



**10. a.m. Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> July 2021**

**Naphill Scout and Guide Hut, Main Road, Naphill, Bucks., HP14 4SX.**

Members of the Planning Committee of the Chilterns Conservation Board for the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty are hereby summoned to a meeting of the Planning Committee at 10.00 a.m. Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> July 2021. Access to meeting from 9.30am.

**Agenda**

1a. Election of Chair and Vice-chair and co-opted members	10:00 – 5 mins
1b. Introductions and apologies	10:05 - 1 min
2. Declarations of Interest	10:06 - 1 min
3. Minutes of Previous Meeting (draft minutes attached)	10:07 - 8 mins
4. Matters Arising	10:15 - 5 mins
5. Public Questions	10:20 - 20 mins
6. CCB Update from Chief Executive Officer (verbal update)	10:40 - 10 mins
7. Terms of Reference & Scheme of Delegation (paper attached)	10:50 - 10 mins
8. Planning Committee Work Programme (paper attached)	11:00 - 10 mins
9. National & Regional Matters (verbal update)	11:10 - 10 mins
10. Development Plan Matters (paper attached)	11:20 - 10 mins
11. Development Management Matters (paper attached)	11:30 - 25 mins
12. Any Urgent Business	11:55 - 5 mins



**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE OF THE CHILTERN'S  
CONSERVATION BOARD FOR THE CHILTERN'S AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL  
BEAUTY**

**held on Wednesday 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2021 by remote video conferencing**

**commencing at 10.00 AM**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Appointing Body</b>
<b>Appointed by Local Authorities</b>	
Cllr Lynn Lloyd	South Oxfordshire District Council.
Cllr Hugh McCarthy	Buckinghamshire Council
Cllr Richard Newcombe	Buckinghamshire Council
Cllr Nick Rose	Buckinghamshire Council

<b>Appointed by the Secretary of State</b>	
Colin Courtney	Secretary of State
John Nicholls	Secretary of State- Chairman
Elizabeth Wilson	Secretary of State- Vice-Chair

<b>Elected by Parish Councils</b>	
Cllr Sue Biggs	Oxfordshire

<b>Co-opted Members</b>	
Chris Hannington	
Paul Hayes	

<b>Officers present-</b>	
Elaine King	CCB Chief Executive Officer
Mike Stubbs	CCB Planning Advisor
Matt Thomson	CCB Planner

<b>And others</b>	
Deirdre Hansen	Minute taker
Paul Matthews	Volunteer Transport Advisor

*This meeting is being held remotely in accordance with the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020 no. 392*

#### **420. Apologies for absence**

Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr Alison Balfour-Lynn, Hertfordshire Parish Councils

Not present Cllr Phil McDowell, Dacorum Borough Council.

#### **421. Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Sue Bigg declared a personal interest in the Kidmore End Neighbourhood Plan and Cllr Richard Newcombe declared an interest as a member of the BC Strategic Sites Committee.

#### **422. Minutes of the previous meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held 18<sup>th</sup> November 2020 were approved as a true record after the following amendments were made:

- 412 replace “thorough” with “through”
- 413.1 after “and protecting landscapes” perspectives was added.
- 414 first sentence was amended to read “The planning advisor sought approval from the Committee for the....”.
- 417. 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph “on the Chilterns on travel” was amended to” on the Chilterns of travel.

#### **423. Matters Arising from the minutes**

None.

#### **424. CCB Update from Chief Executive Officer.**

The CEO gave a brief update on the report issued at the Board meeting.

There was not a strong planning element, Highlights are:

1. HS2.
  - The CCB is not a statutory consultee and as such does not see the s17 applications. An informal grouping has been set up with Buckinghamshire Council (BC) to share information and identify points in the calendar where there will be challenges.
  - A separate group has been set up to issue press releases.
  - The CCB is trying to influence the decision-making parties. The CEO is asking questions and the CCB is keeping its presence known, but how much time should be spent on HS2?
  - It was noted that the Chiltern Society is very active on HS2 and that they have time to do so.
2. Proposal for a National Landscapes Service.

The meeting discussed the developments.

The Chairman thanked the CEO.

1. **The Committee NOTED the updates.**

#### **425. Planning Committee Works Programme**

The Planner had provided a paper proposing a new standard agenda structure and possible new ways of working and sought approval to develop a structured, flexible, work programme for the committee.

The members shared their thoughts and ideas on the proposed way forward making suggestions. The main stay is a standard agenda structure, a three-year rolling programme and an annual key discussion/decision meeting as well as introducing new position statements and suggestions for other topics to be looked at.

The Committee discussed the proposal and agreed the direction of travel with some caution.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the content of the paper, including the dates of the next meetings.**
- 2. The Committee APPROVED the standard agenda and the proposal to develop a rolling three-year programme.**
- 3. The Committee DISCUSSED and MADE SUGGESTIONS for future priorities and ways of working.**

#### **426. National and Regional Matters-update**

The Planner had provided the committee with a report on national planning reforms and regional and sub-regional planning matters, including major infrastructure, and sought approval for responses to consultations submitted on behalf of the CCB.

National Planning Policy and Guidance changes:

1. Responded to: MHCLG amended the standard method for assessing housing need (Dec 2020), it now means an additional 35% housing uplift in urban areas outside London. This is the new policy we will have to work with. This will affect Reading and could have an impact on the South Oxfordshire Local Plan. It does mean less housing for Buckinghamshire.
2. Responded to: MHCLG's consultation on Supporting Housing Delivery and Public Service Infrastructure. It further extends permitted development rights and could have a harmful impact in the AONB.
3. Still working on: MHCLG consultation on a National Model Design Code and changes to the NPPF and PPG. There are some good changes proposed.
4. MHCLG announced increased resources for councils wishing to create or enhance local heritage lists. The Planner will keep the committee informed of developments.
5. National Transport Policy published late February 2021. There were no changes from the consultation paper. It does not offer how to protect or enhance protected landscapes.

Regional and infrastructure matters:

1. Oxford-Cambridge Arc:

MHCLG has published Planning for Sustainable Growth in the Oxford-Cambridge Arc. The CCB will incorporate the new information into the work on developing a position. It was noted that how the pandemic has impacted commuting will need national consideration.

2. East-West Rail: potential to make the Chilterns more accessible by train, but the Committee noted the current proposals do not include the spur to Aylesbury..
3. England's Economic Heartland Transport Strategy. The final strategy is due to be published late February 2021.

Major Infrastructure:

HS2: an update was provided at the February Board meeting.

The meeting discussed the report and the responses.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the content of the report and APPROVED the responses submitted under delegated authority.**

#### **427. Development Plan Matters- update**

The Planner reported that the South Oxfordshire Local Plan had been adopted.

Dacorum officers had been proactive in involving the CCB with the formation of the Dacorum Local Plan as well as treating the CCB as a statutory consultee. The Planner had submitted the CCB's response and circulated it to the committee.

Buckinghamshire Council has started work on their new local plan. As a first stage they have issued a call for Brownfield Sites.

CCB comments were submitted to the Kidmore End Neighbourhood Plan.

The Burnham Beeches Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Strategic Access Management Supplementary Planning Document has been adopted by Buckinghamshire Council.

- 1. The Committee NOTED the content of the paper and APPROVED the submissions made under delegated authority on the relevant consultations.**

*It was agreed to change the running order of the agenda with items 10 & 11 proceeding item 9.*

#### **428. Lighting and Tranquillity- policy discussion**

The Planning Advisor had provided a paper proposing options for a future approach to the Board's position on Lighting and Tranquillity.

It was noted that there is a lack of planning guidance on lighting and tranquillity, which is a technical subject.

The item has come forward due to the CCB's submission to an All-Party Parliamentary Group (APPG) Dark Skies Consultation (Sep 2020), recent planning applications in the AONB involving lighting within the AONB and an increased focus on this issue by bodies like the CPRE and the National Association of AONBs.

The members discussed the options put forward and noted that Cranbourne Chase AONB has produced a position statement and good practical advice on dark skies, which would be worth looking at.

**1. The Committee PROVIDED a steer on the appropriate way forward from the options set out.**

*11.46 Cllr Sue Biggs left the meeting. She was thanked for her contributions to the committee. She replied that she had enjoyed working with the CCB and this committee.*

**429. Chilterns Design Awards**

The Planner informed the committee that the Design Awards will go ahead this year, all be it with a shift in the timetable to later in the year, post lockdown. The Chiltern Society is producing a project plan. The committee will be kept updated on the plans.

**1. The Committee NOTED the update.**

*11.50 Cllr Richard Newcombe left the meeting. He had enjoyed his time on the committee.*

**430. Development Matters- update**

The Planning Advisor advised the committee about and sought approval for the 27 representations on planning applications and the 1 planning appeal representation, including 9 objections and 18 comments.

Of interest to note since November 2020, 4 notices of refusal and 5 applications were withdrawn which were objections or comments seeking revisions from the CCB.

Particular note was made of the following planning applications:

- CC/3/83 Bledlow Household Recycling Centre, Wigans Lane, Bledlow Ridge, Bucks. Planning appeal lodged.
- CB/20/03540/FUL Isle of Wright Lane, Dunstable, Beds. Application withdrawn
- 20/07885/FUL Land North of Bushes Wood and East of Pheasants Lane, Parmoor, Frieth, Bucks. This has been deferred, height has been reduced, but is still an intrusive structure.
- Luton Airport Arrivals consultation.
- PL/20/03652/FA Penn Street Farm, Penn, Bucks. No consideration for the AONB. Refused by BC
- AOC/0051/20 The Misbourne School, Misbourne Drive Gt. Missenden. Condition permitted.
- P19/S4576/O & Pins APP/Q3115/W/20/3265861 Little Sparrows, Sonning Common. Public enquiry opens 27/04/21. The planning advisor asked to be a representative.
- P20/S4706/FUL Land West of Wallingford Road adjacent to sewage works between Goring and South Stoke. More comprehensive buffering would be beneficial.
- P21/S0047/FUL Grove Farm, Patemore Lane, Pishill, Oxfordshire. Had been withdrawn and has come back simpler with 1 less pod.
- P20/S4850/FUL. Jo Jo's Winery, Russells Water, Henley. A challenging application, using the landscape to reduce the bulk

The Chairman thanked the Planning Advisor for sharing his work.

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

**431. Urgent Business**

1. This was the last meeting for Cllrs Hugh McCarthy and Nick Rose. They were thanked for their immeasurable contributions over the years. They both said they had enjoyed the committee.

**419 The next meeting was agreed as Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> July 2021.**

**Future date: Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> November 2021**

**The Chair.....**

**Date.....**

## Item 7: Terms of Reference and Scheme of Delegation

<b>Author:</b>	Matt Thomson, planner
<b>Lead Organisations:</b>	Chilterns Conservation Board
<b>Resources:</b>	Staff time
<b>Summary and purpose of report:</b>	The report discusses and presents options for developing and codifying Terms of Reference for the Planning Committee and a Scheme of Delegation for the planning function.

### Context

1. Recent staff and Board membership changes have resulted in a re-examination of existing working practices and procedures, revealing the absence of a specific up-to-date written record of the Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the Planning Committee, and of the Committee's delegation of its authority to the Board's officers.
2. This is not in itself a problem as the Committee and the Board's officers have been working effectively together on the basis of established practice for several years. However, the lack of a written record makes it difficult to explain to new Board and Committee members, and to new members of staff, what that established practice is, and runs the risk of conflict or misunderstanding.
3. It is additionally possible that a stakeholder could challenge outputs from the Committee or the officers on the grounds that they were apparently produced without the specific authority of the Board. The risk for the Board would be small, because these outputs constitute advice to our stakeholders, and are not themselves binding decisions. However, a challenge could result in a planning decision that relies on our advice being overturned. Furthermore, being seen to have acted without clear authority could be a professional code of conduct issue for the Board's chartered planning officers.
4. This paper presents options for Terms of Reference and a Scheme of Delegation to address this.

### Current written procedures and protocols

5. Activities of the Board and its officers are statutorily determined by the Board's Establishment Order ([The Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty \(Establishment of Conservation Board\) Order 2004](#)), which draws heavily on the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and various local government legislation, including the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended). Combined, these define the roles and powers of the Board and how these should be discharged, including the operation of the Board and its Committees.

6. The Board has interpreted the statutory context and added greater detail through its Statutory Requirements and Code of Governance document (SRCG), the third edition of which was approved at the AGM in April. For convenience, the section relating to the Planning Committee is reproduced at the end of this paper (paras 69-76) – other parts of the document also relate to the operation of Committees more generally, with occasional specific reference to Planning Committee and to the Planning Officer.
7. The text of the reproduced section has been used largely unaltered in various similar predecessor documents issued under different titles going back at least as far as the establishment of the Shadow Chilterns Conservation Board in 2002. It has previously been referred to as implicitly comprising the Committee's Terms of Reference.
8. The same text also represents the delegation of the Board's planning functions to the Committee, and para 71 empowers the Committee to "delegate to the planning officer in consultation with the chief officer such of its functions as it considers desirable and expedient" and requires the Committee to keep this delegation "under review".
9. This provision is supplemented with (and possibly complicated by) text under the section relating to delegation to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), which states:

94. The Planning Committee may delegate its responsibilities for making representations and objections to the chief executive officer of the Board, or to the planning officer in consultation with the chief executive officer, in circumstances where response deadlines do not enable prior consideration by the Planning Committee. Any responses will be agreed with the chairman of the Planning Committee and shall be reported to the next meeting of the Planning Committee for ratification and relevant members of the Planning Committee before making comments or representations.
95. When necessary the chief executive officer will consult with the chairman of the Planning Committee

10. It is officers' understanding that the Committee has accepted that delegation has always followed practice established before the Shadow Board was set up, but that this practice has never been codified. The most recent evidence of practice being considered for review was in July 2015 (item 11), and minute 205 of that meeting records that the Committee agreed "to await the outcome of the [then ongoing] Management Review before discussing the Planning function and the Planning Committee's working arrangements". There is no record of the Committee subsequently returning to this matter.
11. While the Planning Committee is specifically established in the SRCG, and has always been a key part of the Chilterns AONB's governance in some form since it was a standing conference, the Board has no planning powers conferred upon it, and planning functions are not mentioned at all in the Board's Establishment Order.

The Board's planning activities are entirely determined as part of its general powers in line with s.87(4) of the CRow Act:

*"The powers of a conservation board include power to do anything which, in the opinion of the Board, is calculated to facilitate, or is conducive or incidental to ... the accomplishment of the purposes mentioned in subsection (1)" (i.e. "conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area" and "increasing the understanding and enjoyment by the public of the special qualities of the area") ... or any other functions "conferred on it" ... so long as activities are lawful.*

12. Strictly speaking, the Code of Governance only empowers Planning Committee to make "representations on behalf of the Board in relation to planning policy and planning applications", and it is only these activities that the Committee can delegate on to officers.
13. Questions might be asked as to whether this authority covers the full range of activities that the Committee and, indeed, the officers have historically undertaken on the Board's behalf.

### **Terms of Reference**

14. It is recommended that the Committee's ToRs should follow the example of the SRCG by presenting, for clarity, those aspects of the Committee's role and function that are predetermined (as set out in the SRCG) supplemented by the additional provisions and details that will facilitate the Committee's operation, but which are not predetermined.
15. The Committee is not empowered to amend those aspects of SRCG that currently define its role and functions. The SRCG was updated in April 2021, and the next opportunity for making any revisions to it will be the 2022 AGM. It would be appropriate that the Board should be the arbiter of Committee's ToRs, hence the Committee's consideration of its ToRs should be presented as a recommendation to the Board.
16. It is not proposed to present a draft set of ToRs to the Committee, but to set out parameters to be discussed and determined, as follows.
17. The SRCG makes the following provisions with regard to the Planning Committee's role and functions:
  - a. Planning Committee is a standing committee of the Board (para 20).
  - b. The Committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from its membership (para 21).
  - c. Membership of the Committee is appointed by the Board, "usually" at the AGM (para 22).
  - d. Proceedings of the Committee are not invalidated by any failure of the Board to determine the Committee's constitution (para 24).
  - e. Procedures for membership of the Committee, including for co-opted members, are determined in the SRCG at paras 26-28.

- f. Meetings shall be summoned by the CEO or Planning Officer (para 29), but can also be called by the Committee Chair, or Board Chair, or by resolution of a quarter of the Committee's members (para 30).
  - g. Quorum for a meeting is attendance by at least one third of the whole Committee membership (paras 31-2).
  - h. Any member of the Board may attend Committee meetings (para 33) and meetings shall be open to the public, except when dealing with confidential matters (paras 34-37).
  - i. Agendas and papers (other than confidential matters) must be made available to the public at least 3 days before the meeting (with exceptions for extraordinary meetings called at short notice) after circulation to the Board, with minutes available to the public after circulation to the Board, and papers should be available to the public for at least 4 years (paras 40-44).
  - j. The agenda shall include an item for public questions, immediately after the apologies, previous minutes and matters arising (paras 55-62).
  - k. Planning Committee's function is to "make all representations on behalf of the Board in relation to planning policy and planning applications" (para 69); provisions in support of this function, including delegation to officers and a requirement to report to the Board are set out in paras 70-73, 76 and 94 – but see para 18 below).
  - l. Planning Committee shall comprise 9 Board members (4 local authority, 3 Secretary of State, 2 parish) plus up to 4 non-Board members (para 74) with no substitutions (para 75).
18. It is your Planning Officer's view that these provisions are (for the most part) sound and sufficient for the effective operation of the Committee and are not, themselves, in need of further adjustment at this stage. There are two potential areas of uncertainty, however:
- 1. Whether the Committee's function needs to be expanded beyond simply "making representations ... in relation to planning policy and planning applications", and what this actually means (see point (a) in para 19 below); and
  - 2. Whether there are conflicts inherent in the provisions in paras 72 and 94 concerning the Committee's power to delegate authority to officers that require resolution (see the established practice under "Delegation to Officers" below). (As an aside, the last sentence of para 94 appears to require that responses should be reported to the next Committee meeting *before* being submitted.)
19. For completeness, however, the SRCG could usefully be supplemented with some or all of the following in the Committee's ToRs:
- 1. Defining what the Board means by "making representations ... in relation to planning policy and planning applications". This should specify something along the lines that:
    - i. "making representations" includes formal and informal advice, guidance and other correspondence, including with decision makers (councils, the

Planning Inspectorate, (sub-)regional bodies and government departments), developers, other stakeholders, and members of the public, plus statements published by the Board, e.g. on our website and in the media;

- ii. “planning” refers not just to activities under the Town and Country Planning Acts, but any matters relating to the development and use of land (normally excepting the matter of agricultural crops and livestock), and the deployment and management of transport and communications activity using existing infrastructure and including airborne activity; and
  - iii. “applications” includes activities leading to an application, including proposals the procedures for which are not technically described as “applications” (e.g. development orders, hybrid bills, etc.).
2. Frequency of meetings. (Recently PC has met 3 times per year, but the Board now proposes to move to quarterly meetings of the Committee, matching the Board and Executive Committee cycles.)
  3. Format and duration of meetings.
  4. Standards for the timely circulation of papers and minutes to the Committee and Board.
  5. Aspirations for composition of the Committee’s membership beyond simple numbers, e.g. geographical distribution, expertise/skill sets, diversity.

**20. The Committee is asked to consider the above and make recommendations as to the scope and content of the ToRs to be worked up further by officers for consideration by the Board.**

21. The Committee may wish to consider whether any of the above might be worth elevating to the SRCG in a future revision, and/or whether there are other functions of the Board that the Committee considers could be delegated to the Committee or to Officers in the SRCG.

### **Delegation to officers**

22. The SRCG delegates only the following functions to the planning officer (or officers in general):
  - Summoning meetings of committees or sub-committees (CEO or PO, para 29), and
  - Exercising any power of the CEO in her absence, where authorised (all officers, para 89).
23. While the SRCG empowers the Committee to delegate parts of its function to officers (paras 72 and 94), so far this delegation has not been codified or reviewed, and the Committee and officers have worked in the context of practice set prior to the Board’s establishment in 2004.

24. Established practice with regard to making representations on national, regional and local planning policy (and related policy areas, including transportation) and on planning (and similar) applications and other proposals has been:
1. Where consultations are “live” at the time of a Planning Committee meeting (or the consultation is programmed and the content is known or predictable), and it has been expedient to do so, officers have brought reports to the Committee seeking their input.
  2. Where this is not possible (which, with 3 or even 4 meetings annually and consultation periods tending to be between 3 and 8 weeks, is most of the time) officers have prepared and submitted responses with reference to relevant legislation and national and local planning policy, and the Board’s positions as expressed in its Management Plan, Design Guide and other published position statements and technical notes, as well as any specific advice on the proposal in question, or relevant historical advice, provided by the Committee, the Chief Executive Officer, the Chair or Vice-chair.
  3. Responses have been determined in consultation with each other (when more than one officer has been employed), and by seeking advice and occasionally sign-off from the Chief Executive Officer and Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Committee where appropriate.
  4. “Where appropriate” here has been informed by the nature of the consultation, the clarity of existing Board positions of relevance to the consultation, and standing advice from the CEO, Chair and Vice-chair about their capacity to engage with consultations. Generally speaking, in the tenure of the current Planner, both the Chief Executive and the Chair and Vice-chair have indicated that they do not have the capacity to sign off every consultation response. (It is noted that this informal arrangement does appear to contradict a strict interpretation of para 94 of the SRCG which says that “responses will be agreed with the chairman of the Planning Committee” and does not appear to allow for that agreement to be delegated.)
  5. All responses are then reported to Planning Committee for ratification, with any comments made in the Committee’s discussion fed back into relevant future consultation responses.
25. All of the above has worked effectively for the Board, as far as this officer is aware, but the lack of formal codification of the authority delegated to officers can be problematic, as outlined above. The analysis above also shows that the established practice is not precisely aligned with the Board’s intentions for delegation set out in the SRCG, despite its historic implicit and informal approval by the Committee. It also makes the role of the Committee with regard to consultation responses somewhat passive and retrospective, and this may not engage the enthusiasm of Committee members as much as it perhaps could.
26. It is also not clear from the SRCG whence the planning officers’ authority derives to undertake work on behalf of the Board other than responding to planning consultations.

27. It is therefore proposed that the Planner works with the Chief Executive Officer and the Chair and Vice-chair of the Committee to develop a scheme of delegation for the planning function, taking account of the above, and also bringing in some new thinking about how to engage the Committee more effectively 'in real time', as discussed at previous Committee meetings.
28. A current thought is that the planning officers' authority to respond independently to planning and related consultations should be linked to the provision of a register of current consultations, available for scrutiny by the Planning Committee, the Board and the Chief Executive. This would enable responses to be "called-in" for consideration through, for example, an extraordinary meeting, or by other means, such as a write-around to Committee members.
29. **The Committee is asked to consider the above and offer observations on ways forward for delegating authority to officers to discharge the Board's powers under s.87(4) of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 in an expedient and accountable way.**

### **Recommendations**

1. **That the Committee offers observations or recommendations on its Terms of Reference and delegating the Board's authority to officers as requested in paragraphs 20 and 29 of this report.**

**Extract from the Statutory Requirements and Code of Governance (2021)****The Planning Committee****Functions**

69. The Planning Committee shall make all representations on behalf of the Board in relation to planning policy and planning applications.
70. Exceptionally the Planning Committee may conclude that the matter on which it has commented is of such significance to the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty that it requires the authority of the Board. Where possible this will be dealt with under the "Report of the Planning Committee" item on the Board agenda. Where this is not possible the chairman of the Board will be asked to admit the matter at the next meeting of the Board.
71. In particular cases where the Planning Committee requires informal guidance from the Board, the chairman of the Planning Committee, or in his absence the deputy chairman, shall liaise with the chairman of the Board.
72. The Planning Committee shall delegate to the planning officer in consultation with the chief executive officer such of its functions as it considers desirable and expedient and shall keep such delegation under review.
73. The Planning Committee will report responses made on significant matters by it, or on its behalf, to the Board at each subsequent meeting of the Board.

**Composition**

74. Subject to paragraph 26 the Planning Committee shall be comprised of nine members of the Board and up to four persons who are not members of the Board.

The composition of those nine members ideally shall be:

Local authority members:	4
Members appointed to the Board by the Secretary of State:	3
Parish council members:	2

75. No substitute member is permitted to attend meetings on another member's behalf

**Form of signature**

76. Where the Planning Committee acts on planning matters under its delegated authority the chairman (or vice-chairman in his absence) of the Committee will be the authorised signatory using the following convention: “xxx, Chairman, Chilterns Conservation Board Planning Committee, for and on behalf of the Chilterns Conservation Board”.

## Item 8: Planning Committee Work Programme

<b>Author:</b>	Matt Thomson, planner
<b>Lead Organisations:</b>	Chilterns Conservation Board
<b>Resources:</b>	Staff and volunteer (Committee member) time, plus budget of £500 for minute-taker.
<b>Summary and purpose of report:</b>	To update the Committee on progress with new ways of working and the Committee's work programme.

### Background

30. This paper continues the new standard agenda item updating the Committee on progress with reviewing how the Committee works and with its work programme.

### Another new standard agenda item

31. In addition to this meeting's additional item to elect the Committee's Chair and Vice-Chair, undertaking research for the item on the Committee's Terms of Reference revealed a requirement in the Statutory Requirements and Code of Government document for the Committee to allocate space in the agenda for "Public Questions".
32. It is a statutory requirement that the Committee is open to attendance by members of the public (paras 34-37 of the SRCG), and that there should be an opportunity for members of the public to ask questions (paras 55-62). Public questions are normally placed immediately after the 'administrative' agenda items, but Planning Committee may determine to have questions asked at the time of considering a relevant agenda item. A maximum of 20 minutes is advised for public questions, and this has been accounted for in the timing of the agenda – if, as is expected, no public questions are received, this will give the Committee a welcome 20 minutes contingency for the rest of the meeting's business.
33. Questions must be submitted to the Chief Executive Officer (or her representative) "prior to the meeting". There is no specific requirement to advertise this opportunity, and we have not done so in advance of this meeting. Nonetheless, the SRCG's requirement that the agenda and papers are published at least 3 days before the meeting could mean that a curious reader of our website spots and seeks to take advantage of the opportunity. **The Committee may wish to consider whether we should advertise this facility more proactively.**

### Casework updates and new ways of working

34. Officers have not yet had the capacity to make significant progress on modernising the format in which we present casework updates to the Committee, or making information on 'live' consultations more accessible to Members 'in real time'. As a result, the reports continue to follow the established format.

35. We have given the matter some thought however. In particular, colleagues working on the 'Chalkscapes' project have recently launched a microsite, using Microsoft's SharePoint platform, intended to facilitate communication and collaborative working between the partners involved with that project. It is likely that we will investigate a (probably less sophisticated) SharePoint application in which to share a register of current consultation casework and associated documentation with Committee and Board Members.
36. We are also beginning to move towards presentation and analysis of casework activity on a quarterly basis, aligning with the new quarterly meeting cycles.

### **Future priorities**

37. As a result of the interim nature of this meeting, officers have not yet taken forward proposals discussed in March for developing a comprehensive but flexible work programme for the Committee. Our intention is to bring that programme to the next meeting.
38. Some progress has been made on the draft lighting and tranquillity position statement, and we intend to bring that to the next meeting too.

### **Dates of next meetings**

39. The Board has now approved revised dates for Planning Committee, in accordance with the new quarterly cycle. This means that the meeting originally scheduled for 17 November 2021 has been cancelled. The agreed dates for the next meetings are now as follows:
  - **13 October 2021**
  - **12 January 2022**
  - **13 April 2022**

### **Recommendations**

1. **That the Committee notes the content of this paper, including the dates of next meetings.**

## Item 8: Development Plan Matters – update

<b>Author:</b>	Matt Thomson, planner, with Michael Stubbs, planning advisor
<b>Lead Organisations:</b>	Chilterns Conservation Board
<b>Resources:</b>	Staff time
<b>Summary and purpose of report:</b>	To inform the Committee about, and seek approval of, responses that have been made under delegated powers in connection with development plans (strategic, local and neighbourhood) and to update the Committee on any outcomes.

### Local Plans

40. CCB's response to the **Dacorum Local Plan** regulation 18 [consultation](#) was submitted just ahead of the last Planning Committee meeting and after papers had been circulated. For completeness, our response is [here](#), and was summarised in the paper that went to Committee in March. Dacorum's consultation page (linked above) now includes a comprehensive summary of responses received to the consultation, including the following (caveated) summary of key themes raised (p.6):

- A substantial number of objections were received to the overall level of growth in the Borough with many feeling that the Standard Method for calculating housing need was flawed because it was based on outdated 2014-based household projections and not the more recent 2018 figures.
- A large number of residents opposed the overall level of growth earmarked for Tring and Berkhamsted in particular on the basis that this level growth would be disproportionate to these settlements.
- A number of residents felt that the Council should be looking to justify lower numbers based on the constraints in the Borough including the Green Belt, the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the presence of the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC).
- A substantial number of people felt that the Council had not maximised urban capacity in the Borough before releasing land in the Green Belt.
- A large number of people felt that COVID-19 had fundamentally altered how people will live and work and felt that opportunities for further conversions of offices, retail and other employment spaces to housing should be re-examined.
- Many residents questioned the ability of infrastructure to accommodate the proposed growth.
- Detailed representations were made to the Council from landowners/developers of sites included in the consultation and also of sites that were not included in the consultation. These representations raise a number of conflicting issues and further evidence gathering may be required to examine the issues raised.

41. It is pleasing to note that the key issues raised in our response are represented in some form here. Our understanding is that the volume of responses received was

very high and the published timetable for preparing the plan is likely to be affected as a result.

42. Related to the above, officers have also engaged with the Hemel Garden Communities project, which is a partnership between Dacorum and neighbouring St Albans council, with other stakeholders, looking at the sustainable growth of Hemel Hempstead itself. The Planner attended a workshop looking at developing a Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy for expanding the town. Once again, Dacorum's officers have been taking a positive and sensitive approach, and the principles around which the strategy is being formed include making connections with the AONB (in visual, accessibility and nature recovery terms) and improving the landscape corridors around the area's two chalk streams. The scale and location of development as currently proposed are still problematic (and this point was emphasised by the Planner) – but that issue notwithstanding, the approach being taken is enlightened and could have a bearing on the consideration of Natural England's proposed extension of the AONB in that area.
43. No response was submitted to the Hertfordshire County Council **draft Waste Local Plan [consultation](#)**. The plan largely focused on improvements to existing sites, and there were no proposals considered to have an impact on the Chilterns AONB.
44. Our [response](#) to the **Central Bedfordshire local plan main modifications [consultation](#)** focused, as anticipated, on the development proposed to the north of Luton, and the associated bypass, known as the M1-A6 link. We also raised concerns about the demotion of support for the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide from policy to supporting text, and various internal inconsistencies in the plan. Pragmatically speaking, there is very little likelihood of influencing the content of a local plan at the main modifications stage, but our clear inference was that adoption of the plan in the form as proposed to be modified could be considered unlawful in terms of s.85 of the CROW Act 2000.
45. **Three Rivers District Council** published a [consultation](#) on their new local plan under Regulation 18 on 11 June 2021, with an original deadline of 23 July, now revised to 20 August. It had been hoped to bring a report on the consultation to this Committee, but that has proved difficult due to pressures of other work. It is anticipated that at least a verbal briefing could be given to Committee on the 15<sup>th</sup>. The consultation is in two parts: "preferred policy options" and "sites for potential allocation", hence there is still a great opportunity to influence the plan's vision, strategy and detailed content. Initial assessment suggests that, once again, a local planning authority that is significantly affected by both AONB and Green Belt designations is proposing to plan to meet or exceed its centrally-derived assessment of local housing need figure, despite the NPPF para 11 requirement that it should not. The plan may also now need to take account of the possibility of the area covered by the AONB being extended here.

### Neighbourhood plans

46. We submitted supportive comments on the **Shiplake Neighbourhood Plan** pre-submission (Reg. 14) [consultation](#), noting the Parish Council's early engagement with the Board. We commended their draft [Local Landscape Character Assessment](#)

Study (produced by Bettina Kirkham) and its use in justifying a robust “valued landscape” policy context for the Plan, which draws on our advice on considering the setting of the AONB.

47. Shiplake Parish Council was one of the stakeholders involved in discussions that led to our 2013 submission to Natural England seeking an extension to the AONB in the Thames Valley area. It should be noted that Natural England are keen to make the best use possible of locally generated landscape data and assessments as part of their drive to expedite consideration of the designation of new areas as AONB. Shiplake PC’s work and their neighbourhood plan are likely to provide an exemplary case study.

### **Recommendations**

1. **That the Committee notes the contents of this paper and approves the submissions made under delegated authority on the relevant consultations (paragraphs 1, 5 and 7).**

## **Item 11: Development Management Matters**

<b>Author:</b>	Michael Stubbs, Planning Advisor
<b>Lead Organisations:</b>	Chilterns Conservation Board
<b>Resources:</b>	Staff time
<b>Summary:</b>	Representations have been made regarding a number of planning applications and a number of previous cases have been determined.
<b>Purpose of report:</b>	To inform the Committee about, and seek approval of, the responses that have been made under delegated powers in connection with the planning applications as listed and to update the Committee on any outcomes.

### **Background**

1. News on the outcome of previous planning applications on which the Board has made representations is summarised in Appendix 11.1. Of interest and since March 2021 3 notices of refusal were also the subject of CCB objections and 2 applications were withdrawn, to which CCB had also commented seeking revisions or had objected. In two applications the LPA granted permission where CCB previously raised objection, but revisions were achieved (Lords Mill and Misbourne School). In the majority of cases (14 applications) applications were granted, to which the CCB had made comments.
2. Since the last Planning Committee papers for the March 2021 meeting, the Board has made 40 formal representations on planning applications, including 2 appeal representations. These comprise 10 objections, 25 comments, 2 appeal representations, one in support, one pre-application comment and one part comment/part object. The CCB also appeared at a planning inquiry and submitted evidence (Little Sparrow site at Sonning Common). That appeal was allowed (granted on 25th June 2021 and a verbal update will be given. The formal representations are summarised in Appendix 11.2.
3. Current live casework is listed in Appendix 11.3.
4. The Planning Advisor will provide reflections on outcomes of CCB representations.

### **Recommendations**

1. **That the Committee notes and approves the responses made in connection with the applications listed in Appendix 11.2.**

<b>Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.1</b>						
<b>Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon</b>						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded
Land West of Cockernhoe / Land East of Cockernhoe	NHDC	16/02014/1	Erection of 660 dwellings	Pending	<b>CCB Comments</b> as previously reported	05.03.16
Land south and north-west of Cockernhoe and east of Wigmore, Cockernhoe	NHDC	17/00830/1	Mixed use application for up to 1,400 new dwellings and other uses - Outline planning application with all matters reserved	Pending	<b>CCB Objection</b> as previously reported	3.8.17
Land to the south of Newnham Manor	SODC	P16/S3852/FUL	Hybrid planning application for the erection of 100 new residential dwellings	Pending	<b>CCB Qualified Objection</b> as previously reported	24.7.18
Century Park Luton	LBC	17/02300/EIA	Outline Consent for a business park comprising office space (Class B1), warehouse and industrial space and Full application for the construction of a 2km Century Park Access Road	Pending	<b>CCB Holding Objection / Part comment</b> as previously reported.  Objection based on vehicular routing and cumulative impacts on the AONB, without necessary assurances in the application details.	21.1.18
Tralee Farm 20 Wycombe Road Holmer Green Bucks	Bucks, Wycombe Area.	18/07194/OUT	Outline application (including details of access, layout & scale) for erection of 103 dwellings with all other matters reserved	Pending	<b>CCB Comment / Part Objection</b> as previously made (based on Local Plan due process).	25.9.18
Upper Little London Farm Little London Wendover Buckinghamshire HP22 6QQ	Bucks, Aylesbury Area	17/00148/AOP (amended landscape assessment documents submitted June 2018).	Outline application for the demolition of the existing metal barns and outbuildings, conversion of four historic brick barns into one single dwelling and erection of 10 new dwellings	Pending	<b>CCB Comments</b> (original CCB Objection 10th April 2017 as previously reported).	24.7.18

Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded
Land off Pyrton Lane Watlington	SODC	P16/S2576/0	Outline application for the erection of up to 100 residential dwellings.	Pending	<b>CCB Objection</b> as previously reported.	16.7.18
Land Between Longwick Road & Mill Lane Princes Risborough	Bucks, Wycombe Area	18/06916/OU TEA	Outline application (including details of access only, with all other matters reserved) for the erection of up to 360 dwellings.	Pending	<b>CCB Objection</b> as previously reported.	1.9.18
Bozedown Farm Hardwick Road Whitchurch	SODC	P19/S0113/FUL	Five Winter Yurts	Pending	<b>CCB Comments</b> as previously reported.	6.2.19
Land at West Hemel (site allocation LA 3)	DBC	4/03266/18/MFA	West Hemel expansion for up to 1100 (outline) and 350 (full)	Pending	<b>CCB Comments</b> as previously reported	15.2.19
Aston Hill Place Aston Hill Chivery Aston Clinton.	Bucks, Aylesbury Area	19/00679/APP	Demolish existing house and erect replacement detached dwelling	Pending	<b>CCB Comments</b> , as previously reported.	21.3.19
Gomm Valley Reserve Site Cock Lane High Wycombe Bucks	Bucks, Wycombe Area	19/05281/OU TEA	Outline application (including details of main accesses only) for mixed use development on 57.7ha of land providing for the phased delivery of: residential development of up to 1000 dwellings (Use Class C3)	Pending	<b>CCB Objection</b> , as previously reported.	18.3.19
Land off Cuxham Road Watlington	SODC	19/S1928/O	Outline planning permission for up to 70 dwellings with associated open space and sustainable drainage	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	14.7.19

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.1						
Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded
Land to the East of Manor Road to the south of Little Croft Manor Road Goring	SODC	P19/S2923/FUL	Erection of 20 dwellings and associated works with all matters reserved except for access.	Pending	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported</b> <b>CCB COMMITTEE NOTE:</b> August 2020 Planning Committee deferred for a site visit.	16.10.19
Land west of Fairmile Henley-on-Thames RG9	SODC	P19/S2350/FUL	Demolition of existing buildings and development of 72 residential units comprising 52 houses and 20 flats.	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	9.9.19
Durham Farm Durham Farm Lane Wendover Buckinghamshire HP22	Bucks, Aylesbury Area	19/02501/APP	Relocation of Durham Farm from its existing location to a new location along Durham Lane.	Application withdraw 2 <sup>nd</sup> June 2021	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported</b> Note – A fresh application was submitted, June 2021.	28.8.19
Land to South of Kennylands Road, Sonning Common, Oxfordshire	SODC	SODC reference P19/S4350/	Outline planning application for up to 26 dwellings including affordable housing.	Granted outline permission 19th Feb 2021	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported</b>	3.1.20
Land at Britwell Road Watlington	SODC	P19/S4585/O	Hybrid application comprising (1) Full planning permission for the demolition of the existing pig farm and its associated buildings; the erection of 183 dwellings.	Pending	<b>CCB comments as previously reported</b>  <b>CCB COMMITTEE NOTE -</b> Planning appeal (similar on housing layout and numbers) granted on appeal 25 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2020	17.2.20

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.1						
Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded
Land Between Stream And Sunridge Risborough Road Little Kimble Bucks (Doe Farm)	Bucks, Wycombe Area	19/08073/OUT	Outline application (including details of access) for 40 residential units (including 48% affordable housing), as well as an A1 shop	Granted permission 22nd March 2021	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported.</b>  <b>CCB COMMITTEE NOTE</b> - The Neighbourhood Plan, including a policy for this site, passed the examination stage in Feb 2020, however, the referendum is deferred until May 2021. The Neighbourhood Plan is this given ' <i>great weight</i> ' in any development management decision.	10.2.20
Chiltern Farm Barn Main Road North Dagnall Bucks	Bucks, Aylesbury Area	20/01186/APP	Conversion and alteration of existing barn to create four dwellings with access, parking and gardens	Pending	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported.</b>	9.4.20
Chiltern Hills Golf Course Green Street Chorleywood Herts Buckinghamshire (Chiltern & South Bucks)	Bucks, Chiltern & South Bucks Area	PL/20/0429/FA	Construction of a golf driving range including driving range building, protective netting attached to 25 lattice steel towers; erection of a temporary clubhouse.	Pending	<b>CCB Comment / Objection as previously reported.</b>	23.4.20
Rear of Cleeve Cottages Icknield Road Goring	SODC	P20/S0767/FUL	Erection of four terraced dwellings with associated parking and amenity space	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported.</b>	18.3.20

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.1						
Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded
Land Between The A413 Wendover Road And The B4443 Lower Road In The Parishes Of Stoke Mandeville, Weston Turville And Aylesbury.	Bucks, Strategic	CC/0015/20	New dual carriageway link road including: roundabout junction B4443 Lower Road, roundabout junction at A413 Wendover Road, railway bridge	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported.</b>	4.5.20
Stags End Equestrian Centre Gaddesden Lane Gaddesden Row	DBC	20/00706/MF A	Demolition of antiques showroom, antiques store, showroom and storage buildings. 15 new dwellings, including one to the walled garden	Pending	<b>CCB Comments as previously reported.</b>  Note - amended plans submitted September 2020 and with a number of detailed issues to address points raised by CCB	8.4.20
Land to the East of Green Street Chorleywood.	TRDC	20/0898/OUT (300 dwellings) and 20/0882/OUT (800 dwellings)	Residential development for 300 and 800 dwellings (two application) including green spaces and landscaping.	Pending	<b>CCB Objection as previously reported.</b>	15.7.20
Chalgrove Airfield	SODC	P20/S2134/O	Outline Planning Application for Residential-led mixed use development.	Withdrawn 21st May 2021	<b>CCB Comments, as previously reported.</b>  <b>CCB COMMITTEE NOTE – a revised resubmission is expected.</b>	1.09.20

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.1						
Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded
Former Water Research Centre Henley Road Medmenham Bucks.	Bucks, Wycombe Area	20/07424/FUL	Demolition of existing water research centre and construction of one dwellinghouse.	Granted permission 4th March 2021	<b>CCB Comments, as previously reported.</b>	17.08. 20
Uplands Conference House And Training Centre Four Ashes Road Cryers Hill	Bucks, Wycombe Area	20/07678/VC DN	Conversion of former Conference Centre buildings Variation of conditions 2 (Approved Plans), 5 (Landscaping scheme/planting strategy), 8 (lighting), 9 (Agreed Highways: surface water), 13 Approved SUDs condition), 17 (Footpath beside Four Ashes Road), 20 (Cycle and refuse storage) and 24 (Balcony details).	Granted permission 22nd March 2021	<b>CCB Comments, as previously reported.</b>	27.10. 20
43 Springhill Road Goring	SODC	P20/S2488/FUL	Residential development of 52 dwellings including demolition of 43 Springhill Road, vehicular and pedestrian accesses, play area, public open space and associated landscaping and earthworks.	Pending	<b>CCB Comments, as previously reported.</b>	27.10. 20

Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon							Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.1
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded	
Stags End Equestrian Centre Gaddesden Lane Gaddesden Row Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire	DBC	20/00706/MF A	Demolition of antiques showroom, antiques store, showroom and storage buildings. 15 new dwellings, including one to the walled garden.	Pending	<b>CCB Comments, as previously reported.</b>	1.10.2 0	
The Croft Dagnall Road Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead Herts.	DBC	20/03057/FUL	Proposed change of use of the existing agricultural building (Building D), to create 2No. of self- contained residential dwellings.	Granted permission 20th April 2021	<b>CCB Comments, as previously reported.</b>  The materials proposed are low key in nature and sympathetic to the site. The key test in an AONB is to conserve and enhance its special qualities, as set out in Core Strategy policy, the NPPF at 172 and in the CROW Act 2000, section 85. The Board recommends that the decision-maker takes into account the following: • The Chilterns AONB Management Plan ( <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/management-plan.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/management-plan.html</a> ), which deals with the special qualities of the Chilterns and the development chapter notes that <i>‘the attractiveness of the Chilterns’ landscape is due to its natural, built and cultural environment. It is not a wilderness but countryside adorned by villages, hamlets and scattered buildings’</i> . A new Management Plan was approved in February 2019 and some key policies from the Development chapter are set out below, which we hope will be of assistance. • The Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and Supplementary Technical Notes on Chilterns Building Materials (Flint, Brick	15.10.2 0	

Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon							Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.1
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded	
					and Roofing Materials) (of the Chilterns AONB <a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development/buildings-design-guidance.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/planning-development/buildings-design-guidance.html</a> )		
OS Parcel 5122 Ibstone Road Ibstone Bucks	Bucks, Wycombe Area	20/06891/OUT	Outline application (including details of access) for erection of two detached dwellings and associated garaging with all matters other than access reserved.	Refused 12th Feb 2021	<b>Refusal and reason 2 (of 4) deals with the AONB and stated that,</b> <i>'The application site lies within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposed development would erode a visually and functionally important green gap which contributes significantly to the local character of the area. Consequently, the proposed development would be visually intrusive and have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the countryside and would fail to conserve and enhance the AONB'.</i>	24.8.20	
Henley Tennis Club.	SODC	P20/S2656/FUL	The installation of outdoor light to tennis courts 1 and 2.	Granted permission 28th May 2021	<b>Granted</b> <b>CCB COMMITTEE TO NOTE, 2 planning conditions attached relevant to lighting.</b>  <i>(1) The lighting shall be installed and operated in accordance with the detailed specification submitted on 8th March 2021 in support of the application and the document from Signify dated 7th May 2021 stating a maximum of 3000 kelvin</i>  <i>(2) The use of the external lighting system shall be switched off by an automatic timer clock outside the hours of 7am and 9pm, and when the area is not in use within those hours and by a light sensitive switch when natural light is available.</i>	28.10.20	

Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon						Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.1
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded
Johnson Matthey Blounts Court Road Sonning Common.	SODC	P20/S2161/FUL	Demolition of existing restaurant building and development of a new customer innovation centre.	Pending	<b>CCB Comments, as previously Reported.</b>	6.08.20
Land Between Stream And Sunridge Risborough Road Little Kimble Bucks	Bucks, Wycombe Area	19/08073/OUT	Outline application (including details of access) for 40 residential units (including 48% affordable housing), as well as an A1 shop	Granted permission 22nd March 2021	<b>CCB Objection, as previously reported.</b>	4.11.2020
Bledlow Household Recycling Centre Wigans Lane Bledlow Ridge Bucks	Bucks, Strategic/PINS	CC/3/83	Proposed continuation of the use of the land as a Household Waste Recycling Site as currently consented by planning permission no. CC/3/83 at Bledlow Household Recycling Centre Wigans Lane Bledlow Ridge Bucks	Appeal and pending	<b>CCB Comments.</b>  CCB accepts that the planning history of the site must be taken into account but that a fresh <i>denovo</i> consideration of the planning merits affords an opportunity to reappraise the delivery of adopted Waste and Minerals Local Plan Policy 22. This requires a review of traffic/transport, ecological and	17.2.21

Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon							Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.1
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded	
					<p>landscape matters to seek site improvements.</p> <p>We identify the potential for ecological improvements and a management regime that will be sensitive to the nationally protected landscape within which this use is located. Further, Policy 14 of the Waste and Minerals Local Plan also indicates a much more sophisticated policy approach than would have applied when this use was first approved in 1983. In light of the important tests in section 85 of the CROW Act 2000 and the NPPF at 172, CCB has concluded that a real and meaningful opportunity exists to enact enhancements in the consideration of this application.</p>		
Gurdons Farm Oxford Road Stokenchurch Bucks	Bucks, Wycombe Area	20/07259/FUL	Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwellinghouse with associated soft and hard surfacing and landscape	Granted permission 22nd March 2021	<b>CCB Objection, as previously reported</b> (Contrary to Chilterns Buildings Design Guide).	8.12.20	
Heathercroft Elvendon Road Goring	SODC	P20/S4051/FUL	Variation of conditions 2 (Approved plans) & 10 (Landscaping) on application P20/S0017/FUL Demolition of existing dwelling and outbuildings and the erection of three dwellings.	Granted permission 19th January 2021	<b>CCB Comment, as previously reported.</b>  The CCB supports the officer's consideration of light spill and tranquillity in the delegated report considering P20/S0017/FUL. Such design and layout matters are of increasing importance in maintaining and indeed enhancing the intrinsic dark skies environment that must be maintained in nationally protected landscape. We support the conditions as relevant to this material issue.	1.12.20	

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.1						
Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded
Land North Of Bushes Wood And East Of Pheasants Parmoor Lane Frieth Bucks	WDC	20/07885/FUL	Proposed telecommunications installation of 20.0m High HEL Alpha 8 V2 pole on new concrete base and ancillary work.	Pending	<b>CCB Objection, as previously reported.</b>  <b>CCB COMMITTEE TO NOTE:</b> No further amended plans have been the subject of discussion. Wycombe area web portal shows some further details but not a new location.	11.11.20 & 4.12.20
Woodview Nurseries Tinkers Lane Wigginton Tring Herts.	DBC	20/03831/AGD	Steel Portal framed fully enclosed Agricultural Building.	Prior approval refused 19th Jan 2021	<b>CCB Comment, as previously reported.</b>	17.12.20
Land To The West Of Field Cottage (known as The Yard) Buslins Lane Chartridge Buckinghamshire	Bucks, Chiltern & South Bucks Area	PL/20/4401/FA	Erection of detached dwelling, garage, bin/cycle store and fence following demolition of existing	Refused 19th March 2021	<b>CCB Objection</b>  <b>Reason for Refusal.</b>  <i>The character of the area is spacious and rural in nature, to erect a two storey dwelling with a domestic appearance on this site would harm this rural character and special landscape character of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).</i>	12.1.21
Chestnut House Broombar Lane Great Missenden Bucks.	Bucks, Chiltern & South Bucks	PL/20/4250/CONDA	Application for approval of details reserved by conditions 6 & 15 on planning permission PL/19/4163/FA. (Redevelopment of site to provide 2 detached dwellings.	Pending	<b>CCB Comment, as previously reported.</b>	8.2.21

Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon							Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.1
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded	
Church Farm Station Road Aldbury Tring Herts	DBC	21/00324/FUL	Change of use - Conversion and refurbishment of Units 13, 14, 15 and 19 into flexible use under Class E. Demolition of Unit 9 to provide ancillary car parking spaces and landscaping,	Pending	<b>CCB Comment, as previously reported.</b>	3.2.21	
Luton Airport	LBC	21/00031/VAR	Luton Airport. Variation of condition 2 (passenger numbers), 10 (noise contours), 22 (car park), 24 (travel plan) and 28 (approved plans).	Pending	<b>CCB Comment, as previously reported.</b>	17.2.21	
The Misbourne School Misbourne Drive Great Missenden Buckinghamshire HP16 0BN	Bucks, Strategic.	AOC/0051/20	(Additional Comments) Discharge of Condition 8 (Lighting Scheme) of planning permission CC/0043/19.	Granted permission 15th Feb 2021	<b>CCB Objection, as previously reported.</b>  <b>CCB COMMITTEE TO NOTE:</b> The proposal includes lighting on 5 metres high columns. There would be a total of 27 LED luminaires installed on 24 columns. Consideration was given to the alternatives of using 3 metres high columns and bollard lighting (not progressed).  The design treatment seeks to give an average level of illumination across the areas to be lit of 10 Lux average and 0.25 uniformity which is that set out in British Standard BS5489- 1:2020. The proposals include photocell and time clock controls so that the lighting would be only operational when the facilities are in use, and use during the hours of darkness would be kept to a minimum.	27.1.21	

Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded
Little Sparrows Sonning Common	PINS	LPA Reference P19/S4576/O  PINS Reference APP/Q3115/W /20/3265861	Hybrid planning application for the development of a continuing care retirement community care village. Full planning permission for a "village core" with 31 assisted living units and 16 care units and ancillary care facilities, community space, gardens, green space, landscaping and car parking areas with a further 26 assisted living units in blocks B1-B4. An outline application (all matters reserved except access) for 60 assisted living units, ancillary community space, gardens, green space and landscaping and car parking areas.	Appeal Pending	<b>CCB Appeal Representations, as previously reported.</b>  <b>CCB COMMITTEE TO NOTE:</b> The Planning Inquiry ran from 27th April to 6th May and CCB gave evidence. This appeal was allowed (granted) on 25 <sup>th</sup> June 2021. The Inspector found exceptional circumstances on the basis of the need for this sector of housing. He also considered that the site's capacity and sensitivity allowed for development without harming the wider AONB. CCB would contest this finding but we were unsuccessful in helping persuade the Inspector to this judgment.  A verbal update will be provided at the July Committee meeting.	7.2.21
Grove Farm Patemore Lane Pishill Oxfordshire	SODC	P21/S0047/FUL	The erection of 5 holiday pods and associated landscaping and parking	Pending	<b>CCB Comments, previously reported.</b>	5.2.21
Brown Spring Farm, Potten End, Berkhamstead	DBC	20/03964/FUL	Conversion of agricultural barn to residential (prior approval)	Withdrawn 12th April 2021	<b>CCB Comments on Prior Approval Conditions, previously reported.</b>  A similar scheme under 21/00678/FUL is still to be determined.	14.1.21

Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded
The Sycamores' Land east of 206 Crowmarsh Hill.	SODC	P20/S4516/FUL	Erection of five dwellings and associated works as phased development.	Granted permission 5th May 2020	<b>CCB Comments, previously reported.</b>	8.12.20
Lords Mill Moor Road Chesham Buckinghamshire HP5 1TE	Bucks, Chiltern & South Bucks Area	PL/20/1864/HB	Listed Building Consent for The renovation and refurbishment of the Grade II listed Lords Mill Cottage and adjacent timber framed barn structures. The demolition of ancillary shed structures to the rear and the conversion of the existing barn structures into 4 no residential dwellings with rooflights, car parking, and landscaping	Granted Permission 14th May 2021	<b>CCB Objection, previously reported</b> (deletion of fish pass)  CCB Committee to note: The fish pass appears to be reinstated and the Council's Historic Buildings Officer noted in the officer's report that, <i>'There are additional environmental benefits to be gained from the new fish pass, and also from the green roof material, which will soften the appearance of the roof when viewed from higher ground and which will reduce run-off, improve insulation values and help mitigate flooding'</i> .	26.11.20
Agricultural barn and gravel driveways at plot 14 Land Northeast Of Pednor Road Chesham Bucks	Bucks, Chiltern & South Bucks Area	PL/20/2943/FA	Agricultural barn and gravel driveways at plot	Pending	<b>CCB Objection, as previously reported.</b>	5.2.21
Pophleys Farm Grange Farm Road Radnage	SODC	20/S4636/FUL	Erection of a permanent agricultural workers dwelling in connection with Pophleys Farm.	Granted 23rd Feb. 2021	<b>CCB Comments, previously reported.</b>	5.1.21

Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon							Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.1
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded	
High Heavens Landfill Site, Clay Lane, Booker.	Bucks, Strategic.	CC/0067/20	High Heavens Household Waste Site Clay Lane Booker. Application for the demolition of Dano building, reconfiguration of the site and the erection of a food waste building, waste handling bays (part retrospective), contractors office, weighbridge, food waste tank, fire water tanks.	Granted 21st May 2021	<b>CCB Comments, previously reported</b>	8.12.20	
Land to the west of Wallingford Road adjacent to sewage works between Goring and South Stoke	SODC	P20/S4706/FUL	Development and operation of a Transitional Hybrid Energy Project and associated infrastructure	Pending	<b>CCB Comments, previously reported.</b>  Amended plans submitted but still lack necessary details and amendment to the access arrangements.	25.4.21	

Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded
Penn Street Farm Penn Street Penn Bucks	Bucks, Chiltern & South Bucks Area.	PL/20/3652/FA	Installation of a 22.5m steel lattice mast housing 3 antennas, 2 dish antennas, a GPS module, 3 radio equipment cabinets and associated meter cabinet within a fenced compound and enabling operational development.	Refused 24th Feb 2021	<b>CCB Objection</b>  Reason for Refusal, based on AONB harm and stated, <i>'By virtue of the mast's height, the chosen site introduces an urban telecommunications pole which would detrimentally detract from the open rural character of the area and would be a highly visible incongruous addition within the wider sensitive landscape. The height would intrude on the lower level skyline to the extent that it would be visually harmful to the rural character of the street scene. It therefore, does not conserve the special landscape character and high scenic quality of the AONB. Whilst there is an identified need in the area, it is not considered that this particular site offers an appropriate location for the erection of the mast given the harmful visual effect that would result. Despite the social and economic benefit associated with such an installation, these would not out-weigh the substantial harmful visual effect.'</i>	8.2.21
Swiss Farm Caravan Park Marlow Road Henley-On-Thames	SODC reference	P20/S4876/FUL	Bespoke 5* Holiday Lodge Development for 24 Holiday Lodges in Lieu of Camping on the existing camping field CCB Objection	Withdrawn 3rd March 2021	<b>CCB Objection, as previously reported.</b>	2.2.21
EJ Churchill Shooting Ground, Lane End	Bucks, Wycombe Area.	20/08244 VCDN, seeking variation of W/91/6245/RT	Variation of hours of opening planning condition to permit Sunday shooting	Refused 2nd March 2021	<b>CCB Objection, previously reported.</b>  <b>Reason for Refusal dealt with AONB impacts and stated, 'The proposal for seven days of shooting activity would result in</b>	25.1.21

Update on Status of Planning Applications CCB previously commented upon						Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.1
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	CCB response	Date CCB responded
					<i>significant adverse impact by reason of cumulative noise annoyance and disturbance on the amenities of neighbouring property and land. The proposal would therefore fail to protect residential amenity and the quiet tranquil enjoyment by the public of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty’.</i>	
The Hoo Ledgemore Lane Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead Herts	DBC	20/03945/FUL	Retrospective planning consent for retention of agricultural track	Granted 10th Feb 2021	<b>CCB Comments, as previously reported.</b>	14.1.21
Chestnut House, Broombarne Lane Great Missenden	Bucks, Chiltern & South Bucks Area.	PL/20/4250/C ONDA	Approval of details reserved by conditions 6 and 15 (biodiversity and landscaping)	Pending	<b>CCB Comment, previously reported.</b>	8.2.21
Jo Jo’s Winery (formerly Chiltern Hills Farm), Russells Water, Henley.	SODC	P20/S4850/FU L	Demolish stables and store, construct a new micro winery and ancillary residential accommodation	Pending	<b>CCB Comment, previously reported.</b>	27.2.21
Land at Cholesbury Common, OS plot 4800.	Bucks, Chiltern & South Bucks Area.	APP/X0415/W /20/3261555	Change of use of land to residential accommodation for traveller community. Planning appeal by public inquiry.	Pending	<b>CCB Comment, previously reported.</b>	12.3.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Askett Nurseries Aylesbury Road Askett Bucks	Bucks, Wycombe Area	21/05307/FUL	Demolition of all existing buildings and erection of a terrace of 3 x 3-bed and 2 x detached 4-bed dwellings 1 x detached double carport with associated parking and private amenity space & enhancements.	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments.</b></p> <p>The reconfiguration of the layout does not manifest as a significant change. The principal policy change for the CCB is the adoption of the new 2019-2021 AONB Management Plan. That would not materially alter our previous comments. The current revisions maintain the general footprint and relationship to the boundaries.</p> <p>We recommend that when materials are approved that careful attention is paid to the CCB's Supplementary Technical Note and that roofing details involve a natural slate, with attention to the eaves and ridge detailing. Additionally that facing brickwork is of a suitable Chilterns type and locally sourced but always of a suitable clay type. In this location and combined with the landscaping proposed and in light of the part brown-field nature of the site, then the final design impact will enhance the AONB, as is required in the Local Plan, NPPF, Management Plan and CROW Act (section 85, duty of regard). From the papers we can see that the applicant also seeks these outcomes.</p>	1.3.21
The Village Gate PH 225 Aylesbury Road Wendover Buck	Bucks, Aylesbury Area	21/01168/APP	Erection of three buildings comprising nine dwellings (C3) following demolition of existing public house (Sui Generis) utilising existing accesses off Aylesbury Road, with associated hard and soft landscaping.	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>(i) Our previous comments sought a better treatment of the southern boundary to both supplement it and avoid the unnecessary loss of 9 trees. This application includes a landscape master-plan but we could not find any detailed confirmation of this. The new site layout still brings some development close to the southern boundary and prevents or avoids the opportunity for further landscape planting of any substance. CCB still believes this is a matter for amendment and additional planning/relocation of</p>	29.4.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					the footprint to conserve and enhance the setting of the AONB. (ii) The decision on appeal will be material here and the determination of this application should await the outcome of that appeal.	
Bishopswood Farm Horsepond Road Gallowstree Common	SODC	P21/S1659/AG	Barn for storing hay (prior approval application).	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments (prior approval)</b></p> <p>Prior approval is being sought under The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015: 586 and at Schedule 2, Part 6.</p> <p>The size and design of the proposal is striking and not appropriate within the AONB, in this form. CCB is aware that, should planning merit be material in such a determination, then we would promote design and layout amendments. The decision for prior approval also requires a judgment at Part 6 Class A, section (2) subject to subparagraph (3), where it states that <i>(i) the developer must, before beginning the development, apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required as to the siting, design and external appearance of the building.</i> This applies to new agricultural buildings, as is the case here.</p> <p>The CCB would ask that the Local Planning Authority exercise this discretion in the Statutory Instrument and, therefore, reject the prior approval on grounds of being within a nationally protected landscape. That would mean a full planning application would be required. Prior to that a pre-application discussion is best promoted to embrace the Chilterns Buildings Design guide in the use of form, layout and materials.</p>	5.5.21
Bledlow Household Recycling Centre Wigans	PINS	APP/P0430/W/21/3266409	Planning Appeal by Bledlow Ridge HRC CIC against the non-	Pending	<p><b>CCB Representations</b></p> <p>The CCB accepts that the planning history of the site must be taken into</p>	1.0 4.2 1

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Lane Bledlow Ridge Bucks			determination by Buckinghamshire Council of planning application CM/0002/20 for the proposed continuation of the use of the land as a Household Waste Recycling Site as currently consented by planning permission no. CC/3/83		account but that a fresh <i>denovo</i> consideration of the planning merits affords an opportunity to reappraise the delivery of adopted Waste and Minerals Local Plan Policy 22. This requires a review of traffic/transport, ecological and landscape matters to seek site improvements. We identify the potential for ecological improvements and a management regime that will be sensitive to the nationally protected landscape within which this use is located. Further, Policy 14 of the Waste and Minerals Local Plan also indicates a much more sophisticated policy approach than would have applied when this use was first approved in 1983. In light of the important tests in section 85 of the CROW Act 2000 and the NPPF at 172, CCB has concluded that a real and meaningful opportunity exists to enact enhancements in the consideration of this application.	

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Browns Spring Farm Plough Lane Potten End Berkhamsted Herts	DBC	21/00678/FUL	Conversion of the existing barn and removal of existing ancillary structures, plant, machinery and vehicles and creation of dwellinghouse including soft landscaping .	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>Considering this current application on its planning merits alone there is insufficient information to make a fully informed decision on matters of detail and no planning statement or Design and Access Statement is submitted. On matters of planning principle, the site is part of a much larger planning unit. Consideration will need to be given to the entire unit of occupation. This requires a comprehensive treatment of the entire site. Potentially there could be a significant improvement to the AONB but as matters stand this application forms a small part of a planning unit comprising use for storage and repair of vehicles and storage of other non-agricultural materials. As the application stands, it fails to deliver AONB policy in the CROW Act 2000 at section 85, the NPPF at 172 and the Local Plan at Policy 97. The new 2019-24 AONB Management Plan supports opportunities for enhancing the AONB by removing derelict or detracting developments and infrastructure (Policy DP13). That policy cannot be applied in isolation. It needs to be a part of a much wider and comprehensive reconsideration of the while planning unit.</p>	16.3.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Land to South of Kennylands Road, Sonning Common, Oxfordshire	SODC	P21/S2032/FUL	Development for 26 dwellings including affordable housing, new public open space and landscaping with detailed vehicular access	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comment</b></p> <p>The CCB previously commented on the previous outline application, now consented. Most of these comments still apply, notably that the principle of development is established and that the setting of the AONB would not be harmed.</p> <p>CCB, for ease of reference, sets out our previous comments. Our only supplementary comment relates to plot 1-5, which appears to have a very bulky roof when viewed from the rear elevation (i.e. the rear facing section of the roof frontage appears bulky when viewed from the south-west. The papers with the previous outline mentioned two storey development as a factor in the mitigation of impact and plot 1-5 appears as a more bulky and three storey development. As the land between this site and the AONB is itself deemed a valued landscape, then we recommend that a two storey roof form is promoted here. That will also be more sympathetic to the roof designs as adopted for the remaining dwellings.</p> <p>NOTE: Previous application (approved) was under reference P19/S4350/.</p>	1.0 6.2 1

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Kitcheners Field Castle Hill Berkhamsted Herts	DBC	21/02076/FUL	Proposed new fencing and access gates providing for safeguarding of pupils	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>The Chilterns AONB Management Plan DP1 Ensure planning decisions take full account of the importance of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB and the great weight given to its protection in the NPPF. DP2 Reject development in the AONB unless it meets the following criteria: a. it is a use appropriate to its location, b. it is appropriate to local landscape character, c. it supports local distinctiveness, d. it respects heritage and historic landscapes, e. it enhances natural beauty, f. ecological and environmental impacts are acceptable, g. there are no detrimental impacts on chalk streams, h. there is no harm to tranquillity through the generation of noise, motion and light that spoil quiet enjoyment or disturb wildlife, and i. there are no negative cumulative effects, including when considered with other plans and proposals.</p> <p>In this case the fencing, which is high, serves a safeguarding purpose and we recommend that its visual appearance is as 'blended' as is possible. This means that the materials and any associated future landscaping can create as soft a final appearance as is possible.</p>	7.0 6.2 1

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Meadhams Farm Brickworks Blackwell Hall Lane Ley Hill Chesham Bucks	Bucks, Waste & Minerals	CM/0025/21	Application to vary condition 6 (Infilling and Restoration Time Limits) of planning permission CH/2011/60006/B CC to extend the time to complete filling within Area Strong 1A by 12 months at Meadhams Farm Brickworks	Pending	<b>CCB Comments</b>  The Board has no objections to this proposal.	1.0 6.2 1
Clements End Farm, Clements Ends Road, Studham	DBC	<b>CB/21/01831/FUL</b>	New stables and ancillary residential accommodation	Pending	<b>CCB Comments</b>  A number of existing farm buildings are worthy of retention. They include brick facings and a shallow plan form, typical of many rural ancillary buildings within the AONB. They would work well as a series of re-purposed structures, ancillary to an overall livery function.  The Chilterns Buildings Design Guide provides guidance on the context of such buildings and at 4.20 states that, ' <i>It may not always be acceptable to site a new building in or around an existing farmstead either for visual or for practical reasons. Before concluding that the only available choice is to build remotely from the farmstead, consideration should be given to the repair, modification and re-use of an existing building</i> '. Thus, we see some merit in reutilising these buildings and linking them two a new courtyard for the stables.  Creating a cluster of new buildings, loosely linked to the existing buildings and with appropriate use of materials would be an approach consistent with the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide.	19. 5.2 1

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					The tied residential element, can appropriately, be integrated into this form, as is illustrated in the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide at its page 48.	
The Croft Farm Dagnall Road Great Gaddesden Hemel Hempstead	DBC	21/01344/RET	Change of use of agricultural land and retention of existing buildings for short-let holiday accommodation	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>In this case, therefore, the consideration of special qualities must prevail over other matters, if a conflict is identified and greater planning weight be attributed to those qualities over the tourism/rural diversification aspects. Looking to the AONB Management Plan, which identifies those special qualities, this location is notable for its mosaic of woodland cover, farmland, flora, fauna and public rights of access.</p> <p>The applicant has submitted a number of studies, including ecological and arboricultural. It is the case, that some of these existing works have been located above or within the root protection areas (RPAs) of a number of trees . Public access passes close by and the appreciation of the special qualities is heavily influence here by a landscape character that combines woodland with the farmed landscape. It is important, therefore, that the structures are completed shielded in the wider views and from the nearby public rights of way network. Assurances on the RPA matter is also beneficial. This would require an appropriate and proportionate landscape and visual impact assessment. It need not be complex but the LPA may want to be reassured on this point.</p>	4.5.21
The Common Berkhamstead Golf Club	PINS	APP/A1910/C/20/3265457 Dacorum BC reference: 20/00072/REF U (application refused 11th January 2020 in	Enforcement Notice Appeal by Berkhamstead Golf Club Berkhamsted Golf Club , regarding the creation of a car park.	Appeal Pending	<p><b>CCB Representations</b></p> <p>CCB supports the reasoning as advanced in the reasons for refusal at 2 and 3. We note that the Council has deemed the car park, nominally suitable for some 50 vehicles, as major development within the policy tests in the NPPF at 172. This</p>	9.3.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
		background to this enforcement notice appeal).			<p>judgment appears perfectly appropriate to us and is supported by the sensitivity of the surrounding Hertfordshire Landscape Character Type 121 (Ashridge). The Chilterns landscape here is very sensitive and highly valued. The lack of any appropriate habitat assessment in a location that is bounded to the north and east by parkland BAP priority habitats (linking to semi improved grassland), represents a significant deficiency. We had sought this information at the application stage.</p> <p>Therefore the previous application failed to deliver the conserve duty and enhance duty in the CROW Act 2000, Policy 97 of the Local Plan and was in conflict with the AONB Management Plan.</p>	
Buryfield Car Park Link Road Great Missenden Bucks	Bucks, Chiltern & South Bucks	PL/21/0770/FA	South eastern turning circle extension to existing car park.	Pending	<p><b>CCB Support</b></p> <p>CCB welcomes the care and attention to lighting in this application, which is confined to 3 limited locations within the site and avoids a floodlighting of the turning area. We recommend a 'warm light', as above, to fall below the 3,000 Kelvin limit and preferably at 2,700 Kelvin. We are able to support the variations as shown in this proposed layout and affiliated details.</p>	29.3.21
Greenbanks Toms Hill Road Aldbury Tring Herts	DBC	21/00517/FHA	Two storey side and front extensions.	Pending	<p>CCB Comments</p> <p>We support the comments made by Natural England and assurances as delivered by planning conditions to control impacts on the nearby SSSI during construction operations.</p>	30.3.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Hampden Farm Barn Greenlands Lane Prestwood Buckinghamshire HP16 9QX	Bucks, Chiltern & South Bucks Area	PL/21/1676/OA	Outline application for the erection of 12 dwellings including 5 affordable homes, and the conversion of stables block to provide a further 1 dwelling.	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>The proposed 12 dwellings represent a development that 'spills' over into the AONB landscape that envelopes Prestwood. Such a material erosion of landscape character harms the special qualities of the AONB here and notably the unspoilt countryside, secret corners, remoteness and woodland cover (see AONB Management Plan 2019-2024, pages 10 and 11 for the special qualities). The AONB's dramatic Lodge Wood, an ancient and semi natural woodland, is set within the wider farmed setting. That relationship would be eroded and lost</p> <p>12 dwellings, in this location, amounts to major development within the NPPF 172 tests. Failure to deliver any conservation or enhancement of the AONB is manifestly contrary to the Development Plan and the NPPF 172 and the CROW Act at its section 85. The applicant's do not comment on AONB policy in their supporting statement and include no landscape or visual impact assessment. Nevertheless a clear and tangible erosion of landscape character would be the result.</p>	18.5.21
Handpost Cottage Church Road Ivinghoe Bucks	Bucks, Aylesbury Area.	21/00918/APP	Removal of existing outbuildings and outside storage, and erection of 3 dwellings.	Pending	<p><b>CCB Objection</b></p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB) raises objection to this proposal which is wholly inappropriate in this location and demonstrably harms the landscape character of this part of the AONB. This site forms a constituent part of the Bucks Landscape Character Assessment LCA 10.2 Ivinghoe Foothills (LCT 10). This landscape is considered to be of a high sensitivity in the LCA study, notwithstanding its location within the AONB (by definition of high sensitivity under Landscape Institute guidance and national planning policy). To build here would be very harmful and is contrary to</p>	19.5.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					the key duty of regard in the CROW Act section 85 and in the NPPF at 172. We set out below AONB Management Plan policies DP1 and DP2 (emphasis added). This proposal is contrary to both and is unacceptable in principle.	
Carrying out of works to 650 metres of Riverbank to prevent further erosion	Bucks, Wycombe Area	21/05417/FUL	Henley Regatta Land Marlow Road Fawley Bucks.	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>The Chilterns AONB Management Plan (<a href="http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/management-plan.html">http://www.chilternsaonb.org/conservation-board/management-plan.html</a>), which deals with the special qualities of the Chilterns and the development chapter notes that ‘the attractiveness of the Chilterns’ <i>landscape is due to its natural, built and cultural environment</i>’. The Nature policies (chapter 5) in the 2019-2024 AONB Management Plan address a number of relevant issues and promote bio-diversity gains. NP5 <i>Control and eradicate (where possible) invasive non-native pests and diseases in the Chilterns and develop strategies to reduce their impact</i> (this includes Phytophthora, Himalayan balsam and Japanese knotweed). NP7 <i>Improve ecological condition, resilience and diversity of important wildlife habitats.</i> NP8 <i>Maximise ‘win-win’ opportunities where restoration/ expansion of wildlife habitats can, at the same time, provide benefits to society and respect/strengthen landscape character.</i> NP9 <i>Ensure those who make decisions that impact Chilterns’ wildlife are able to do so on the basis of robust, up-to-date and readily available ecological information.</i> NP11 <i>Ensure delivery mechanisms are in place to secure net gains for biodiversity in the AONB and its setting.</i></p> <p>CCB understands the need and desire to reinforce this part of the river bank, within the nationally protected landscape. We have seen the objection raised by the Environment Agency (EA) and we note that some of these matters may be resolved through the submission of further details.</p>	29.3.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					In these further details and assurances or controls, the CCB welcomes the design and ecological thinking behind what is called a 'green/grey' scheme in preference to a highly engineered scheme, as is evident on the south bank. The latter option would be unacceptable in any event, when measured against ecological and landscape criteria.	
High Rews Farm Seymour Court Lane Marlow Buckinghamshire SL7 3DD	Bucks, Wycombe Area	21/05530/FUL	Demolition of the existing farmhouse and link, demolition of existing sheds and storage buildings, erection of single storey side extension to existing Threshing, Milk and Flint barns with two storey side extension to create 8-bed single dwelling with associated landscaping and parking garage/storage building/farm office building. Demolition of Crendon barn and construction of new stable building.	Pending	CCB Comments We welcome the retention of the traditional buildings in the overall ensemble of buildings and the harnessing of Chilterns materials in the new buildings, including the new farmhouse. The new farmhouse echoes the barn vernacular and the materials used are sympathetic. As this is a residential use then the use of lighting from inside to outside is clearly different to a traditional farm building. The SE, SW and NE elevations do contain a lots of glazing. Whilst some of the lighting impacts will be shielded by the overall farm cluster, CCB recommends use of low light spill and non-reflective glazing, as pioneered by Pilkington glazing	1.4. 21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Hudnall Park House, Field Study Centre, Hudnall Common, Little Gaddesden	HCC	PL/0206/21	Erection of an electronically operated automatic swing gate and solar power system	Pending	<b>CCB Comments</b> The CCB would not propose to comment on this planning application in any great detail and the application looks perfectly appropriate.	19.5.21
Castle Hill (amended scheme)) at Kitcheners Field Castle Hill Berkhamsted Herts	DBC	21/01676/DRC	Details as required by condition 4 (lighting) attached to planning permission 4/01663/18/FUL (Lighting of existing drive and parking area: times of use 15.30 to 18.30 Monday to Friday between 1 November and 1 April	Pending	<b>CCB Comments</b> Thank you for consulting the Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB) on the monitoring of this planning condition. CCB has no particular comments to make on these submissions. We promote best practice and support the LPA's monitoring of this condition and the implementation of the approved lighting scheme.	19.5.21
Korobe Fairfield Road Goring	SODC	P21/S0251/FUL	Demolition of the existing dwellinghouse and construction of a new dwelling. (As clarified by Energy Statement and SAP calculations received on 1 March 2021)	Granted 14 <sup>th</sup> May 2021	<b>CCB Comments</b> We have considered the submitted papers and can see that a pre-application was pursued, with the LPA's initial guidance contingent upon a full landscape and visual impact assessment and with certain design amendments proposed. The pre-application opinion gave due weight and attention to the AONB and focused on the relationship to the east, with its open landscape and plentiful public access. The pre-application reports, correctly, that the site falls within the AONB as the designation covers all this part of the settlement of Goring and its settlement edge with the wider landscape.	16.3.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					<p>The submitted LVIA, whilst detailed, tends to confuse the status of the site by stating that it is adjacent to the AONB (LVIA 1.2 and 2.5 and 4.5). The LVIA at its 4.8 accepts that the AONB is highly sensitive in any landscape assessment. Of interest to the CCB here, the LVIA states at its 6.2 that mitigation is achieved by virtue of sensitive design. The Design and Access Statement does accept that the site falls within the AONB.</p> <p>The Chilterns Buildings Design Guide does not preclude contemporary design. The applicant's refer to the design amendments to step back the elevations, as is mentioned in the CBDG at 3.26 to 3.28.</p> <p>Looking at the site layout and the relationship between the edge of the settlement and the wider landscape, our principal interest is the relationship to the east / east elevation. CCB has, in recent years, been concerned about the impact of extra glazing in the design of new development, as may impact upon the dark skies environment of the landscape. The AONB is an intrinsically dark skies environment, as set out in guidance by the Institute of Lighting professionals. The new AONB Management Plan 2019-2024 deals with this issue in the (new) policy DP8. This policy and supporting text established that, <i>'Traditional Chilterns vernacular buildings have small windows. Modern designs with large areas of glazing should be avoided so that buildings do not appear as boxes of light in the countryside at night, and glinting glazing in the daytime'</i>.</p> <p>We would promote a reconsideration of the extent and design of the glazing on the east elevation. It strikes us that, when reviewing this it would be appropriate to pull in the second floor</p>	

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					accommodation from what is otherwise the roof space of comparable buildings in the area. An appreciation of the settlement edge from within the wider and open landscape to the east would be enhanced by such amendments.	
Land Adjacent To Cholesbury Lane (OS Field 4800) Cholesbury Lane Buckland Common Buckinghamshire	Bucks, Chiltern & South Bucks Area	PL/21/0690/FA	Change of use of land to residential for members of the Gypsy/Traveller community, comprising the siting of 3 mobile homes and 3 touring caravans, and associated works (Hardstanding, parking, refuse store, vehicular access) for a temporary period of 3 years.	Pending (now appealed)	<p><b>CCB Comments / Objection (part)</b></p> <p>The CCB previously raised an objection against application PL/20/1835/FA on 21st August 2020. We have set these out below, for ease of reference. Planning Practice Guidance 'When can conditions be used to grant planning permission for a use for a temporary period only?' (Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 21a-014-20140306, Revision date: 06 03 2014) states that 'Circumstances where a temporary permission may be appropriate include where a trial run is needed in order to assess the effect of the development on the area or where it is expected that the planning circumstances will change in a particular way at the end of that period'.</p> <p>This application harms those qualities by materially eroding the host landscape. CCB accepts that a remedy to this situation will be required. Following the duties that govern the responsibilities of a conservation board (i.e. the CROW Act at section 87) the CCB concludes that the application for retention is harmful and does not satisfy national or local</p>	29.4.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					<p>policy that protects the AONB. CCB recognises the historical connection between Gypsy and Traveller communities and the economy, culture and environment of the Chilterns, which continues to this day. We recognise that the balance between need and availability of sites means that locating sites within the AONB may, sometimes, be necessary. It is essential, both for meeting the objectives of AONB designation and for providing the best living environment for the Gypsies or Travellers themselves, that such sites are selected strategically (i.e. through development plan processes) and then carefully designed, landscaped and managed, which is no more or less a burden than is expected of any other development proposal. For the reasons set out above, we do not consider that the current proposal pays sufficient attention to the AONB designation. When considering planning policy matters, as plans are produced and strategic matters determined, CCB would seek to work with all parties including the council and the Gypsy and Traveller communities. This site would not fall within such a site selection process.</p>	
Lys Mill, near Howe Road Watlington	SODC	P21/S0867/PEJ	Pre-application consultation for change of use to equestrian centre and 6 holiday 'pods' in the adjoining woodland	Pending	<p><b>CCB Pre-application comments.</b></p> <p>CCB has noted that this application is different to the application approved under on 15th March 2018 under reference P13/S0561/FUL for a mix of B1, B2 and B8, at land to the north and also known as Lys Mill or Farm. Plans, in that case, require the use of the restricted byway (consent P13/S4170/DIS and various turning plans and access plans). The restricted byway and adjacent bridleway were both within the blue line of site ownership, for that application. An approved plan shows works to assist access and vehicle</p>	20.4.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					<p>tracking at the estate road / restricted byway junction.</p> <p>In these pre-application papers the planning statement states around 10 movements a day (or 20 trips, we assume) a day and with details of this will be set out in any transport assessment. From the papers, we could not ascertain how access is to be achieved and the increased use of the byway/The Ridgeway could, potentially, be harmful to the objectives of the AONB, notwithstanding the safety and amenity of users. We appreciate that greater details are required but the potential for harm exists.</p> <p>This is a significant issue for consideration of the future merits. Combined with a highway assessment (as mentioned above), the relationship to restricted byway within the The Ridgeway National Trail will be a critical issue for consideration of the conservation / enhancement duties, as applied in an AONB. Under consent P13/S0561/FUL , two approved plans dealt with design improvements at the junction between the Lys Mill track and The Ridgeway. The Friends of the Ridgeway and The Ridgeway Partnership (Sarah Wright, Ridgeway Trail Officer on Ridgeway@oxfordshire.gov.uk) will need to be consulted on any future planning application as well as the CCB.</p>	

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Kidmore End Memorial Hall Reade's Lane Sonning Common	SODC	P20/S4912/FUL	Lighting on the proposed Multi Use Games Area and lighting around the site for wayfaring and access	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p><b>MUGA Lighting.</b> The rationale and justification is detailed. Two options are advanced. Option A appears to have a tighter radii of impact but we know that the key issue will be the LUX setting, the use of cowls/shielding and need for a tilt angle at 0 degrees to the horizontal. CCB recommends the use of supplementary cowls / shields as an added safeguard and a good way of achieving best practice.</p> <p>A curfew is mentioned in the papers, at 22-30. CCB recommends this is conditioned.</p> <p>Table 6 of the Lighting Impact Assessment recommends that a maximum Kelvin of 3000 is used. We agree with that as a ceiling and new technologies are currently rolling out 2700 Kelvin. This is the level recommended in the 2019-2024 AONB Management Plan at its policy DP8. Again, we recommend a condition that the colour temperature is 2700 - 3000 and promoted at the lower end of this spectrum as new technologies emerge.</p> <p><b>Walking, running, learn to cycle route.</b> We understand that this element was withdrawn from the previous application P20/S2526/FUL. A supporting rationale is contained in the planning statement and linked to Sport England's 10 principles for active design. We know that the SODC landscape architect has previously commented on this. CCB understands the case put forward to promote exercise in the winter months and later into the evening. Such tangible public benefits are to be balanced against the duty to conserve and enhance the special qualities of the AONB, as set out in law, policy and guidance. Light erosion into the landscape is an area of concern. CCB</p>	16.3.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					would promote some of the newer and innovative technologies that illuminate wayfaring paths by using solar stud lighting as set into the path edges. We understand that designers such as Solar Eye offer these design alternatives. CCB would promote consideration of that here. A new 'bat hat' solar stud offers further habitat benefits.	
Land at Middle Grove Farm Chesham Road Hyde End Bucks	Bucks, Chiltern & South bucks	PL/21/0316/O A	Hybrid Application comprising full planning permission for the conversion of an existing stable block into two, 4-bedroom dwellings and outline planning permission including details for scale, layout and means of access for 11 new dwellings including demolition/clearance with details reserved in respect of appearance and landscaping.	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>We set out a number of design parameters, in brief, below as:</p> <p>(i) The materials re-used and supplemented on the existing stable block should be replicated in the new build elements. The barn roofs appear to be the subject of comprehensive replacement and the original patina and shape made uniform, to accommodate the roof accommodation, we have assumed. It would be preferable to have a SPAB style of repair of the roof (Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings) to keep this design feature and to work within that roof framework.</p> <p>(ii) That the overall design ethos for the new build must be to recreate the Chilterns farmstead cluster (see Chilterns Buildings Design Guide at chapters 4 and 5, especially) To achieve that here does require amendment to the layout and the form. The layout requires a clustering of buildings, redolent of Chilterns farm enclaves. Thus, buildings are of varying heights and roof treatments and layout accentuates, if not replicates, a farm courtyard in its appearance. An example is illustrated at page 48 of the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide.</p>	31. 3.2 1

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					<p>(iii) The new buildings, which we acknowledge result in a substantial reduction in built footprint, enjoy deep footplates and, therefore, large roofs. The Design Guide promotes a 40 degree pitch for clay tiles and again we refer to the Design Guide at pages 30 and 31 CCB recommends a design review discussion on these points. The outline nature of this part of the application should result in further and modified indicative drawings, to give suitable illustration to these issues. The terraced group, more accurately reflects the design aspirations of the Chilterns Design Guide.</p> <p>(iv) Landscaping needs to be open and informal, with minimal plot sub-division by fencing. Bio-diversity enhancements are discussed and minimum lighting is important, to enhance the wider location and for bio-diversity conservation. Some of these matters can appropriately be controlled by planning condition.</p>	
Land at Crowell Road Chinnor, Oxon.	SODC	P21/S0804/O	Outline application (with all matters reserved except Layout and Access), for the erection of up to 54 age restricted dwellings (for people aged 55 and over), including 40% affordable housing and communal facilities, on land to the north of Crowell Road, Chinnor. New vehicular access to be created off Crowell Road, along with the	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>The CCB previously commented on the history application P17/S1867/FUL (in June and September 2017).</p> <p>In essence the CCB's comments were then directed at the settings relationship between new developments on the edge of Chinnor when set against the AONB escarpment landscape character. That scheme was subsequently dismissed on appeal. The Inspector accepted (paragraph 57) that the site lies within the, 'undefined setting of the AONB', with the boundary some 800 metres to the south east. The matter was also raised in the reason for refusal (dealt with by the Inspector at his paragraph 58). As mentioned in our original comments, the CCB remained then and remains today concerned as to</p>	4.5.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
			retention of the existing pedestrian access to Oakley Road to the North (additional information received 31 March 2021)		<p>the future settings relationship around Chinnor.</p> <p>The Inspector reported the CCB's comments at his paragraph 61 and stated that, <i>'The LCA draws a line along Crowell Road and contrasts with the Bellway scheme opposite the site. The Bellway scheme was considered to be visually prominent in views to and from the AONB whilst the appeal site is noted as only having potential views from the escarpment. This is consistent with the views of the CCB, which does not object to the proposal subject to delivery of proposed mitigation'</i>.</p>	
Land off Papist Way Cholsey Oxfordshire	SODC	P21/S1503/O	Outline application for access for Mixed Use Development comprising, up to 350 C3 residential dwellings, C2 Care and Assisted Living, E(a) retail, E(g) employment space, F2 Community Building, E(e) Daycare Nursery, Open Space and Landscaping	Pending	<p><b>CCB Objection</b></p> <p>This application falls within the setting of the Chilterns AONB and also the North Wessex Downs AONB. Those settings relationships would be harmed. This harm is readily demonstrated in the landscape and visual impact section of the Environmental Statement (ES). Photomontage viewpoint C very clearly illustrates how views from the Wallingford - Goring and Wallingford - Woodcote corridor are impacted. The CCB would ask that the assessment of setting is given full weight and the duties in the CROW Act 2000, section 85 are applied when calibrating the planning balance (i.e. impacts upon the special qualities arising from development outside the AONB).</p> <p>This application seeks to re-open the Neighbourhood Plan assessment, in which site CHOL 2 was not supported by the neighbourhood planning body, nor the Local Planning Authority. The sensitivities of this site within the setting of two AONBs was considered in the assessment of sites and roundly dismissed. The assessor agreed with the Parish Council's assessment and concluded the site allocations were</p>	21.4.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					<p>based on 'clear evidence' (7.47 of the assessors report).</p> <p>In the discharge of the planning balance, the CCB would ask that the LPA gives weight to the settings implications (clearly illustrated in the applicant's photomontage viewpoint C), the sweeping and majestic views of the dipslope landscape from higher ground south east of Mongewell and the landscape character assessment in the Lepus study of November 2019. Lighting within the development will serve to further exacerbate these harmful impacts.</p> <p>From the standpoint of AONB impact this application is contrary to Development Plan policy in the Local Plan ENV 1 (setting and AONB Management Plan) and Neighbourhood Plan EO1 and EO2, contrary to AONB Management Plan policy DP4 (setting) and the CCB's Position Statement on the Setting of the AONB. The CROW 2000 at section 85 gives legal force to setting when assessing impacts. The NPPF 2021 consultation revisions include the setting of an AONB as a material matter of importance. This revision may be in force by the time this application is determined.</p>	

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Land south of the CALA Homes Carmel Meadows development	SODC	P21/S1677/FUL	Proposed new 4-bedroom family dwelling at land comprising triangular portion of land.	Pending	<p><b>CCB Objection</b></p> <p>To develop one dwelling here would appear discordant in the landscape and would be deeply harmful to it (Landscape Character Assessment by Lepus Consultants as evidence base to the Local Plan). The site is readily visible from the passing footpath that links Wallingford / Crowmarsh Gifford to The Ridgeway. The Carmel Meadows (formerly CABI) site, as granted on appeal in 2017, is not apparent and shielded by a dense screen and boundary. People walking the footpath and enjoying the Chilterns landscape that envelopes this popular route would see this development as a jarring and out of place development, materially eroding the landscape character and the aesthetic / perceptual landscape qualities that predominate here. The CCB is deeply concerned at the unauthorised felling of mature trees. We have seen the comments raised by the Council's Countryside officer. We believe this unacceptable miscreance can be given material planning weight because it is a matter in the public interest and addresses a planning purpose. As woodland cover is a part of the special qualities of the Chilterns and is such an important part of this sites relationship to its immediate surroundings, then we would ask that the LPA attributes planning weight. This land is a priority habitat and recorded on the DEFRA Magic resource. The Forestry Act 1967 includes powers to require restocking after unauthorised felling. The CCB would respectfully ask that these enforcement.</p>	18.5.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Land adjacent to The Orchard, Benson, Oxon.	SODC	P21/S0882/O	Outline application for up to 19 dwellings (including 40% affordable housing), with all matters reserved with the exception of access	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>We have reviewed the papers and agree with the applicant (supporting planning statement at 2.9 and 5.18), that the site falls within the setting of the Chilterns AONB and North Wessex Downs AONB. One of the principal views of the site from the AONB is from along Eyres Lane and this is denoted as viewpoint 8 in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. We are aware that this site has been the subject of commentary in a recent planning appeal, dealing with setting.</p> <p>Views from this site back towards the Chilterns constitutes an important design / layout element. If the LPA are minded to grant permission, we recommend that attention is given to the roofing design and materials, with regard to the colour hues and profiles. We recommend that some attention is also given to the roofing materials used on the neighbouring land (under reference P17/S1964/O). The ultimate aim will be to achieve a muted and naturally weather patina, to help reduce the impact upon distant views.</p>	30.3.21
The Bull Fields Chesham Road Bellingdon Chesham HP5 2XT	Bucks, Waste & Minerals	CM/0010/21	Extraction of approximately 21,000 cubic metres of clay, with restoration to a planted undulating landscape	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>I am writing to let you know that the Chilterns Conservation Board will not be commenting on the planning application in any great detail. We could not find any documents on the Buckinghamshire portal, however, we have been consulted on similar matters in the past and note that this application is linked to a function that is of intrinsic benefit to the Chilterns AONB. We note restoration and planting is proposed and we support the application for its associated key benefits to the Chilterns AONB.</p>	30.3.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
Land Between The Warren And Middle Path Farm Tring Road Ivinghoe Bucks	Bucks, Aylesbury Vale Area	21/00705/APP	Erection of dwelling and detached garage	Pending	<p><b>CCB Objection</b></p> <p>The Chilterns Conservation Board (CCB) raises objection to this proposal which is wholly inappropriate in this location and demonstrably harms the landscape character of this part of the AONB. This site forms a constituent part of the Bucks Landscape Character Assessment LCA 10.2 Ivinghoe Foothills (LCT 10). This landscape is considered to be of a high sensitivity in the LCA study, notwithstanding its location within the AONB (by definition of high sensitivity under Landscape Institute guidance and national planning policy). To build here would be very harmful and is contrary to the key duty of regard in the CROW Act section 85 and in the NPPF at 172. We set out below AONB Management Plan policies DP1 and DP2 (emphasis added). This proposal is contrary to both and is unacceptable in principle.</p>	31.3.21
Caddington Golf Club, Chaul End Road, Caddington	CBC	CB/20/01833/MW	The remodelling of the golf course, through the importation of inert clean subsoil to enhance/realign and modify levels of 6 no. existing golf holes in full and 2 no. in part, as well as the redevelopment of the existing footgolf area to provide a new 20 bay driving range as well as associated works, including improvements to water features, landscaping and Public Rights of Way	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>The CCB recommends revisions, which comprise:</p> <p>(i) Far greater retention of existing trees. The proposed loss of 4.3 hectares of cover is unacceptably high. New planting could potentially screen some of the non-native planting that exists.</p> <p>(ii) Redeployment of existing woodland to create closed in tree lined fairways, as in the Suffolk Coastal AONB at Woodbridge Golf Club.</p> <p>(iii) Deletion of 30 m high fencing and lattice tower supports, with use of existing and new planting to create a suitably protected corridor.</p> <p>(iv) Greater details on the design, material and sustainable design criteria that apply to the 20 bay driving range clubhouse.</p> <p>(v) Confirmation as to no floodlighting being proposed.</p>	2.6.21

New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					Without these revisions, which are designed to conserve and enhance the special qualities of the AONB, we have concluded that the proposal must fall for consideration within the major development tests set out in the NPPF at 172.	
Land at Greenwoods, Land North of Higham Road and East of the A6 Bedford Road, Barton Le Clay, Bedfordshire	CBC	CB/21/02011/ OUT	Outline Application: Erection of up to 3,850 residential units (Use Class C3); up to 30 extra care apartments (Use Class C2); care / nursing home of up to 20 bedrooms (Use Class C2); creation of a new local centre including provision of up to 600 sqm of retail floorspace (Use Class E(a) or E(b)), up to 600 sqm of employment floorspace (Use Class E(c) or E(g(i))), health centre (Use Class E(e)), community building(s) (Use Class F.2(b)) and hotel (Use Class C1); provision of a Nursery, 5FE Primary School, including Reception, and 6FE Secondary School, including Sixth Form facilities (Use Class F.1(a)); provision of	Pending	<p><b>CCB Objection</b></p> <p><b>Setting impacts upon the AONB.</b> In this submission we conclude that this application would result in a negative impact upon the setting of the AONB when viewed from the chalk escarpment. Further, the spatial extent of this scheme, itself proposed outside the Local Plan process, exhibits considerable potential to harm the evidential and aesthetic significance of the Chilterns Hillfort Scheduled Monument at Sharpenhoe Clappers contrary to the NPPF at 192(a) and in the discharge of section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Other important 'views out' are also negatively impacted and include Ravensburgh Castle and other views from Pegsdon Hill and Barton Hills.</p> <p><b>Panoramic views within the AONB's special qualities.</b> The wider setting of the AONB, in this case, is principally a consequence of the panoramic views from the northern chalk landscape into the wider vale and clay landscape beyond. Such views are widely appreciated and contribute to a 'perceptual landscape' which yields much public benefit. In other words, these 'views out' manifest to combine the sensory and cognitive elements of landscape appreciation (i.e. combining senses and understandings gained from sources and experiences).</p> <p><b>Rural Hinterland and policy protection.</b> Development in the northern vale is scattered and interspersed, itself heavily influenced by protective planning</p>	11.6.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
			landscaped communal amenity space including children's play space and sports facilities; creation of new publicly accessible woodland comprising up to 32 hectares; creation of solar park		<p>policies including both green belt protection and registered historic landscape protection (the Grade I landscape at Wrest Park). These policies are germane to the setting of the AONB because they ensure that the landscape beyond it is maintained as an overwhelmingly rural landscape, with land-use controls maintaining both openness (green belt) and historic landscapes (registered parks and gardens).</p> <p><b>Impact on Chiltern's hillforts.</b> The location of a promontory hillfort at Sharpenhoe Clappers is no co-incidence. This vantage point historically takes advantage of the wide panorama beneath. A similar relationship exists at Barton Hills, with many publicly accessible views yielding tangible public benefits of leisure, recreational and place- identity. The applicant's consultants deal with visual /panoramic impacts in their submitted wireframe and visual impacts documentation. In particular we would refer to the LVIA viewpoint 18 (Sharpenhoe) and ES 15.4 Wireframes viewpoint 19 (Barton Hills at 14 years post mitigation).</p> <p><b>Conclusions.</b> In the CCB’s judgment this impact is harmful and does not deliver the duty of regard in the CROW Act, section 85 and is contrary to the AONB Management Plan at DP4 (setting). The draft NPPF revisions (as published by MHCLG in early 2021) propose new text to incorporate the setting of an AONB as a material matter. This new policy may be in force when this application is determined. If it is then we argue the application is also contrary to that policy.</p>	
Mile Barn Farm, Hemel Hempstead Road, Dagnall, Berkhamsted	Central Beds	CB/21/01017/FULL	Redevelopment of Brownfield employment site to include 30 Residential Dwellings 268sqm	Pending	<p><b>CCB Objection</b></p> <p>CCB’s starting point is that this site is unsuitable for a housing estate. It would harm the natural beauty of the AONB and fail to conserve and enhance it. The</p>	18.5.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
			B1 Office space and associated parking		<p>location is poor for housing. It is not a residential area and is not in a settlement. It is not a sustainable location for new housing, being without any community facilities, in open countryside and with no footway to the nearest village of Dagnall. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should avoid the development of isolated homes in the countryside, and none of the circumstances that it lists for exceptions to this would apply here (while conversion of redundant or disused buildings can be an exception, re-development does not qualify). We also refer to the (new) AONB Management Plan policies 2019 – 2024 and DO1 / 2 and 3 and DP 1 /2 and 3 (see below).</p> <p>The development form, layout and configuration does not satisfy the legislation and policy tests that seek robust protection of the special qualities of the AONB. This application would erode those qualities and 2 promotes unsustainable development within the countryside and is positively harmful to delivery of the CROW Act at section 85 and the NPPF at 172.</p> <p>CCB would support limited conversion and some modest new build and which follows the agricultural design ethos of a clustered Chilterns Farmstead (as found in the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide). That ethos is not followed in the design and layout proposed here and harm follows to this nationally protected and, by definition, highly valued landscape. Further, recreational proximity to the nearby Ancient Woodland would fail to satisfy the NPPF at 170.</p> <p>The submitted Design and Access Statement refers to some of the mitigation planting (as detailed in the submitted Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					Assessment and landscape plans) as a consequence of pre-application consultation with CCB. This is correct, however the development premise of CCBs opinion here was that a residential estate, as now proposed, was deemed unacceptable and harmful to the special qualities of the AONB.	
The Reformation PH Horsepond Road Gallowstree Common	SODC	P21/ S2332	Change of use and extension of former Public House to provide Veterinary Surgery. Demolition of outbuilding and erection of 1 x 4 bed detached house with attached garage, parking and garden. Erection of 2 x 3 bed detached cottages with parking spaces and gardens	Pending	<b>CCB Objection</b>  In brief summary CCB regrets the loss of this community facility and accepts that the policy protection afforded by the SODC Local Plan CF1 'Safeguarding Community Facilities' must be given considerable weight in any determination. We are aware that there has been a local campaign to protect and reinstate this use. The proposed use as a veterinary hospital use would fall within CF1 as a exception against the test that 'the replacement of an existing facility equally convenient to the local community it serves and with equivalent or improved facilities'. The proposed housing is not necessary as a requirement of policy CF1.	21.6.21
Orchard Caravan Warrendene Road Hughenden Valley Bucks	Bucks, Wycombe Area	21/06498/CLE	Certificate of lawfulness for existing use of land as a caravan site	Pending	<b>CCB Objection</b> (based on the case for a CLEUD not being made).  The Chilterns Conservation Board recommends that this application is refused on the grounds that the applicant's evidence lacks precision (does not establish a 10 year use, nor a historic consent that has been continuously in use) and is ambiguous (confuses historic structures within an orchard - agricultural use and fails to understand the curtilage and planning unit issues that prevail).  The applicant's own evidence fails to cross the necessary evidential threshold	23.6.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					and demonstrates the reverse as to what is intended, i.e. that this is lawfully agricultural land, with some ancillary and historic storage of caravans.	
The (former) Reformation PH Gallowstree Common	SODC	P21/ S2332	Change of use and extension of former Public House to provide Veterinary Surgery. Demolition of outbuilding and erection of 1 x 4 bed detached house with attached garage, parking and garden. Erection of 2 x 3 bed detached cottages with parking spaces and gardens,	Pending	<p><b>CCB Objection</b></p> <p>CCB regrets the loss of this community facility and accepts that the policy protection afforded by the SODC Local Plan CF1 'Safeguarding Community Facilities' must be given considerable weight in any determination. We are aware that there has been a local campaign to protect and reinstate this use. The proposed use as a veterinary hospital use would fall within CF1 as an exception against the test that 'the replacement of an existing facility equally convenient to the local community it serves and with equivalent or improved facilities'. The proposed housing is not necessary as a requirement of policy CF1.</p> <p>CCB would support amendments to the frontage and we promote deletion of the eastern dwelling. A more holistic approach to this site would countenance the reinstatement of the pub and the veterinary use to occupy a part of the site, with the potential for one dwelling to promote an 'enabling case' to secure the long term viability of a use and location that is central to the fabric of this community. To achieve this would require withdrawal of this application and new design work and community engagement</p>	23.6.21
Western end of the Handy Cross hub, High Wycombe.	Bucks, Wycombe Area.	21/06259/FUL	Five storey building to use as offices and self-storage use including car parking, servicing and landscaping	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>The principle of development is previously established by an outline permission granted in 2013 (under 12/06/06261/OUT). The site's location is within the geographic setting of the AONB, although that is tempered by the immediate physical infrastructure of the M40. The AONB boundary runs east -</p>	1.6.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					<p>west and immediately to the south of the motorway corridor.</p> <p>The CCB accepts that the impact upon the setting of the AONB is greatly affected by the location of the proposal to the northern side of the motorway corridor. Nevertheless, as the topography rises to the south and views can be obtained from the AONB, we recommend that the proposed planting maximises the opportunity to create a defined green edge and that the materials exhibit a muted palette, due to the relative prominence of the site on a spur in this comprehensive development location. The Design and Access Statement denotes the use of <i>'large format insulated metal panels, with colour and orientation used to create visual interest and scale'</i>. An appropriate muted palette of colour and a robust planting scheme will assist, when viewing from within the AONB.</p>	
Reading Golf Club Kidmore End Road Emmer Green	Reading BC	210018	Outline planning application, with matters reserved in respect of Appearance, for demolition of the existing clubhouse and the erection of a new residential-led scheme (c3 use to include affordable housing)and the provision of community infrastructure	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>The CCB has looked at the application papers and the Environmental Statement (Volume 3 - Landscape and Impact Assessment), especially. We also give weight and authority to our own Position Statement (2011) on 'Development affecting the setting of the Chilterns AONB'. We have concluded that the application site falls broadly within the wider setting of the AONB and sits next to or just beyond a wider valued landscape, itself a part of the setting and contained within the National Character Area 110 and with a landscape character that shares much with the South Oxfordshire LCA Chilterns Plateau with Valleys.</p> <p>The topography, local vegetation and built form in and around the</p>	28.6.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board's Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
					current planning application site limits the immediate visual impacts upon the valued landscapes that falls within the wider setting. In this respect, the CCB has concluded that there is little impact on the immediate setting of the AONB boundary, as exists. We would recommend that the status of the wider valued landscape is given weight in any planning decision and that a landscape master-plan and management plan protects and indeed enhances the relationship between the existing site edge and the wider landscape.	
Land off Greenfield Road, Westoning, Bedford.	CBC	CB/21/02583/FUL	Construction of a temporary 43.45MW Solar Farm, to include the installation of Solar Panels with transformers, a 132KV substation, a DNO control room, a customer substation, GRP comms cabin, security fencing, landscaping and other associated infrastructure	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>In balancing the issues in this application, the CCB recommends that consideration is given to reducing the cover of development within the southern parcel, to pull the development away from the boundaries and permit additional screening. This helps protect the wider settings, as assessed by the visual appreciation by receptors (people) visiting the northern escarpment, walking the landscape and appreciating the view. We base this on the cumulative assessment of impact derived from the public views and location of the scheduled monument at Sharpenhoe Clappers.</p> <p>In summary, the CCB accepts that a direct visual impact upon the visual setting of the existing boundary would be relatively tempered by distance but we welcome consideration of these amendments. The submitted LVIA readily acknowledges the importance of these views and this relationship at its 6.19, 6.20, 6.23, 6.33 and 7.7.</p>	29.6.21
Land at the Fairmile, Henley on Thames	SODC	P19/S2350/FUL	Demolition of existing buildings and development of 72 residential	Pending	<p><b>CCB Comments</b></p> <p>CCB recommends that:</p>	30.6.21

Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.2						
New CCB Responses on Planning Applications since Last Planning Committee						
Location	LPA	Ref. No.	Development	Status	Summary of the Board’s Response (please contact the Board for more detailed information if this is required)	Date
			units comprising 52 houses and 20 flats with associated access, servicing, parking, amenity space and landscaping		<p>(i) An LVIA assessment is completed. This has been completed and reaffirms the sensitivity of the AONB landscape.</p> <p>(ii) Maintaining elements of the unimproved grassland that sits within the site, associated with (below)</p> <p>(iii) Adherence to achieving biodiversity net gain, as is stipulated in Neighbourhood Plan Policy EN1. A detailed study confirms a net gain strategy and delivery.</p> <p>(iv) Reviewing the design on the western boundary on the basis of the LVIA findings. The CGI file view 3 illustrates a much larger form of development than found elsewhere.</p> <p>(iv) Paying closer regard to the impact of building out across Area 2 (as defined in the Landscape Design Brief). A reduction in the number of dwellings to the level set out in the Neighbourhood Plan would improve this relationship when viewed from within the AONB.</p> <p>(v) We have seen the additional consultation points raised by the SODC’s Landscape Officer. The additional point as to lighting impact is raised and we fully concur with that. From the Oxfordshire Way the lighting impact could (potentially) be concealed by the careful use of low level lighting, however from south-western vantage points the orientation of development at the boundary does result in a more dramatic impact. This supports the need to reduce the level of built development in what is defined as Area 2 of the development.</p>	

<b>Item 11 – APPENDIX 11.3</b>				
<b>Current live casework</b>				
Ref. No.	Proposal	Status	Application Site	Deadline for Comments
CB/21/02583/ FULL	Temporary Solar Farm	Pending	Land off Greenfield Road Westoning	11.7.21
21/S2588/0	4 dwellings and new school playing field	Pending	Land to the East of B481 at Rotherfield Peppard	16.7.21
21/02407/APP	Durham Farm Wendover	Pending	Relocation of farmhouse and ancillary buildings (HS2)	13.7.21