5.1.6 Due to the submission of revised plans and new supporting information, full re-consultation was carried out on 11 April 2019. In response letters of support from some 247 separate sources have been received at the time of writing, noting though some postal addresses have submitted comments from individual occupants. A total of 39 objections have been received and four representations that have been treated as being neutral.

5.1.7 It is noted that many of the grounds for objection received echo those set out in the original officer report (pages 7 - 10) so will not be repeated again. New grounds for objection raised, and the reasons given for support are summarised below.

5.1.8 **Additional grounds for objection/comments:-**

- Question the accuracy of the red edge site plan as this encompasses Hyrons Lane (n.b., refer to report below)
- Sought clarity whether the additional parking proposed would be at ground level or in the form of a multi-storey
- Increased parking provision still considered to be inadequate
- Electric vehicle parking spaces should be located next to the children's play area
- Inadequate parking provision for site workers during construction period
- The Transport Assessment is flawed as this states that the average duration of stay at the existing car parks is less than 1 hour. This data cannot be relied upon to inform assessments about future parking demand as people will be encouraged to stay longer at the proposed centre.
- No provision for dedicated parent and child parking spaces
- The alternative coach parking arrangement is not appropriate – also where are coaches expected to park while they wait. The proposed Car Park Management Plan will not sufficiently address this
- The application does not state intended hours of opening
- Whilst noting the design changes, including reductions in height and change to material palette, the design is still considered unacceptable
- Insufficient details provided in relation to contractors' access arrangements or site compound, with concern that this will impact on the adjoining open space (n.b. refer to report below)
- Existing background noise levels are already too high, so this is not an acceptable basis to assess the future noise conditions
- Not enough consideration has been given for sustainable design/technologies in building design
- The numerous references made to other leisure centres as justification for the proposed size is not helpful as these examples bear very little relevance to this setting in Amersham. The case for such a large building in this location is not proven
- It is not clear how crowd movements within the building will work comfortably (i.e. community room on the upper floor may not handle future demand)
- Lack of play provision for younger children
- Amersham already has ample facilities and the money required could be better spent elsewhere
- There is no planned change in road infrastructure to accommodate additional traffic flows
- Claims made that there is ample parking capacity in nearby car parks is disputed
- The servicing area is poorly located adjacent to a children's play area
- Question the 'business case' put forward in the original application now that the 'future development site' has been reduced in size. Still no clarity/certainty around the funding for this proposal
- The decision should be deferred until the new unitary authority has been established

- Unhelpful scaremongering that if the proposed facility is not delivered then the existing facilities will be lost/demolished
- This is a predominantly residential location so the future noise environment should respect that
- The revised building still remains too large
- Proposal is missing a dedicated children's pool
- Building design should be more sympathetic to the retained barn building on site
- Swimming pool gallery area is not big enough
- Size of the building will create a wind tunnel effect
- There is no evidence to demonstrate demand for some of the additional facilities (e.g. squash courts)
- This will increase traffic/congestion on Woodside Road
- Building will harm the outlook/view of nearby properties
- The building needs a greater set back from the road

5.1.9 Reasons for support:-

- The new centre will be a valuable resource for the health and wellbeing of local residents and aligns with the priorities of the Clinical Commissioning Group, who supports the proposal
- Will help to revitalise the town which has been suffering of late from shops closing down
- Enhanced facilities and new pool will benefit members of Amersham Swimming Club, are vital to the future of the swimming club, and for hosting competition swimming
- Update and improvement is long overdue, facilities for 21st century use are required and the existing buildings are unattractive and not energy efficient
- Proposal will benefit the existing nursery on site and secure its future
- The enhanced nursery facility supports the Local Authority's duty to ensure sufficient childcare provision
- This facility will support future growth and social development of Amersham
- New facility will benefit local schools who will also use this
- Will be a major benefit for the younger generation
- This is needed to safeguard the future of the swimming pool and diving facilities, both of which are well used
- A modest level of disruption during construction is inevitable but it is well worth the long-term benefits for decades to come
- The new facility is vital to ensure continued provision of pool/gym/leisure facilities in Amersham
- This will attract people to the town which in turn will increase spending on the high street
- There is ample parking in the area with the new multi-storey car park
- A new library is needed and this will be a fantastic facility
- This will secure a legacy of sports education and community facilities for future generations
- The revised external appearance is now more in keeping with local context
- Will encourage people to keep fit and active
- A positive thing for younger people and will help prevent them getting involved in anti-social behaviour
- This will become a new vibrant hub for Amersham-on-the-Hill
- The existing pool will soon become economically unviable, and having a replacement is vital
- This will lead to the creation of new jobs which is welcomed

Amersham and District Residents Association:

Pleased to note the changes made to increase parking provision and amendments to the building design. These changes address their earlier concerns and they are now able to support the application.

Consultations

5.1.10 Bucks County Council Highways Officer:

- No additional comments in respect of trip generation, pedestrian access, sustainability and construction;
- Note the proposed changes to the parking layout and number of spaces, which is for the Local Planning Authority to review;
- Welcome the changes made to include the coach parking on site, but note that it would not be possible for a delivery/servicing vehicle and a coach to be parked in their respective positions at the same time;
- Use of the shared operational area needs careful management and assurances in this regard should be set out in a Car Parking Management Plan, that shall be secured through condition.

No objection, subject to recommended conditions.

5.1.11 Sport England:

Have reviewed the information and have no comments to make beyond their initial response.

5.1.12 Natural England:

Confirmed they had no comments.

5.1.13 Thames Valley Police Architectural Liaison Officer:

Confirmed they had no further comments to make.

5.1.14 Bucks County Council Strategic Access Officer:

Confirmed they had no further comments.

5.1.15 Landscape Officer:

The final landscape / planting scheme will need to be secured through condition.

5.1.16 Bucks County Council Archeological Service:

Having reviewed the evaluation report no significant archeological features were recorded. No objection raised, and it is not considered necessary to apply any conditions.

5.1.17 District Strategic Environment Teams (Environmental Health):

No additional comments to make in respect of land quality.

Following review of the updated noise assessment no additional comments to make.

5.1.18 Bucks County Council Sustainable Drainage:

No objection, subject to conditions.

5.1.19 Tree Officer:

Note the changes made, but no change to previous conclusions.

5.1.20 Bucks County Council Highways Officer:

No objections have been raised in respect of the changes made to parking layout, coach parking, minibus parking and servicing arrangements. This would be subject to various conditions being secured, including the requirement for a Car Parking Management Plan.

5.1.21 Ecology Officer:

No change to their original comments.

5.1.22 Planning Policy:

In response to the submitted Sequential Test and Impact Statement Officers consider the report is a proportionate response to the national requirement to undertake a sequential test and impact assessment for the proposed development. It demonstrates that the proposal satisfies the requirements of a sequential test. Further it is considered that it demonstrates there would be no negative impact on town centre investment, whether existing, committed or planned, and neither would there be any negative impact on the vitality and viability of relevant centres. Any impacts are likely to be neutral or, in the case of Amersham on the Hill, positive for the centre.

5.1.23 Urban Design:

- The increased use of brick is considered a positive design change, suggested that different types of grey brick and laying patterns be explored
- Applicant should provide more clarity on how the timber cladding will be fixed/laid to the building
- Samples of all materials need to be agreed
- The landscaped setting for the building should be developed further, with recommendations made as to how best to achieve this (n.b. these are to be secured through condition 5)

Evaluation

5.1.24 The original officers' report to the Planning Committee recommended that planning permission be granted for the development, subject to conditions as set out on pages 38-44 of the attached report. At the Planning Committee meeting on 14 February, Members raised concerns in respect of the appearance of the building and supporting information as set out above and as a consequence the application was deferred for the applicant to consider the concerns raised, look at ways to address these, and to return the application to the Committee at a later date for further consideration.

5.1.25 Having considered the reasons to defer the application the applicant has submitted revised plans amending the building design, and has provided further information in response to the various concerns. The following has been submitted for consideration:

- Revised plans and elevations;
- Design and Access Statement addendum;
- Servicing Strategy Statement;
- Transport Assessment addendum;
- Sequential Test and Impact Assessment;
- Noise Assessment addendum note; and
- Energy and Thermal Performance Building note

5.1.26 Each area of concern raised by Members is dealt with in turn below.

Integration of design specifically external materials of the sports hall:

5.1.27 Members' concerns related primarily to the design and appearance of the sports hall, the

palette of materials and the lack of integration of the building design. In response the applicant has reviewed the proposed design and materials and the following amendments have been made:

South-west elevation (King George V Road):

- Reduction in building height by 800mm (to main entrance area) and reduction in height of 1.5m to central section
- Signage updated and re-located
- Alterations to timber cladding arrangement, change to brick type, alterations to glazing and new architectural fins introduced

North-east elevation (Rear / Car park side):

- Reduction to height of the sports hall by 700mm
- Sports hall materials amended from dark grey cladding to vertical timber cladding (western red cedar)
- Change to brick type – new lighter grey brick proposed
- Swimming pool changing village façade changed from dark grey cladding to lighter grey brick

North-west elevation (fronting car park / Chiltern Avenue):

- Reduction in building height by 800mm (to main entrance area)
- Signage updated and re-located
- Change to brick type – new lighter grey brick proposed
- Alterations to glazing and introduction of architectural fins

South-east elevation (King George V Field):

- Reduction to height of the sports hall by 700mm
- Sports hall material amended from dark grey cladding to vertical timber cladding (western red cedar) to match materials on south-west elevation
- Glazing rationalized and alterations to arrangements to glazing/windows

5.1.28 Further reconsideration of materials has resulted in a simpler palette of materials, the omission of the dark grey cladding to the sports hall and other parts of the building, and its replacement with vertical timber cladding (western red cedar). The revised timber arrangement includes 45 degree timber bands to break up the mass of the sports hall and the community centre elements, as well as providing added visual interest to the elevations. The introduction of a lighter grey brick is a reference to the traditional use of flint as a building material in and around Amersham, and the introduction of more of this brick in place of external cladding is considered to be a further improvement to the building design and appearance. Alterations to the fenestration, changes to glazing and the addition of architectural fins are all considered to be positive design changes.

5.1.29 With regards to the timber cladding the applicant has confirmed the type of timber to be used is guaranteed by the manufacturer for 30 years against rot and decay. This demonstrates the robustness and durability of this product.

5.1.30 The reductions in height to sections of the building, by as much as 1.5m in places, will help to reduce its massing, and these are welcomed alterations. Updated CGI's submitted give an impression of the revised materials palette and how the amended building will appear.

5.1.31 Overall these changes are considered to positively respond to Member concerns, and with these changes incorporated it is considered the building better relates to its context, there is more consistency across elevations and the simplified materials palette results in a softer appearance. The notable changes to the external appearance to the sports hall help to reduce

the overall dominance of this part of the building and enhance its design and appearance. All of these changes (along with the various height reductions) are welcomed and in respect of the changes the wording of the materials condition 16 is recommended to be changed as set out below.

Lack of a Town Centre Impact Assessment on Amersham and neighbouring town centres:

- 5.1.32 Members were concerned with the lack of an assessment of the potential impact of the proposed facility on Amersham-on-the-Hill town centre, as well as other nearby town centres.
- 5.1.33 Policy Officers had previously noted the lack of an impact assessment but concluded that as the proposed facility is to replace and enhance existing facilities that serve an existing catchment then it was not seen to be a proposal that would have any significant negative effects on town centre vitality and viability. No such assessment was therefore considered necessary by Officers prior to reporting the application first time. Notwithstanding this, and in response to Members concerns, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) the applicant has since undertaken a supporting 'Sequential Test and Impact Statement'. This assessment considers potential impacts on Amersham-on-the-Hill town centre and other nearby town centres (including Chesham).
- 5.1.34 The assessment concludes that:
- There are no alternative sequentially preferable sites for the development within Amersham-on-the-Hill town centre
 - The proposal would not adversely impact on existing, planned or committed investment in the centres of Amersham-on-the-Hill, Chesham or Chalfont St Peter
 - The proposal would not negatively impact on existing centres, it is considered that this will positively impact on the vitality and viability of these existing centres, primarily Amersham-on-the-Hill
 - There will be a positive impact in terms of significant employment opportunities generated during construction and operational phases.
 - There would be no conflict with tests of the NPPF.

No objection has been raised to the assessment, or its conclusions.

Inadequate car parking provision and to investigate how additional car parking could be accommodated:

- 5.1.35 Members raised concern that there was insufficient on site parking to meet future demand. Originally 221 car parking spaces were proposed which was deemed to be inadequate, the applicant was asked to consider whether additional on site parking could be accommodated.
- 5.1.36 Whilst noting the Committee's concerns it should be noted there was no objection to the level of parking initially proposed, this was supported by Bucks County Council Highways. The number of car parking spaces proposed originally (221) was informed by assessed demand, as set out in the submitted Transport Assessment. It is considered that this initial analysis provides a robust assessment of envisaged future demand, and Officers were satisfied that 221 spaces represented an acceptable level of parking provision to meet likely demand from the proposed development.
- 5.1.37 To address Members' concerns the applicant is proposing an increase in car parking spaces on site. An additional 42 spaces are proposed on site, increasing the overall provision from 221 to 263 spaces (a 19% increase). These additional spaces have been located to the north of the building on a part of the site shown as 'future development site'. As stated previously the

development or otherwise of this part of the site is not a matter for planning committee at this time and the area would be landscaped until or unless planning permission for any alternative use is granted.

5.1.38 Following the February Committee meeting the applicant has undertaken additional car parking analysis into both current and future demand. Some key points of note are:

- Survey data results demonstrate there is current spare parking capacity within the existing on site car parks, so as things stand there is spare capacity during peak weekday evenings and peak weekend times. When existing demand and forecast additional demand are combined the proposed increase in parking provision to 263 spaces can be expected to accommodate envisaged future demand. It is considered unlikely that overspill parking would occur.
- Using data results obtained from Council parking surveys it is evident that the Council's own parking data is within a 10% margin of error when compared to the applicant's own parking survey results. This is within an acceptable margin of error range and validates the applicant's own survey data.
- Travel surveys were undertaken for centre users, with 329 direct respondents. Results showed that 47.7% of people surveyed drive to the site and that a significant percentage of visitors by car are passengers.
- Survey results showed that a number of users will arrive by car but are simply dropped off, so these visits do not involve use of any parking spaces. The proposed layout includes a dedicated drop-off area which is an improvement on the existing site which has no dedicated drop-off facility.
- Peak usage of the existing car parks does not coincide with periods of peak demand for the proposed centre.
- In the unlikely event that parking demand exceeds capacity the applicant has demonstrated the number and availability of public car parks for use across Amersham-on-the-Hill, should the need for these arise. The wider parking availability, including the multi storey car park and Sycamore Road could comfortably accommodate any overspill parking during the envisaged peak usage periods, which are weekday evenings and weekends.
- During the peak visitor periods envisaged (weekday evenings and weekends) there is sufficient space available in the CDC office car park (capacity - 173 spaces, available for free use to the public Mon – Fri 17:30 to midnight and Sat and Sun all day), the multi storey (capacity – 1046) and Sycamore Road (capacity – 280). Council parking survey results demonstrate clearly that in the case of both the multi-storey and Sycamore Road car parks, there is a notable drop-off in parking demand post afternoon. Further evidence that there would be ample capacity nearby for overspill parking during peak centre usage times (weekday evenings and weekends), if required. The aforementioned public car parks are all within a short walking distance of the site.

5.1.39 The proposed increase in the number of parking spaces on site from 221 to 263 seeks to address Committee Member concerns raised about parking levels. This quantum has been informed by a thorough and robust evidence based assessment. It is considered this level of parking is justifiable and appropriate to meet demand at peak times of use. And in the unlikely event that parking demand exceeds capacity on site it has been demonstrated how the site is well situated for visitors to make use of existing nearby alternative public car parks within Amersham-on-the-Hill. For example the Council offices car park, multi-storey car park and Sycamore Road car park are all known to have plentiful spare capacity during the peak periods for visitors to the proposed centre (weekday evenings and weekends).

Location/provision of coach parking:

- 5.1.40 Coach parking was originally proposed to take place within an area of site containing marked parking bays, that would have needed to be temporarily marked out by cones at times when coaches were expected, and that this arrangement would be managed by the centre operator in accordance with a Car Parking Management Plan (CPMP) (to be secured through condition). This solution was not acceptable to Members.
- 5.1.41 In response to Members' concerns an alternative solution is proposed; coach parking will be provided within the designated operational/service area to the north of the building. This will cater to the long stay parking of coaches on site. Appreciating that the operational area is to be a shared area also used for deliveries and refuse collection, it is proposed that use of this area this will be managed by the centre operator through a CPMP, in order to avoid any conflict between coaches and delivery or refuse vehicles. No use of vehicle parking bays will be required.
- 5.1.42 Having reviewed the swept path analysis drawings Highways Officer's note that servicing or deliveries could not take place within the operational area when there is a coach situated here. The centre operator will need to ensure that deliveries and servicing cannot take place at times when coaches are expected, and sufficient assurance in this regard will need to be made in the CPMP. Provided this Plan is secured through condition then there would be no objection raised on highway grounds. The applicant is committed to managing the use of the operational service area and demonstrating this through the aforementioned condition.
- 5.1.43 To demonstrate the suitability of the proposed coach parking solution the applicant has sought the views of a prospective site operator. The operator has confirmed that operating in a manner which only permits one vehicle at a time to site is not dissimilar to the way in which they operate a number of other leisure sites, and this is a tested, workable and implementable solution.
- 5.1.44 It should be noted that at present there is a single on site coach parking bay, so the proposal will not be different in this regard. The location of the coach parking area ensures that passengers will not have to cross the path of traffic when embarking/disembarking to and from the building, which from a safety perspective is welcomed.

Noise Levels:

- 5.1.45 The future noise environment was a concern of Members, who wanted further consideration of the potential noise conditions.
- 5.1.46 The applicant has been in discussion with the Council's Environmental Health Officer and an addendum to the noise assessment has been provided. Since the Committee meeting in February further baseline measurement has been carried out at an additional location north east of the site to consider potential impacts from the external play areas. The assessment therefore now contains representative background noise conditions from four nearby locations on site.
- 5.1.47 Future noise sources have been considered, including noise breakout from the proposed facility, noise from vehicles on site (car park), noise from mechanical plant and noise from dedicated external play/sports areas.
- 5.1.48 The assessment shows that predicted noise emissions from these noise sources will not contribute significantly to the existing ambient noise levels; this is taken as a strong indication

that the proposal will not have a noise impact. The assessment takes into consideration the current noise sources including traffic on the roads and existing fixed sources associated with the existing buildings.

- 5.1.48 Having reviewed the updated noise assessment there are no outstanding concerns from Environmental Health in relation to methodology, or conclusions in this document.

Inadequate servicing area for the range of different service demands:

- 5.1.49 Members were concerned that the servicing area to the north side of the building may not be large enough to meet future demands from the range of different users.
- 5.1.50 As set out in the original report to Committee, there is not expected to be a material increase in the number of servicing trips / vehicles generated by the use as the proposals are largely a replacement and enhancement of existing facilities, and this remains the position. It is relevant to note that the operational servicing area to the north of the building is an improvement over and above the existing situation, as there is no dedicated on site servicing area currently. This means all servicing in the future can take place off the highway which is welcomed.
- 5.1.51 To give some added comfort that the operational servicing area can adequately accommodate future demands the applicant has confirmed that all servicing will be undertaken through a pre-booking system, and that this will ensure deliveries do not conflict with the arrival of coaches. This will be controlled through the approval of a CPMP. The proposed servicing strategy is demonstrated further through the submitted 'Servicing Strategy Statement' – this document demonstrates the minibus drop off arrangements and the much improved parking provision for minibuses, with two dedicated minibus bays and the potential for further bays if required. The applicant has also demonstrated swept path analysis for standard 10m long delivery vehicles and for smaller general delivery vehicles (i.e. transit sized), both of which are acceptable to Highways.
- 5.1.52 As per the original recommendation, Highways Officer's do not raise objection to the servicing arrangements, or the swept paths provided sufficient assurance is given in a CPMP (to be secured through condition) that general servicing / deliveries cannot be carried out when coaches are expected to be on site.

Thermal rating of the building:

- 5.1.53 As set out in the original report the proposed energy strategy for the building will deliver in excess of the minimum 10% of energy from renewable or low carbon technologies. To address the concern of Members further information relating to the thermal performance of the proposed building has been submitted.
- 5.1.54 It is confirmed by the applicant that the fabric of the building has been designed in line with Part L2A of the 2013 Building Regulations (Conservation of Fuel and Power), and that it has been designed to maximise the thermal performance of the building. The proposed building will achieve improved thermal performance that exceeds current Building Regulations Part L2A with respect to the walls, floors, glazing and air permeability. The specification of these will help to reduce the building's heat losses and positively contribute to the building's sustainability credentials.

Other matters:

- 5.1.55 During the course of reconsulting on this application additional concerns have been raised regarding the ability to construct the development and use of adjacent land. For the avoidance of doubt a planning application cannot be refused on the basis of issues relating to the construction of the development. This is not a material planning consideration but a matter for the developer/landowner to resolve. Permitted development rights exist in relation to the use of adjoining land for temporary periods whilst development is implemented and as such as a local planning authority there is no control over the use of the land for this purpose. The CMP (to be secured through condition) in any event seeks to mitigate the impact of the development in so far as it possible to do so within the extent of planning control.
- 5.1.56 In addition an issue was raised in relation to landownership and extent of the red edge of the application site which due to a drafting error had included Hyrons Lane, this has now been omitted.

Conclusion

- 5.1.57 The revisions to the building design and the additional supporting information submitted by the applicant, in response to the matters for which the application was deferred from the February Planning Committee meeting are considered to respond appropriately to the concerns raised. The changes to the design, materials and appearance of the building are supported, the increased parking provision proposed is considered a reasonable and proportionate response, and the revised arrangements for minibus parking, coach parking and servicing vehicles represent improvements to the original proposal. The additional supporting information submitted appropriately addresses matters relating to town centre impact, noise conditions and the thermal performance of the building. The additional consultation period has demonstrated the level of public support for the proposal, whilst also recognising the objections received, and those reasons for objecting.

Recommendation

- 5.1.58 The recommendation, on the basis of the revised additional information, is to resolve to recommend Council approves its own development subject to referral to Full Council and subject to the conditions as set out on pages 38-44 of the original case officer report with a revision to the wording of condition 16 (external materials), as set out below:-

Before any construction work commences above ground, a sample panel of all external materials are to be erected on site (including mortar mix and pointing profile) including named types of samples of all the facing and roofing materials to be used for the external construction of the development hereby permitted, details of this shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be fully implemented in accordance with the approved details unless alternative materials details are submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

6 ITEMS FOR NOTING

6.1 NEW PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT APPEALS

CH/2017/1650/FA - Log cabin for use as a farm office, restroom and storage associated with the agricultural use (part-retrospective), Oaklands Farm, Beamond End Lane, **Beamond End**

PL/18/2316/FA - Redevelopment of site with three dwellings following demolition of existing dwelling and using same vehicular access, Lantern Lodge, Chiltern Hill, **Chalfont St Peter**

PL/18/3249/FA - Demolition of Nine Elms and The Cottage and erection of 2 detached two storey dwellings, including new entrance gates and associated ancillary works served by existing access onto Jordans Way, Nine Elms, Jordans Way, **Jordans**

PL/18/3625/FA - Two storey side, single storey front and single storey rear extension following demolition of existing utility room, 55 Tylers Hill Road, **Chesham**

PL/18/3698/FA - Two storey rear and single storey front extensions, 10 Charter Drive, **Amersham**

PL/18/3811/FA - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of two detached dwellings served by an altered access, 21 Howe Drive, **Knotty Green**

PL/18/3827/OA - Outline application for erection of two detached houses, improvement works to the unnamed lane and provision of associated parking and landscaping, Penn Wood House, Beamond End Lane, **Beamond End**

PL/18/4507/FA - Erection of Timber Building (retrospective), Land rear of The Cottage, Cherry Lane, **Woodrow**

6.2 APPEAL DECISIONS

CH/2017/1958/FA - Erection of 6 retractable floodlight columns (2.8m rising to 15m) and lamps to light a football pitch plus associated control cabinet, Penn and Tylers Green Football Club, Elm Road, **Penn**

Officer Recommendation: Refuse Permission

Committee Decision: Refuse Permission

Appeal Decision: Appeal Allowed (16.04.2019)

CH/2017/2068/EU - Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for an existing use relating to land as residential garden in connection with Lands Farm, Barrack Hill, **Coleshill**

Officer Recommendation: Refuse to Grant Use Certificate

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed (03.04.2019)

CH/2018/0480/FA - Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a detached building comprising 9 flats, with accommodation in the roof space, basement parking with vehicular access ramp, the erection of a bin store, and associated landscaping, Newbury House, 2 Knottocks Drive, **Knotty Green**

Officer Recommendation: Defer to approve subject to legal agreement

Committee Decision: Refuse Permission

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed (02.04.2019)

CH/2018/0679/FA - Agricultural building (Unit 2) part retrospective involving alterations and retention of part of building the subject of enforcement notice 2015/00016/AB/EN/1, Whitethorns Farm, Ashley Green Road, **Chesham**

Officer Recommendation: Refuse Permission

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed (26.03.2019)

PL/18/2180/FA - Demolition of existing garage, erection of two-storey side extension to form one flat and erection of detached rear building to form one flat with associated garage and hard landscaping, MMC Sportif Ltd, Sunnyside, London Road, **Chalfont St Giles**

Officer Recommendation: Refuse Permission

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed (18.04.2019)

PL/18/2421/FA - Energy storage facility to provide energy balancing services to the National Grid, Land Adjacent to Energy Transform Station, Lycrome Road, **Chesham**

Officer Recommendation: Refuse Permission

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed (02.04.2019)

PL/18/3422/FA – Erection of detached carport, 40 Copperkins Lane, **Amersham**

Officer Recommendation: Refuse Permission

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed (09.04.2019)

PL/18/4129/FA - Loft conversion incorporating rear dormer, 26 Abrahams Close, **Amersham**

Officer Recommendation: Refuse Permission

Appeal Decision: Appeal Dismissed (01.04.2019)

6.3 WITHDRAWN APPEALS

PL/18/2033/FA - Redevelopment of site to provide two detached dwellings with integral garages, a pair of semi-detached dwellings with garages and hardstanding, landscaping and vehicular accesses, 28-32 Oval Way, **Chalfont St Peter**

Officer Recommendation: Conditional Permission

Committee Decision: Refuse Permission

Appeal Withdrawn (16.04.2019)

6.4 CONSENT NOT NEEDED

PL/19/0672/HB - Two free standing externally illuminated car parking signs and replacement externally illuminated pole mounted sign, The Polecat Public House, 170 Wycombe Road, **Prestwood**

6.5 PERMISSION NOT NEEDED

PL/19/0728/TP - Felling of an ash tree protected by a Tree Preservation Order, 16-22 Park Grove, **Knotty Green**

6.6 WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

CH/2018/0421/FA - Erection of two semi-detached dwellings, served by new access from Forelands Way, Land to Rear of The Forelands, Punch Bowl Lane, **Chesham**

PL/18/3563/FA - Redevelopment of site with 2 detached dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping following demolition of existing buildings (Option 2), Stable Farm, Amersham Road, **Chalfont St Peter**

PL/18/3649/FA - Subdivision of plot and erection of dwellinghouse attached to existing dwellinghouse, 30 Upper Belmont Road, **Chesham**

PL/18/4566/FA - Erection of single storey temporary classroom unit with associated landscaping, Alfriston School, Penn Road, **Knotty Green**

PL/19/0451/SA - Application for certificate of lawfulness for proposed: Conversion of the existing one flat above a shop into 2 flats, 111A High Street, **Chesham**

6.7 INFORMATION REGARDING PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE DETERMINED

Appended for your consideration are lists of applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, and the Planning [Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas] Act, 1990, together with a recommendation from the Head of Planning Services. The forms, plans, supporting documents and letters of representation relating to each application are available for inspection on Public Access on the Councils Website.

Background papers for each of these planning applications, unless otherwise stated, are the application form and related letters, statements and drawings, notices, papers, consultations, and any written representations and comments received.

Reports may be updated at the meeting if appropriate, for example, where responses from consultees or further letters of representation are received.

AGENDA ITEM No. 7

7 REPORTS ON MAIN LIST OF APPLICATIONS

AGENDA ITEM No. 8

8 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) the public be excluded from the meeting of the following item(s) of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act
