



South Buckinghamshire Area Planning Committee minutes

Minutes of the meeting of the South Buckinghamshire Area Planning Committee held on Tuesday 12 April 2022 in Amersham Council Chamber, King George V House, King George V Road, Amersham HP6 5AW, commencing at 2.30 pm and concluding at 3.45 pm.

Members present

T Egleton, M Bracken, T Broom, S Chhokar, P Griffin, Dr W Matthews, G Sandy and A Wheelhouse

Others in attendance

A Armour, L Dolan, R Ghattoura, L Hornby, B Robinson and A-M Kenward

Agenda Item

1 Apologies for Absence

Cllr G Hollis

The Chairman asked Cllr Dr W Matthews to stand in as vice chairman.

2 Declarations of Interest

Councillor A Wheelhouse: Application numbers PL/21/4834/FA and PL/22/0128/FA – declared a non-pecuniary interest due to being a member of Beaconsfield Town Council and Chairman of Beaconsfield Society. Councillor Wheelhouse declared she had not expressed a view when the applications were discussed and that she had an open mind, would listen to the debate and make a decision once the debate was over.

3 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 15 March 2022 were agreed as an accurate record.

4 WITHDRAWN FROM AGENDA. PL/21/3820/FA - Granary, Denham Court Farm, Village Road, Denham, Buckinghamshire, UB9 5BG

This item was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting.

5 WITHDRAWN FROM AGENDA. PL/21/3821/FA - Granary, Denham Court Farm, Village Road, Denham, Buckinghamshire, UB9 5BG

This item was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting.

6 WITHDRAWN FROM AGENDA. PL/21/3840/FA - Granary, Great Barn, Hayloft and Dairy, Denham Court Farm, Village Road, Denham, Buckinghamshire, UB9 5BG

This item was withdrawn from the agenda prior to the meeting.

7 PL/21/4834/FA - 123 Holtspur Top Lane, Holtspur, Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire, HP9 1BW

Demolition of existing building and erection of pair of semi-detached dwellings vehicular access.

This application was the subject of a site visit.

Members voted in favour of a motion to grant permission subject to conditions. The vote was defeated.

The motion was proposed by Councillor T Egleton and seconded by Councillor W Matthews.

Members then voted in favour of the motion to refuse the application for the reason of

- 1) The application site is located on the fringe of the built-up area, close to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and in a Townscape Character setting of Green Suburban. The increase in the number of dwellings on the site together with the massing, scale, design of the building and the resultant reduction in space for soft landscaping would result in a development that would not be consistent with the identified Green Suburban Townscape Character and would have a negative visual impact upon the street scene and views into the site from the wider locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies EP3 and H9 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999) and Policy CP9 of the Core Strategy (adopted February 2011).
- 2) By virtue of the massing, scale and design of the proposed semi-detached dwellings, they would appear as substantive masses of built form which would be visually intrusive and dominant, impinging upon the established relationship with the neighbours. This relationship would also be exacerbated by falling land levels on site. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring properties and as such do not comply with Policies EP3, EP5 and H9 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999).
- 3) By virtue of the location of the site being positioned close to the brow of a hill, the accessibility of the site would be dangerous to users of the highway given the increase in associated vehicular movements as a result of the increase in dwelling numbers on site. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to highway safety and convenience and is contrary to of Policy TR5 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999) and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4) The occupants of the proposal would add to the recreational disturbance of

the Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation as the proposal would not contribute satisfactorily to mitigate its impacts in this respect. In the absence of a planning obligation to secure suitable strategic access management and monitoring, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, the proposal is contrary to Core Policy 9 of the South Bucks Core Strategy (adopted February 2011), Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy SPD, and Section 15 of the NPPF.

Informative: The applicant is advised that the fourth reason for refusal can be overcome with the completion of a Planning Obligation relating to strategic access management and monitoring for the Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation. If the Applicant is minded to appeal the decision, then they are advised to contact the Council in advance to enable the completion of the Planning Obligation.

Speaking in objection: Ms Lisa Vink.

Speaking as the agent on behalf of the applicant: Mr Alexander Coney.

It was proposed by Councillor A Wheelhouse and seconded by Councillor S Chhokar.

Resolved: that the application be refused for the reasons stated above.

8 PL/22/0128/FA - 121 Holtspur Top Lane, Holtspur, Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire, HP9 1BW

Demolition of existing house and garage and erection of two semi-detached dwellings with associated refuse store and parking.

This application was the subject of a site visit.

Members voted in favour of a motion to grant permission subject to conditions. The vote was defeated.

The motion was proposed by Councillor T Egleton and seconded by Councillor W Matthews.

Members then voted in favour of the motion to refuse the application for the reason of

- 1) The application site is located on the fringe of the built-up area, close to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and in a Townscape Character setting of Green Suburban. The increase in the number of dwellings on the site together with the massing, scale, design of the building and the resultant reduction in space for soft landscaping would result in a development that would not be consistent with the identified Green Suburban Townscape Character and would have a negative visual impact upon the street scene and views into the site from the wider locality. The proposal is therefore contrary

to Policies EP3 and H9 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999) and Policy CP9 of the Core Strategy (adopted February 2011).

- 2) By virtue of the massing, scale and design of the proposed semi-detached dwellings, they would appear as substantive masses of built form which would be visually intrusive and dominant, impinging upon the established relationship with the neighbours. This relationship would also be exacerbated by falling land levels on site. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring properties and as such do not comply with Policies EP3, EP5 and H9 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999).
- 3) By virtue of the location of the site being positioned close to the brow of a hill, the accessibility of the site would be dangerous to users of the highway given the increase in associated vehicular movements as a result of the increase in dwelling numbers on site. The proposal would therefore be detrimental to highway safety and convenience and is contrary to of Policy TR5 of the South Bucks District Local Plan (adopted March 1999) and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4) The occupants of the proposal would add to the recreational disturbance of the Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation as the proposal would not contribute satisfactorily to mitigate its impacts in this respect. In the absence of a planning obligation to secure suitable strategic access management and monitoring, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, the proposal is contrary to Core Policy 9 of the South Bucks Core Strategy (adopted February 2011), Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy SPD, and Section 15 of the NPPF.

Informative: The applicant is advised that the fourth reason for refusal can be overcome with the completion of a Planning Obligation relating to strategic access management and monitoring for the Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation. If the Applicant is minded to appeal the decision, then they are advised to contact the Council in advance to enable the completion of the Planning Obligation.

Speaking in objection: Ms Lisa Vink.

It was proposed by Councillor A Wheelhouse and seconded by Councillor S Chhokar.

Resolved: that the application be refused for the reasons stated above.

9 Date of Next Meeting
10 May 2022, 2.30pm

10 Availability of Members Attending Site Visits (if required)
To confirm members' availability to undertake site visits on 9 May 2022, if required