



Planning Committee

10.00 a.m. Thursday 14th February 2013
The Chilterns Conservation Board office,
90 Station Road, Chinnor

Agenda

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Apologies | 10.00 – 10.01 |
| 2. Declarations of Interest | 10.01 – 10.02 |
| 3. Minutes of Previous Meeting | 10.02 – 10.10 |
| 4. Matters Arising | 10.10 – 10.15 |
| 5. Public Question Time | 10.15 – 10.16 |
| 6. High Speed 2 – update | 10.16 – 10.40 |
| 7. AONB Management Plan Review | 10.40 – 11.00 |
| 8. Feedback from events | 11.00 – 11.20 |
| 9. Strategic Growth Plans and LEPs | 11.20 – 11.40 |
| 10. Development Plans responses | 11.40 – 12.05 |
| 11. Planning Applications – update | 12.05 – 12.25 |
| 12. Any urgent business | 12.25 – 12.30 |
| 13. Date of Next and Future Meetings | 12.30 – 12.30 |

Next meeting: **Thursday 9th May 2013** at The Chilterns Conservation Board office, 90 Station Road, Chinnor, OX39 4HA

Future meetings: **Thursday 5th September** and **Wednesday 27th November 2013**

Item 3 **Minutes of Previous Meeting**

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisations: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Budget of £520 per year for minute-taker plus staff time

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

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

Background

1. The draft minutes from the meeting on 27th November 2012 have been previously circulated and are attached (at Appendix 1) for approval.

Recommendation

1. **That the Committee approves the minutes of its meeting which took place on 27th November 2012.**



DRAFT MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CHILTERN CONSERVATION BOARD PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY 27TH NOVEMBER 2012 AT THE CHILTERN CONSERVATION BOARD OFFICE, STATION ROAD, CHINNOR, COMMENCING AT 10.00 AM AND CONCLUDING AT 12.30 PM

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

| Member | Appointing Body |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Appointed by Local Authorities | |
| Cllr Brian Norman | Three Rivers District Council |
| Cllr Bill Storey (observing) | Hertfordshire County Council |
| Appointed by the Secretary of State | |
| Bettina Kirkham (Chairman) | |
| John Willson | |
| Elected by Parish Councils | |
| Cllr Margaret Jarrett | Hertfordshire Parish Councils |
| Cllr Barbara Wallis | Buckinghamshire Parish Councils |

OTHERS PRESENT

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Co-opted Members | |
| Gill Gowing | Strategic Planning Adviser to The Chiltern Society |
| Officers | |
| Colin White | Chilterns Conservation Board |
| Others | |
| Deirdre Hansen | Minute taker |

| Member | Appointing Body |
|---------------|------------------------|
|---------------|------------------------|

60. Apologies

Councillors Roger Emmett, Chris Richards and Alan Walters, Mike Fox (Chairman of the Board) and Mike Stubbs, The National Trust.

61. Election of Chairman

Bettina Kirkham was unanimously elected as Chairman until the Board's next Annual General Meeting and took the Chair.

62. Public Question Time

There were no members of the public present.

63. Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest in items on the agenda were made.

64. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes were approved and signed by the Chairman as a true record after the following amendments were made: item 52 in the last sentence 'it' was deleted; item 54 in line 2 of the third paragraph 'untidy site' was replaced by 'Untidy Site' and item 54 in the penultimate sentence 'and'.

65. Matters Arising from the minutes

1. Item 52: the Planning Officer has sent a note to the local planning authorities commenting which planning applications the Board wishes to be consulted on.
2. Item 54: the question was raised following the student research project if there were any examples of S215 notices. There was no evidence that such notices had been issued within the AONB and it was felt that issuing them was not necessarily the right thing to do.

66. High Speed 2 – update

The Planning Officer updated the Committee about the latest developments in connection with a possible high speed rail route through the Chilterns.

The Committee was particularly informed about:

- Feedback from the third round of Community Forum meetings. A continuing problem is that information on agenda topics is not provided prior to the meetings making participation in debate and comments at the meeting difficult.
- Feedback from the first Buckinghamshire planning forum meeting organised by HS2.
- The Board response to the draft Code of Construction Practice.
- Feedback from the 51M noise forum meeting.
- Tunnel issues.

- The Board's meeting with HS2 Ltd to discuss mitigation.
- Feedback from the Buckinghamshire Mitigation and Compensation Panel.
- The Judicial Reviews which were about to commence in the High Court.

A thorough discussion of the Planning Officer's report took place.

1. The Committee NOTED the report.

67. AONB Management Plan Review

The Planning Officer reported to the members that the current AONB Management Plan runs from 2008-2013. A review of the plan has commenced and some key contextual issues have been identified. The Committee's views were sought in connection with suggested revisions to the issues, policies and actions for the emerging Management Plan. The plan is a plan for the Chilterns AONB. The actions are of a strategic nature, reviewing the plan should be meaningful to a wide audience.

The Planning Officer gave a slide show presentation of the many issues concerning the Management Plan.

It was noted that members of the planning committee interested in taking part in boundary review meetings should notify the Planning Officer.

Extracts that had been forwarded were discussed in depth and suggestions, updates and comments were noted and would be taken forward to officers' meetings that would be taking place.

The Committee was encouraged to review the other parts of the plan outside the meeting and to send any comments to officers of the Board.

Progress with the review will be reported to subsequent meetings of the Planning Committee and Members were asked for input as and when required.

- 1. The Committee APPROVED the retention of the existing issues, policies and actions as detailed.**
- 2. The Committee APPROVED the proposed additional issues, policies and actions as detailed.**
- 3. The Committee APPROVED the proposed changes to the issues, policies and actions as detailed.**
- 4. The Committee NOTED the programme for the production of the Management Plan 2014-19.**
- 5. The Committee NOTED that Committee members should contact the Planning Officer with any additional comments by Christmas 2012.**

12.25 John Willson and Gill Gowing left the meeting

12.29 Brian Norman left the meeting

12.30 The meeting was no longer quorate and as such closed by the Chairman.

All other agenda items to be carried forward to the next meeting

68. Date of the next meeting

Thursday 14th February 2013 at the office of the Chilterns Conservation Board, 90 Station Rd, Chinnor commencing at 10.00 am.

Future meetings: Thursday 9th May, Thursday 11th September and Wednesday 27th November 2013.

The meeting closed 12.30

The Chairman

Date

Item 6 High Speed 2 update

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: Community Forums, the Buckinghamshire Mitigation and Compensation Panel, the Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire Planning Forum, bilaterals and the wider HS2 group continue to meet. A further draft of the Code of Construction Practice and details of the phase 2 'Y' route from Birmingham to Manchester and Leeds have been released by HS2 Ltd.

Purpose of report: To update the Committee about the latest developments in connection with a possible high speed rail route through the Chilterns.

Background

1. The Community Forums continue to be attended by a large number of people from a variety of different organisations and continue to be dominated by presentations from HS2 Ltd. New and revised plans continue to be presented at the forum meetings and should have been circulated prior to the meeting. Comments are sought by HS2 Ltd at the forum, but this is not possible as the plans cannot be read at the scale provided.
2. The second meeting of the Buckinghamshire and Hertfordshire Planning Forum took place recently and the Board was represented. It is understood that the following issues were discussed: HS1 link; Hybrid Bill; planning and highways regimes; updates from sub groups (including acoustics, code of construction practice and heritage). It is understood that the Environment Forum (a national forum) has not yet met.
3. The draft Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) was previously the subject of a six week period of consultation (with a limited audience) which ended in October. As previously reported the Board prepared and submitted a response. A further draft of the CoCP has been released but consultation on this will be held over until the Environmental Statement is issued. A detailed examination of the most recent CoCP has not taken place to date.
4. Details of the phase 2 'Y' route from Birmingham to Manchester and Leeds were released recently. This has resulted in a lot of activity along the more northern bits of the route. There was also some activity in our area with requests for information. Maps that were released with the announcement show that the route passes through Crewe, but to do so has taken a much more sinuous alignment. This begs the question – if it can happen there why can it not happen in our area in order to avoid the Chilterns AONB? An examination of the route show that because of the kink it is about 17 miles longer than if a straight line were taken. Clearly a more sinuous and longer route will mean that trains will have to travel more slowly and that journey times will be longer.

5. One other plan was released which appears to show, because dots are placed in specific locations, that HS2 Ltd have moved Manchester approximately 9½ miles north east. In addition it appears that Leeds has moved approximately 15½ miles south west. In HS2's world this would mean that Manchester is on the northern outskirts of Rochdale and Leeds is on the southern edge of Halifax. Such inaccuracies will lead to much confusion and should be questioned via the advertising standards authority.
6. Tunnel issues remain on the agenda though it is understood that HS2 have still failed to fully respond to suggestions that have been put to them. At its January 2013 meeting the Board agreed that, once the Judicial Reviews are completed, it would release a statement on the possibility of a longer tunnel including the option of a tunnel with a gap.
7. The Board held a meeting to discuss mitigation with HS2 Ltd. This was considered by HS2 Ltd as a bilateral meeting, though no real progress was made as HS2 Ltd were not prepared to release any information about the design of any mitigation. The Board remains particularly concerned about the implications of using bunding and fencing to mitigate noise.
8. The Buckinghamshire Mitigation and Compensation Panel and the wider Chilterns group continue to meet and provide an opportunity to discuss relevant issues. The most recent meetings of the wider Chilterns Group have been well attended.
9. Any change in the situation will be reported to the Committee in the future.

Recommendation

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

Item 7 AONB Management Plan Review

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: The current AONB Management Plan runs to the end of 2013. A review of the Plan has commenced and key issues, policies and actions have been identified. Discussions have taken place about a possible AONB boundary review. Work is starting on the SEA Scoping Report and a timetable is included for information.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about the latest developments in connection with the emerging 2014-2019 Management Plan and to encourage further feedback.

Background

1. As previously reported, the review of the current AONB Management Plan has commenced. This Committee has discussed and identified the key issues, policies and actions in relation to the Development chapter of the Plan. In addition, the Committee has discussed other broader elements of the Plan that are relevant.
2. Members of the Board (including some Planning Committee Members) were involved in a recent workshop which dealt with a possible AONB boundary review. Some fundamental issues were highlighted including:
 - The starting point for any assessment should be – is the landscape worth protecting?
 - There is a need to demonstrate the benefits of designation – there may be opportunities for restoration of gravel pits or landfill sites for example.
 - The evidence base will need to be worked up to show Natural England that there is a good case for review.
 - In connection with the Management Plan review it would be appropriate to include some simple wording on the principles for any boundary review. No maps would be included and reference would be made to other AONBs that are in the process of reviewing their own boundaries.
3. Much work remains to be done in connection with this and the Committee will be updated as progress is made.
4. The Committee is asked to continue to consider the existing as well as any additional issues, policies and actions as part of the review, and to inform the Planning Officer of any suggested additions or other alterations by mid-March.
5. The Committee is asked to note the current timetable for the production of the Management Plan as detailed below. This will involve the following key tasks:
 - Liaison with partners and updating of evidence base (ongoing).

- Preparation of a draft Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Scoping Report (January to March 2013). This will be reported to the Board meeting in March 2013.
 - The formal draft SEA Scoping Report will be issued for consultation (May to June 2013 for 6 weeks). An update of the situation will be reported to the Board meeting in June and consultation feedback will be reported to the Board meeting in October 2013.
 - Preparation of the draft Management Plan and draft Environmental Statement will be ongoing during this period with the involvement of a sub group of the Board and the drafting of the documents should be complete by August 2013.
 - Consultation on draft Management Plan and draft Environmental Statement (from 20th September to 13th December 2013 for 12 weeks).
 - A review of the consultation feedback will be considered in a report to the Board by the end of February 2014.
 - Final approval of the Plan will be considered by the Board in March 2014.
 - The reviewed Management Plan will be published in April 2014.
6. Progress with the review will be reported to subsequent meetings of the Planning Committee and Members are asked to input as and when required. The next few months will involve some intensive work in order that feedback can be given to influence the content of the SEA, Environmental Statement and the Management Plan itself.

Recommendations

1. **That the Committee continues to provide the Planning Officer with any suggested alterations to the Management Plan up to mid-March 2013.**
2. **That members of the Committee consider their involvement in a Management Plan sub group.**
3. **That the Committee notes the position in connection with a possible AONB boundary review.**
4. **That the Committee notes the programme for the production of the Management Plan 2014-19.**

Item 8 Feedback from events

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: The Board has recently held its annual Planning Conference, Annual Forum and the second Planning Forum for 2012.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about the feedback from recent events and to consider the details of the next Planning Forum.

Background

1. The annual Chilterns AONB Planning Conference took place on Wednesday 3rd October 2012 at the Benson Village Hall in South Oxfordshire. The Conference considered various issues related to the National Planning Policy Framework. Five talks were given addressing various issues in connection with decision-making, achieving sustainable development, finding out what is missing, renewable energy and the likely impact of more recent Government pronouncements. This year there were no site visits and the Conference finished with a late lunch.
2. About 75 people attended from 40 different organisations, with a large number (about 45) from Parish and Town Councils. This might have arisen from the different fees that were applied (£30 for Parish and Town Councils, charities and similar organisations and £45 for all other attendees). The Conference generated about £1,800 in income and costs were about £750.
3. Feedback forms were given to all delegates and about 30 were returned. Overall the feedback is very good with most people being 'very satisfied' with the Conference. Most people favoured retention of the format and timings for next year and suggestions were made for some issues that could be covered at a future Conference including the following:
 - Role of Local Nature Partnerships in planning and the need for local authorities to have regard to their views;
 - Update on Government pronouncements;
 - Water issues;
 - Provision of space for play and community in development;
 - Something for smaller rural villages;
 - Rural markets and market towns;
 - Planning for the needs of the elderly;
 - Public health planning, and
 - More information about neighbourhood plans

4. The only negative comments that were made related to the delivery of the various talks with suggestions being made about the use of powerpoint presentations (or not) and the audibility of some of the speakers. There is not much that can be done about presentation style (other than taking account of the comments made) though the comments are valid, and encouragement is always given for people to use the microphone provided.
5. It is proposed that the next Conference should take place in early October 2013 and that this will be the subject of a report at a future meeting.
6. The Board's Annual Forum took place on 16th November 2012 at Hastoe Village Hall. It was attended by about 100 people who were taken through a series of presentations detailing a review of the work of the Board, the Chiltern Woodlands Project and the LEADER project from 2011-12 as well as current and future work. The State of the Chilterns Environment report was also discussed. The AONB Management Plan review was also highlighted and delegates were asked to let the Board know about key issues that they thought the reviewed plan should address. These have been collated and included in the ongoing work. Some key future issues and challenges were then noted, particularly Ash Dieback.
7. The second Planning Forum for 2012 took place on Monday 10th December. The main item for discussion was the Management Plan review. Those that attended were taken through the main issues, policies and actions that had previously been discussed at the Planning Committee. The Forum suggested some additional changes and these will be incorporated in the work that is ongoing on the review. The possible AONB boundary review was also subject to some discussion.
8. It is proposed that the next Planning Forum takes place in mid-May 2013. A series of possible dates will be circulated via a Doodle poll and Councils will be asked to host the Forum. The Forum will be informed about the Management Plan review and any update in connection with the possible AONB boundary review. It will be an ideal time to discuss Local Plan progress at the local planning authorities as it will be over a year since the adoption of the National Planning Policy Framework. Allied to this it would be appropriate to discuss LEP activity and strategic growth plans (see item 9 on this agenda) and recent planning application decisions not in line with the Board's comments (see item 11 on this agenda). The Committee is asked to suggest additional or alternative issues for discussion.

Recommendations

1. **That the Committee notes the feedback and other information from recent events.**
2. **That the Committee notes the arrangements made thus far and suggests any additional issues for discussion at the next Planning Forum meeting.**

Item 9 Strategic Growth Plans and Local Enterprise Partnerships

Author: Colin White Planning Officer

Lead Organisation: Chilterns Conservation Board

Resources: Staff time.

Summary: The planning press recently reported that new strategic growth plans to be prepared by local enterprise partnerships could override local authority local plans. Some research has been undertaken to try and find out more and to come to some conclusions about what the Board should do.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about the likely implications for the Board of local enterprise partnership strategic growth plans and to propose a way forward.

Background

1. There are now 39 designated Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) which cover all areas of England. The Chancellor's Autumn Statement 2012 announced that LEPs will be asked to draw up Strategic Growth Plans (SGPs).
2. An article in Planning magazine (14th December 2012) included details from the Autumn Statement and highlighted the concern from some planning consultants that the new SGPs could override local development plans, although they are unlikely to be statutory in nature. A number of consultants told Planning that they expect local authorities' local plans to comply with the growth strategies of their LEP, although they do not expect the latter, unlike the former, to have a statutory basis. However, it was felt by some that local plans should not be adopted where they conflict with the LEP's objectives in the SGP.
3. If this is true it would mean a body comprised of local businesses and local authorities would be responsible for setting key SGPs for an area – possibly without the planning expertise or peer reviews and public consultation that currently take place when local authorities develop their local plans. The inference is that such SGPs could promote growth in housing and employment that might be beyond the level detailed in a local plan. Such proposals are unlikely to have been subject to proper planning scrutiny, and this is a major cause for concern.
4. Based on the research that has been undertaken it appears that the Planning article mentioned above goes beyond the facts and speculates on the relative superiority and statutory status of Local Plans and LEP-led SGPs. In terms of what the Government has officially announced on this, the Autumn Statement is the most reliable source. It says the LEP plans should be 'consistent with national priorities' and should 'build on any existing plans and include coordination with ongoing public programmes' and involve consulting with local partners. It does not state explicitly whether they would take priority over existing statutory local plans in certain situations.

5. However, local authorities or other bodies, and not LEPs, are expected to deliver programmes and projects, whilst ensuring that there are proper accountability structures in place. Based on the Autumn Statement, the emphasis appears to be on the LEP plan leading the way in setting local priorities for investment and determining growth funding. Funding will be available to LEPs for developing the plans.
6. Apparently, the Government will 'devolve a greater proportion of growth-related spending on the basis of strategic plans developed by LEPs', by creating a single funding pot for local areas from April 2015. It is understood that funding will reflect the quality of strategic proposals put forward by LEPs, as well as local need. Further details about this are due in the Spring Spending Review. In addition, management of the EU Common Strategic Framework Funds will be aligned according to priorities in the LEP strategic plans.
7. The Autumn Statement is the first stage of the Government's response to the Heseltine Review ('No Stone Unturned') on all aspects of Government policy that affect economic growth. However, a full Government response to Heseltine's Review is not due until the spring.

What this means for the AONB and the Conservation Board

8. On the basis of what we know so far, the LEP SGPs will be relatively important documents influencing funding for growth in their areas.
9. Although their statutory status or interaction with Local Development Plans has not been publicly announced, the Autumn Statement made it clear that the LEP SGPs should be consistent with national priorities and should build on existing plans and coordinate with ongoing public programmes.
10. From this, it would be in the Board's interest to engage with the LEPs as they put together their SGPs to ensure key AONB priorities are taken into account. This will clearly be a complex matter as the AONB falls within 5 different LEP areas:
 - Oxfordshire
 - Buckinghamshire Thames Valley
 - Hertfordshire
 - South East Midlands
 - Greater Cambridge and Greater Peterborough
11. This is complicated further as the Buckinghamshire Thames Valley and South East Midlands LEPs and the Hertfordshire and Greater Cambridge and Greater Peterborough LEPs overlap each other within the AONB. A map of the 39 LEPs is available at: <http://www.lepnetwork.org.uk/leps.html>
12. More details on the SGPs are expected as part of the Government's full response to the Heseltine Report, which is due in the spring. However, although it is not yet clear whether the response will include clarification of the status of the SGPs relative to local development plans, it is hoped that the response will outline expected timings for the SGPs.

13. Whilst waiting for details, it is considered that the best ways of contacting and influencing the relevant local LEPs which affect the AONB should be investigated.
14. The LEP network is likely to be able to assist further with how groups of LEPs could best be contacted. For example there may be existing forums that could be joined, or the Board might play a role in bringing together (virtually and/or physically) representatives from neighbouring LEPs that cover the AONB to discuss particular issues of concern.
15. It is therefore suggested that further research is done via the LEP website (<http://www.lepnetwork.org.uk/>) and that the free LEP newsletter that is available from the LEP network website is signed up for.
16. Once more is known about the emerging SGPs it is likely that the Board will need to try and engage with LEPs in order to influence the production of the plans and then respond as they are published. Such engagement and responses will be reported to the Committee in the future.

Recommendations

1. **That the Committee notes the likely emergence of Local Enterprise Partnership Strategic Growth Plans.**
2. **That the Committee instructs the Planning Officer to undertake the investigative and engagement actions as outlined in the report.**

Item 10 Development Plans Responses**Author:** Colin White Planning Officer**Lead Organisations:** Chilterns Conservation Board**Resources:** Staff time.

Summary: Responses have been sent in connection with the public consultation exercises on the following development plan documents: **Three Rivers DC** Proposed Submission Development Management Policies; **Aylesbury Vale DC** Vale of Aylesbury Plan Affordable Housing Consultation; **DCLG** New opportunities for sustainable development and growth through the re-use of existing buildings; **OFGEM** RIIO-T1: Initial Proposals for National Grid Electricity Transmission and National Grid Gas – Overview consultation; **Dacorum BC** Draft Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Masterplan; **Central Bedfordshire Council** ‘Southern Bedfordshire Chiltern Arc Green Infrastructure and Access Vision Plan, August 2012’; **London Luton Airport Operations Limited** pre-application public consultation on revised master plan document; **Environment Agency, Forestry Commission and Natural England** Building a Better Environment; **Central Bedfordshire Council** proposed content of Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan; **Scottish and Southern Energy** consultation on future electricity distribution networks; **Wycombe DC** Local Plan to 2031 Issues; **Central Bedfordshire Council** Chiltern Local Area Transport Plan draft; **Buckinghamshire County Council** Local Flood Risk Management Strategy Consultation; **DCLG** technical consultation on ‘Extending permitted development rights for homeowners and businesses’; and **DfT** Major Infrastructure Reform – Amendments to the definitions for Highways and Rail NSIPS in the Planning Act 2008; **UK Power Networks** Business Plan 2015-2023.

Purpose of report: To inform the Committee about, and seek approval of, the responses that have been made under delegated powers in connection with the development plan documents as listed.

Background

The following paragraphs detail the responses that have already been drafted and sent in connection with the public consultation exercises on the development plan documents as listed.

Three Rivers DC Proposed Submission Development Management Policies

1. The Board supports the following policies as drafted – DM1 (residential design and layout), DM3 (the historic built environment), DM5 (renewable energy developments), DM6 (biodiversity, trees, woodlands, watercourses and landscaping), DM7 (landscape character, and the Board particularly welcomes the references to the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and Supplementary Technical Notes on local building materials), DM9 (contamination and pollution control), DM11

(open space, sport and recreation facilities and children's play space and particularly welcomes the reference to resisting development on commons), DM12 (community, leisure and cultural facilities), DM14 (telecommunications) and DM15 (moorings).

2. Policy DM8 (flood risk and water resources) though the Board supports the policy it is considered that reference could usefully be made to the use of water meters within the measures to be incorporated to ensure efficient use of water resources.

Aylesbury Vale DC Vale of Aylesbury Plan Affordable Housing Consultation

3. The Board supports the Council's proposed policy approach for delivering affordable housing in the Vale of Aylesbury Plan, which will include the following principles: a target to secure 35% affordable housing provision on developments of more than 15 dwellings; developments of between 5 and 14 dwellings should include at least 20% dwellings as affordable; developments of fewer than 5 dwellings should provide a financial contribution equivalent to 20% on-site provision to facilitate off-site provision; support for affordable housing on rural exception sites, and a requirement that, provided it is consistent with the latest AVDC and government housing allocation policies, a proportion of new affordable homes will be sought to meet local needs arising from the area of the district where the homes are built.

DCLG New opportunities for sustainable development and growth through the re-use of existing buildings

4. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this consultation.
5. The Chilterns Conservation Board supports government policy to promote sustainable development in rural areas. The Board recognises that making best use of existing buildings and bringing empty and redundant buildings back into productive use brings benefits to the rural economy as well as to the management of designated landscapes. Under current planning arrangements the Board works closely with its constituent Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to support agricultural diversification within the context of conserving and enhancing landscape character, and we are seizing opportunities to build more sustainable rural economies.
6. Notwithstanding the comments detailed below, the Board is keen to maintain the requirement in protected landscapes, and other Article 1(5) areas (World Heritage Sites, Conservation Areas, National Parks and AONBs), for proposals for the reuse of redundant rural buildings to come through the planning system. In this way the LPAs, often in consultation with the Board, will be able to manage the details involved in such conversions and changes of use to ensure that the special qualities of the protected landscape are appropriately conserved and enhanced. Examples of how this works effectively include:
 - Appropriate management of associated hard and soft landscaping to conserve local character
 - Mitigation measures to safeguard species such as bats and barn owls
 - Appropriate management of rebuilding works ensuring the retention or replacement of particular features important to local character
 - Ensuring control of any external lighting

- Achieving renewable energy and sustainable construction targets
7. Exemption for AONBs from the proposed changes would be in keeping with the National Planning Policy Framework 'presumption in favour of sustainable development', which acknowledges the need for more restrictions on development in AONBs and other protected landscape areas than there is elsewhere.
 8. The Board is concerned that implementing the proposals that are detailed in the consultation will not be practical, and introducing the proposed changes will remove the ability of LPAs to manage the impacts of development on key elements of landscape character. The Board is also concerned that the encouragement for the re-use of existing as well as redundant buildings may well lead to the proliferation of more agricultural buildings in rural areas to replace those that are lost to agriculture through re-use. It is suggested that, should the changes be brought about, any re-use should only be of demonstrably redundant agricultural buildings which are capable of re-use without substantial renovation and alteration, and subject to the caveats detailed below.
 9. The Board considers that the recommendation that the proposal will only apply to buildings in existence on the date the consultation was published (paragraph 29) will cause considerable difficulty for the LPAs in determining whether or not a building was in place at the date of the consultation, and this will become increasingly difficult over time. In addition, there is no definition of what constitutes a building for the purposes of conversion. There is no mention of whether it is of permanent and substantial construction. Is a Dutch barn, a building open on all four sides, a potential candidate for re-use? Is it a building at the time of the consultation? Can the sides be filled in under agricultural permitted development (PD) rights and then 'the building' re-used? Paragraph 29 also suggests that after 10 years in 'agricultural use' the same PD rights could apply. Again, it will be very difficult for the LPA to determine whether or not it has been in agricultural use for the whole of that period. There is also concern about what level of use constitutes agricultural use. For example, such use could be the nominal garaging of a tractor or other farm vehicles overnight, or the storage of redundant farm equipment.
 10. Such proposals are likely to lead to a proliferation of new agricultural buildings. Further restrictions would therefore be necessary if this proliferation is to be avoided. A limiting mechanism would need to be devised to stop farmers from using existing agricultural permitted development rights to secure new buildings, only to then move their agricultural operations from the old buildings to the new ones and using their new permitted development rights to change the use of the old buildings. Relying on local planning authorities or third parties to retrospectively challenge the legality of initial use of agricultural permitted development rights would not be an adequate or fair safeguard.
 11. Paragraph 30 proposes that only low impact changes would be permitted. However, there is no definition of low impact, although in paragraph 32 there is a recognition that high impact development needs to have local consideration. The Board wonders when low impact becomes high impact and considers that this would have to be very clearly defined to avoid ambiguity. It is doubtful that such a clear definition could be achieved although the consultation suggests thresholds and limitations. The range of use classes being considered in paragraph 32 as potentially low impact causes the

Board concern. What may be low impact in the LPA's view may differ from what the land owner considers as low impact.

12. The Board is concerned that nowhere in the consultation is any mention made of associated operational development connected with the change of use. Would this require planning permission? Most agricultural buildings would not be capable of conversion to the uses listed in paragraph 32 without significant building works and also, in many instances, engineering works to create parking areas and accesses for example. Presumably such works would remain within planning control and thus only the principle of the change of use would not be a planning consideration, provided that it was 'low impact'. However, it seems that this would increase rather than reduce uncertainty and would be likely to make enforcement even more complicated and cumbersome than it is at present.

Historic Buildings and Farmsteads

13. For many designated landscapes traditional farming practices and historic farmsteads are very important components of landscape character and provide the historic dimension to the special qualities of the landscape designation. It is important to find new uses for redundant agricultural buildings and to investigate ways that they could be put to better use in order to help enhance, diversify and strengthen individual farm businesses and the wider rural economy.
14. Although Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments are specifically excluded from the changes proposed in this consultation (paragraph 51) there is no recognition of buildings within Article 1(5) areas including World Heritage Sites, Conservation Areas, National Parks and AONBs. The Board considers that the exemption from the proposed changes should be extended to cover Article 1(5) areas (and therefore including AONBs). This is particularly important in connection with proposals for the conversion of agricultural buildings to other uses, including A1-3, B1, B8, C1 and D2. In some individual cases business, retail and leisure uses (A, B and D) might be acceptable. However, the Board generally opposes C1 use because most farm buildings will be unsuited to this future use and we fear that, with possible permitted rights for change of use in the future, this may create a way of getting residential uses in the countryside without the controls of the NPPF.
15. This raises an additional concern. The consultation does not consider potential subsequent changes of use. As described above, if it is permitted to change to C1 hotels, then proposals elsewhere in the consultation document (paragraphs 40 to 43) would allow for a further change of use to C3 dwelling houses. The Board considers that this is likely to lead to not only a free for all in terms of rural business reusing existing buildings, but also a way for new dwellings to be provided in the countryside without any form of planning control

Article 4 Directions

16. The Board is concerned that the use of Article 4 Directions by local planning authorities is not going to be a practical method to withdraw any new permitted development rights which are not appropriate in particular locations, because LPAs generally lack the capacity to make numerous such directions.

Requirement for Prior Approval

17. If the Government were to introduce some or all of the proposals in this consultation, there would be a strong case for some sort of mechanism that enabled local planning authorities to consider potential impacts.
18. In practice, though, the matters that would need to be made available for local planning authority approval are likely to be so complex as to render obsolete the benefits of removing the need for a planning application.
19. Without a change in primary legislation, the matters which could be 'reserved' for prior approval by the local planning authority are limited. Allowing local planning authorities approval rights over siting and appearance would be insufficient as it would not enable all of the types of matters listed above to be managed. It would not, for example, enable parking and highways impacts to be managed.
20. If the Government does choose to allow some or all of these changes of use to be taken out of the planning application system and made subject to the prior approval process instead, there should be further consultation on a firm set of proposals and a draft statutory instrument.
21. The Board considers that the proposals constitute a significant threat to the countryside since it will result in a proliferation of new agricultural buildings in the countryside in order to free up existing buildings for re-use. Many of these will be in unsustainable locations. Furthermore, taken as a whole, the proposals provide a way of securing new homes in locations which planning policies both at national and local level would expressly prohibit.

OFGEM RIIO-T1: Initial Proposals for National Grid Electricity Transmission and National Grid Gas – Overview consultation

22. The Board is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the RIIO-T1: Initial Proposals for National Grid Electricity Transmission and National Grid Gas – Overview. The Board understands that RIIO stands for 'Revenue = Incentives + Innovation + Outputs' and that the consultation is concerned with the transmission price controls for National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) and National Grid Gas (NGGT) from 1st April 2013 to 31st March 2021. The Board is interested in the NGET aspect and Question 2 that is detailed in the 'outputs, incentives and innovation' supporting document. We are asked: 'Do you have any views on our Initial Proposal on setting an expenditure cap for the start of RIIO-T1 in relation to addressing the visual amenity impacts of existing infrastructure in designated areas?'
23. The Board welcomes the new initiative to provide an allowance to transmission operators to underground existing transmission lines which impact on designated landscapes. The Board considers that this will complement the existing initiative that is currently being delivered by the distribution networks. The Board also understands that there will be a similar scheme for proposed lines. This is also welcomed and supported. However, the Board is concerned that there appears to be a lack of collaborative working between those delivering projects relating to undergrounding existing cables and those dealing with proposed new lines.
24. We consider that it will be important to ensure that the wording in the final document relates to addressing the visual amenity impacts of existing infrastructure 'on', as

opposed to 'in', designated areas as the impacts generated by pylons do not just stop at the boundaries of the designated areas.

25. It appears that there is a significant willingness to pay (WTP) by the public, but there is lack of clarity about how the ultimate allowance has been determined which is confusing to the stakeholders involved. The WTP research that is mentioned demonstrates that there would be an expenditure cap of £1.1bn based on 2009/10 figures. However, the consultation places a cap at the start of the RIIO period of £110m. The Board trusts that the allowance will have the flexibility to be increased (as detailed in paragraph 2.50 of the supporting document) significantly towards the threshold suggested by the NGET analysis, as the proposed levels are only likely to achieve the undergrounding of about 4 miles of existing powerlines (based on a cost of about £25m per mile as detailed in footnote 12 on page 15 of the supporting document). The Board would like to know how this ceiling will be reviewed and the resultant expenditure monitored.
26. The Board has significant concerns about fact that the allowance is being considered on a 'use it or loose it basis'. The Board understands the need for setting timescales for delivery, however, given our experience in helping to deliver projects to underground distribution lines, we have found that they sometimes require protracted negotiations with landowners and others. We think it would be safe to assume that similar negotiations would have to be undertaken for transmission lines and that they would be a lot more complicated and therefore time consuming. We are concerned that if projects failed to be delivered within a price review period then the allowance is likely to be lost.
27. The Board is aware that a draft list of proposed schemes has already been published by National Grid. It would be beneficial if there is a much greater degree of transparency in the selection of such schemes. Any proposals should have a greater level of consultation with the relevant designated landscapes bodies built-in to the process, as local knowledge may help the prioritisation of schemes. It would also ensure that those lines targeted would deliver the greatest landscape benefits as opposed to being the most expedient to do.

Dacorum BC Draft Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Masterplan

28. The Board is grateful for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Hemel Hempstead Town Centre Masterplan. Many of the visions and objectives are welcomed. However, one of the key features of the town centre is the River Gade. This is an important chalk stream and is therefore a globally rare resource. Much of the previous work that was undertaken along the river as it runs through the town centre has had detrimental impacts on it and its quality and the current over-abstraction has resulted in significantly reduced flows.
29. The Masterplan represents an ideal opportunity to address some of the damage yet it does not appear to place any value on the River Gade as a significant environmental resource, other than to provide an opportunity to reflect buildings (presumably on the assumption that water is retained within the river) and as a route along which to place paths.
30. In order to improve the quality of the public realm and to enhance the natural environment along the River Gade, and thus to conserve and enhance the quality of

this important Chilterns' chalk stream, the Board considers that any restoration work within the corridor of the River Gade should seek to respect the natural environment and re-naturalise the river (by removing artificial concrete banks and obstacles to the movement of aquatic life for example) and thus re-create a more natural river channel and corridor. The Board considers that this should be reflected in the objectives, opportunities, visions and design principles that apply to the River Gade and its corridor including the lower end of Gadebridge Park, Jellicoe Water Gardens and the Marlowes Shopping and Plough Zones. The Board considers that such changes would demonstrate that the Council is committed to ensuring that the River Gade is a valuable asset to the town.

Central Bedfordshire Council 'Southern Bedfordshire Chiltern Arc Green Infrastructure and Access Vision Plan, August 2012'

31. General comment – The Plan still includes a great many photographs. Though they now have captions many do not seem to serve any useful purpose – it would be better to remove many of them. In some cases the pages could be used for maps or figures which should all appear in the document from the start.
32. General comment – Although the Board has been involved it is not clear what other organisations apart from the Council, Groundwork and the National Trust have had an input into the production of the plan. The Board would advise that at the very least Natural England and the Wildlife Trusts (they were very involved in development of biodiversity layer for GI plans in this area) should be contacted and involved in any future work or iterations of the plan.
33. Front page – Green Infrastructure (GI) includes access so the title is a little misleading. The Board is unsure what is meant by a 'vision plan'. Is it a plan or is it a vision, or is it a plan for how to deliver a vision? This is not made clear in either the summary or introduction.
34. Executive Summary – Though the Board has contributed to the production of the Vision Plan it has not been as involved as is suggested by the first paragraph. The Board welcomes the aim of plan which is to produce a holistic vision which seeks to improve connectivity of landscape and GI and networks to ensure access routes and spaces are fit for purpose.
35. Executive Summary – A map should have been included at this point to show the area covered, with clear links to other areas outside the direct scope of the vision plan but within the sphere of influence of the Council's development strategy (many other locations and areas are mentioned later in the document). A map would show the geographic scope of the plan and some of the rationale for that scope would become obvious when a map is examined. It would have been good to see a wider area covered, taking in some of the sites to the east of the A6 (Barton Hills and Warden and Galley Hills for example). This is particularly relevant given the emerging initiative to encourage collaborative management between sites across this area including sites such as Barton Hills (badged as North Chilterns Chalk initiative).
36. Executive Summary – Paragraph 4 talks about 'conserving the diversity'. This also needs to encompass **enhancement** as well as conservation of the area's characteristic features, (both natural and historic). The Vision should be used as a

framework not just to protect important sites but to expand and link them along the lines of the principles set out in the Natural Environment White Paper 2011 (more, bigger, better and joined spaces for nature).

37. Executive Summary – this section needs to explain where this plan ‘sits’ in relation to other GI plans and development strategies for the area. Similarly, it is not clear where the plan sits within the development plan hierarchy and what status it will ultimately have. There is little point in producing such a plan unless it has real purpose.
38. Introduction – Paragraph 1.2 mentions figure 1 but this is not included in the document. Inclusion of the figure would remove the need for much of the text.
39. The Project Area – Paragraphs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 repeat much of the locational information already referred to.
40. In Paragraph 2.2.3 it is not clear what time period the comments on Agri-environment schemes and CAP reform refer to.
41. Paragraph 2.2.4 should include the Board’s statutory purpose. It is the duty of the Conservation Board, in the exercise of its functions, to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty, and the purpose of increasing the understanding and enjoyment by the public of the special qualities of the area of outstanding natural beauty (see Section 87 Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000).
42. Paragraph 2.2.5 includes a lot of text that is somewhat superfluous as well as an appendix that would presumably appear in any printed version. It would be better to edit the text and then refer readers to relevant websites for further information.
43. Paragraph 2.5.1 should mention arable flora and bird interest as well as hedgerows, and not just chalk grassland. This paragraph refers to perceived benefits in connection with public ownership - ‘There are a number of Sites.....which, when in public ownerships, are managed to maintain and enhance this biodiversity...’ Private ownership doesn’t necessarily preclude management for biodiversity. The Board wonders if this statement should be so specific about the link with public ownership.
44. Paragraph 2.5.10 should refer to arable flora rather than weeds, and the Board suggests that any reference to farmland habitats should not just be about hedgerows supporting arable flora / farmland birds.
45. Paragraph 2.6.7 mentions an important hedgerow protected under the Hedgerow Regulations, though it is difficult to know where this is – a plan would have been useful.
46. In the Policy Context section text should be added to refer to the Natural Environment White Paper 2011, the National Ecosystem Assessment and the Bedfordshire Local Biodiversity Action Plan. This area is also part of the Wildlife Trust’s North Chilterns Chalk Living Landscape.
47. Paragraph 4.4 (1) refers to the lack of visitor facilities - the Board suggests that it would be more productive to consider this issue over a wider area, taking in more of the sites in the area and considering how the public currently use them or might want to use them in the future, and what the opportunities are to enhance facilities. This comment also applies to recommendations 6.2.1 and 6.4.1 – i.e. more work is

- needed across a wider area to assess need and the feasibility of providing a visitor centre.
48. Paragraph 4.5 (1) refers to the AONB. The statutory purpose for the AONB should be correctly reflected in the wording and therefore 'and enhanced' should be added after 'conserved' in line 3 and 'of the area' should be added after 'characteristics' in line 2. Similarly, the second sentence would benefit from being redrafted as it does not meet the purposes. To comply with national policy (see policies 113 to 118 in the NPPF) the second sentence should be amended to read along the following lines: 'Full account should be taken of the likely effects of any development within the setting of the AONB in order to ensure that the nationally designated landscape is afforded the greatest degree of protection'.
 49. Paragraph 4.5 (8) refers to the existence of the overhead power lines. In order to improve the quality of the landscape and its attractiveness to potential users it would be beneficial to seek undergrounding of the power lines as part of any comprehensive development in the area.
 50. Paragraph 5.3.4 talks about landscape and heritage objectives and still fails to mention the AONB and its statutory purposes.
 51. Section 6.2 deal with biodiversity recommendations. The Board considers that this section should be strengthened with regard to ensuring appropriate management of existing habitat, and should include chalk grassland, woodland and farmland habitats. Reference should also be made to the provision of management advice.
 52. Despite numerous references to the lack of public access and rights of way in the heart of the project area nothing is really done about this as part of the vision plan aside from a brief mention in paragraph 6.3.5. Greater access should be provided with both north/south and east/west links within the centre of the area. Views from all routes need to receive consideration as part of any visitor experience assessment.
 53. Paragraph 6.4.6 – The Board considers that the area would be better promoted as part of North Chilterns Chalk – we are not persuaded that 'Southern Bedfordshire Chiltern Arc' has much local resonance. It is considered to be too small an area to try to give an identity to.
 54. Paragraph 6.4.8 refers to provision of interpretation. The Board would not support separate interpretation for this area, and would want to see it as part of the North Chilterns Chalk promotion.
 55. Paragraph 6.4.15 should refer to the North Chilterns Chalk initiative which is looking at collaboration between organisations involving volunteers across a wider area.
 56. Section 7 details an Action Plan. The Action Plan contains no detail about lead organisations, priorities, timescales or costs. At least some of this detail should be included from the start as it suggests that the plan will not be implemented at any stage. The Board wonders whether specific proposals for changes to land management (for example locations for creation of new woodlands) been checked against existing local BAP plans and biodiversity / GI layers to check that there is not a conflict of objectives. Has the information been checked to ensure that locations for woodland creation are appropriate?
 57. Section 8 is entitled 'progressing the plan'. Page 53 details information about the English Woodland Grant Scheme and the Board's Sustainable Development Fund.

English Woodland Grant Scheme also provides grants which can be used to help enhance management of existing woodlands. The Board suggests that in connection with the reference to its Sustainable Development Fund the statement that the Board meets quarterly should be removed. The grants panel meets more frequently than that. In addition, the last sentence should be amended to read: 'Funding applications are welcome from a wide range of applicants including voluntary / community organisations, local businesses, and individuals'.

58. Figure 7 details the vision arising from the text. The Board considers that further thought should be given to the identification of further rights of way within the central part of the area, the map clearly shows a very large gap in the rights of way network that will not encourage people to use the wider area.
59. Similarly, crossing points on the A6, M1 and railway are already shown. However, the Board considers that a further crossing of the A6 will be needed to the north, particularly as a direct link could then be made to Barton Hills. Those that are proposed should provide enhanced crossing facilities (proper green bridges for example) that encourage people into the wider countryside beyond.
60. Figure 7 also shows 3 locations for possible visitor centres – notwithstanding any direct impacts on the AONB, its setting and enjoyment that might arise from the possible development of visitor centres, the Board considers that to lessen the impact on sensitive sites any centre proposed for the Sundon Hills Country Park should be to the west of the main road and much closer to the former landfill site. The centre proposed on the A6 should also provide for direct links to the east towards Barton Hills and the possible centre within the proposed development area to the north of Luton would be better sited further to the north of the development area in order to allow easier access to the wider countryside beyond. The Board may well have comments to make about specific proposals if they are submitted at some point in the future.

London Luton Airport Operations Limited pre-application public consultation on revised master plan document

61. The Chilterns Conservation Board is concerned about the future use of London Luton Airport (LLA), particularly arising from the overflying of aircraft over the AONB, and its setting, both during the day and at night. The Board has had no direct contact from either the Airport owners or operators and as a statutory body with responsibility for the management of the AONB which is immediately adjacent to the airport we would have expected to be involved in discussions on the expansion of the airport and its likely impacts.
62. Despite not being directly consulted the Board would still like to take the opportunity to comment at this stage in the development of the plans that are being prepared on behalf of the London Luton Airport Operations Limited (LLAOL) and London Luton Airport Limited (LLAL). As we understand it the proposal is for an expansion of passenger numbers from about 9 million passengers per annum (mppa) to 18 mppa by about 2031.
63. As detailed in the information that we have seen, this would appear to principally involve provision of a new taxiway parallel to a current taxiway, extending the

taxiways within the existing curtilage of the airport and extending terminal buildings and car parking.

64. If the aircraft type were to remain as at present, the number of aircraft movements would roughly double. We understand that the size of aircraft is generally increasing. This would mean that such an increase in passenger numbers could be catered for by an increase in aircraft movements which would not double the present number. However, such an increase would nonetheless be very significant. Furthermore, larger aircraft are noisier so the detrimental impacts that are likely to arise are more than likely to be at least the same if not worse.
65. The Chilterns Conservation Board has statutory duties to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and to increase the understanding and enjoyment by the public of the special qualities of the AONB.
66. The revised master plan has been examined and the Board notes the changes that have been made. Whilst consideration of the landscape and visual impacts has moved within the document, and it is now considered as a key environmental issue, the notes that no consideration is given to the likely impacts of the operation of the airport on the Chilterns AONB and its setting.
67. The Board considers that LLAOL is failing in its statutory duty of regard to the purpose of the AONB (to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area, Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000).
68. The Board therefore opposes the expansion plans for the following reasons:
69. The Board considers that the proposals are premature because they have not been incorporated into a national aviation strategy which has yet to be published.
70. The Board is concerned that with such short timescales between this consultation and the submission of a planning application (by November 2012 which gives no more than 6 weeks) no account will be taken of any feedback given.
71. The public consultation material is hard to access, poorly produced, very difficult to read and will lead to lack of engagement.
72. The Board is not convinced that the expansion would be taken forward in an environmentally sensitive and sustainable way and, despite being a statutory body, has yet to have sight of the Scoping Report that is required in connection with the production of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). As part of the scoping for the EIA the statutory Chilterns AONB Management Plan should clearly be referred to alongside the Board's Position Statement on Development Affecting the Setting of the AONB (attached).
73. The Board is extremely concerned about the likely impacts of overflying aircraft, especially at night, on the tranquillity and enjoyment of the Chilterns AONB, and this should clearly be fully assessed as part of the Scoping and EIA process prior to any planning application being made. In addition, the EIA should also address landscape and visual effects arising from the use of the airport and the proposed extended taxiways especially because there will be a huge number of aircraft that, when they are not on the ground, would be clearly visible from many miles around. Even when on the ground aircraft are visible from many areas including the Chilterns AONB.

74. The likely effects on the Chilterns AONB should also be considered as part of the EIA. The Board considers that the impacts on the AONB and its enjoyment should be subject to specific detailed consideration as part of the EIA because it is clearly a sensitive receptor. For potential noise impacts the Chilterns AONB should again be subject to specific detailed consideration outside the normal confines of L_{Aeq} assessments. In addition, the impacts of night noise should also be fully considered and should include assessments from within the AONB and its setting.
75. The Board is also concerned about the likely noise impacts arising from the increase in the number of taxiing aircraft.
76. The Board is concerned about the likely impact of new buildings on the surrounding landscape which includes the Chilterns AONB and its setting.
77. The Board is concerned about the likely impacts on traffic flows on roads within the AONB arising from the traffic associated with additional passengers.
78. The Board is concerned about the likely development pressures for new housing for example to cater for increases in the number of employees.
79. Despite the recent adoption of the Airport Noise Action Plan (2010 to 2015) the Board considers that there is no clear commitment from LLAOL towards effective noise and environmental controls and the Board considers that restrictions should be put in place to significantly reduce the number and frequency of night time flights.
80. In connection with this issue the Board understands that Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted all have strict night noise controls with Government setting limits on noise emissions and aircraft movement numbers. We understand that London City has a night and weekend curfew. The Board is aware that there are no such limits placed upon LLA and we therefore consider that stringent limits on the number of night flights should be introduced to protect the local environment and to provide people with certainty. In addition, we consider that these should reflect the limits imposed by Government at the other three major south east airports.
81. Any future planning application should be treated by the applicant as an opportunity to seek significant improvements and mitigation to the noise impact environment created by the airport. The Board will expect any such planning application to contain a comprehensive analysis of the future noise implications of the growth proposals and to be proactive in coming forward with positive proposals for improvements and mitigation. These proposals should include the imposition of night flight limitations consistent with those at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted. The Board would expect such limitations to be imposed through a Government body, which would be independent of the airport owner or operator, in order to ensure that environmental concerns are not biased by, and/or offset, commercial gains.
82. The Board would be grateful if it could be involved in the discussions or consultation about any revisions to the existing Night Noise Policy
83. The Board does not accept that noise levels will decrease because a significant increase in the number of flights by larger aircraft would mean that there would be a significant increase in the frequency of flights leading to a significant decrease in the intervening quiet periods. As a result average noise levels are likely to rise.
84. The Board considers that any expansion plans must be developed in the light of existing operational constraints. These include the proximity of Heathrow airspace

and the Bovingdon stack, as well as possible route changes affecting Luton Airport. In addition, the future mix of aircraft and type of flight (for example passenger, corporate or cargo) also need to be taken account of.

85. In addition, the Board understand that NATS has plans to substantially review the structure of the airspace in the south east of England. This may involve changes to the Bovingdon stack which, with other things, may result in changes to departure and arrival routes at Luton Airport. It is not clear to what extent the proposed growth has taken such factors into account.
86. The Board would welcome the opportunity to discuss its representation with LLAOL and LLAL and would also like to ensure that it is closely involved in the implementation of the Noise Action Plan's key action to 'assess the impact of London Luton Airport traffic on the Chilterns AONB and explore potential for operational improvements'
87. We would be grateful if we could be consulted formally at later stages. We will no doubt comment more fully as the development plans are progressed to the planning application stage.

Environment Agency, Forestry Commission and Natural England Building a Better Environment

88. The Chilterns Conservation Board welcomes the production of the 'Building a Better Environment' document.
89. It would be useful to also refer to AONBs in Table 1, second column under 'areas of development expertise'.
90. The key sections from 5 onwards are useful and detailed, however, it would be helpful if they were all linked up with a summary at the end of the document.
91. Section 5, page 9, under 'our role' mention is made of the provision of specialist advice on landscapes. Though this is welcome it does not actually happen in practice. In most cases NE refers an applicant to others for advice, often the local AONB unit for example. This issue is also not really addressed later in Section 18. It would be useful to explain NE's role in advising on the landscape impacts of development (either planning applications or proposals in development plans). The use of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments should be encouraged.
92. Page 10 includes an image of a solar PV farm – the relevance of this to the document is not clear, it would perhaps be better (and more encouraging) to use an image of solar PV or hot water in a domestic-scale setting.
93. Sections 8 and 9 ought to include a full explanation of sustainable drainage systems with all of the likely elements from green roofs through to rainwater harvesting, as well as measures to more closely manage water demand (for example water efficient white goods, grey water recycling and water meters).
94. Section 13 could usefully include references to the NPPF (particularly paragraph 118) and the need to protect aged and veteran trees outside ancient woodland.
95. Page 17 – the fifth bullet point mentions increasing genetic diversity or varying species that will improve resilience in connection with climate change. Care will be

needed in the choice of species, particularly in those places where increasing genetic diversity is not necessarily an appropriate action.

96. Reference should be made in Section 14 (statutory wildlife sites and biodiversity) to Local Nature Partnerships and the Natural Environment White Paper, possible under 'further opportunities'.
97. There are references to further information on pages 18 and 19 which refer the reader to the page on which the cross reference is made (see the bottom of page 18 and towards the top of page 19).

Central Bedfordshire Council proposed content of Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan

98. Thank you for informing the Chilterns Conservation Board about the consultation in connection with the proposed content of the Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan for Central Bedfordshire Council.
99. The Board has examined the questionnaire that is available and has the following brief comment to make by way of response.
100. In accordance with Policies 114 to 116 and 113 in the National Planning Policy Framework, the Conservation Board considers that full consideration should be given to the statutory requirement to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB as well as the need to take full account of any development that may be outside but likely to affect the AONB as part of Policy 3 (assessing planning applications for Gypsy and Traveller sites) or Policy 4 (assessing planning applications for the expansion of existing Gypsy and Traveller sites).

Scottish and Southern Energy consultation on future electricity distribution networks

101. The Board was consulted in connection with the Scottish and Southern Energy (SSE) proposals for their electricity distribution networks. This will represent the SSE business plan for the period from 1st April 2015 to 31st March 2023 and would be consistent with the same period as the OFGEM RIIO-ED1 (which stands for Revenue = Incentives + Innovation + Outputs in Electricity Distribution in the period 2015 to 2023). The southern half of the Chilterns AONB is within the SSE area and just recently SSE has agreed to partake in the OFGEM undergrounding of overhead wires in protected landscapes scheme. This is encouraging and it would clearly be beneficial for the AONB if this engagement was continued until at least 2025. This would be part of SSE's environmental commitment and would be addressed through its business plan. The following text was submitted to SSE in answer to Question 10 - Are there any particular environmental projects that you think we should undertake? If yes, please explain.
102. The Chilterns Conservation Board considers that SSE should fully take part in the OFGEM undergrounding of overhead wires in protected landscapes scheme and should fully utilise the available funding in the period from 2015 to 2023. Such an involvement would be a clear demonstration of SSE's statutory duty to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONBs within its area (under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000). Previous willingness to pay surveys have clearly demonstrated that customers are happy for

such funding to be utilised and the Board encourages SSE to continue the work it has recently done in connection with the OFGEM scheme in the period to 2015.

Wycombe DC Local Plan to 2031 Issues:

103. The Board has limited comments to make at this stage. However, we would stress that full consideration should be given in the Plan to the need to have regard to the statutory purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB and its setting. The preparation of the various technical studies, and particularly in connection with landscape and ecology, is welcomed. Reference could usefully be made to the statutory AONB Management Plan, Highways Guidelines, Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and the Supplementary Technical Notes on Chilterns Building Materials as a means of ensuring that the statutory purpose is met.

Central Bedfordshire Council Chiltern Local Area Transport Plan draft

104. Though the Chiltern Local Area Transport Plan (CLATP) covers an area which is mostly within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) there is little mention, if any, of the AONB and its importance. The Board considers that this should be rectified with appropriate references made to the AONB, its Management Plan and the key publications that relate to transport ('Environmental Guidelines for the Management of Highways in the Chilterns' and 'The Chilterns Cycleway' in particular). Furthermore, the Board considers that any references made should use 'Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty' or 'AONB' and should include the statutory purposes for which the AONB is designated. Any future proposals should clearly take full account of the context of the site, particularly within the AONB, and should ensure conservation and enhancement of the natural beauty of the area.
105. Cycling is covered in section 6.5. However, the Board can find no mention of the Chilterns Cycleway despite the fact that this promoted route passes through the area. Cycling is a positive alternative to car driving and should be encouraged wherever possible. Despite the fact that the Chilterns Cycleway is predominantly a leisure route its potential for modal shift should not be ignored.
106. The second paragraph of Section 7.4 should have 'an' inserted before 'Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty'.
107. Section 9.6 deals with Kensworth and mentions that the Green Infrastructure Plan has identified a number of places where footpaths should be 'improved/created or upgraded'. Though such matters would normally be supported, great care will be needed in connection with any 'improvements' or 'upgrading' to ensure that there is no detrimental impact on the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB or on the enjoyment or understanding or its special qualities. The same point can be made about Section 9.9 which deals with Whipsnade and 'improvements' to Rights of Way.

Buckinghamshire County Council Local Flood Risk Management Strategy Consultation

108. The Board is grateful for the opportunity to comment on this consultation document and would like to be consulted at later stages in its development.
109. The Chilterns Conservation Board supports and welcomes the production of the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy for Buckinghamshire.
110. The Board supports the following policies as drafted – Policy 11 (Sustainable Drainage Systems); Policy 12 (reducing urban creep); Policy 13 (promoting sustainable land management); Policy 15 (works on ordinary watercourses), and Policy 16 (location specific actions to manage flood risk).

DCLG technical consultation on ‘Extending permitted development rights for homeowners and businesses’

111. The Chilterns Conservation Board supports government policy to promote sustainable development in rural areas and welcomes the recognition, set out in Paragraphs 5 and 34 of the consultation document, that *‘safeguards under planning and other regimes will remain in place, and the changes to permitted development rights for homeowners and businesses will not apply in protected areas such as conservation areas, National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Sites of Special Scientific Interest’*.
112. Paragraph 34 states that in order to make sure that there is no adverse impact on protected areas it is proposed that the changes should not apply on article 1(5) land (which includes AONBs) as well as Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Question 9 asks: ‘Do you agree that article 1(5) land and Sites of Special Scientific Interest should be excluded from the changes to permitted development rights for homeowners, offices, shops, professional/financial services establishments and industrial premises?’ The Board’s response to this question is ‘yes’, because exemption for article 1(5) land ensures that the Local Planning Authority (LPAs), often in consultation with the relevant AONB Partnerships and Conservation Boards, will be able to manage the details involved in proposed developments in order to ensure that the special qualities of the designated landscape are appropriately conserved and enhanced as required by the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 and the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000. Exemption for AONBs from the extension to Permitted Development Rights is also considered to be in keeping with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’, which acknowledges the need for safeguards on development in article 1(5) areas.
113. There are many examples of how the consultation with LPAs works effectively, including: the consideration of appropriate designs and materials; the appropriate management of associated hard and soft landscaping to conserve local character; the provision of mitigation measures to safeguard species such as bats and barn owls; the appropriate management of building works to ensure the retention or replacement of particular features important to local character; ensuring the control of any external lighting, and seeking to achieve renewable energy and sustainable construction targets.
114. The Conservation Board is very concerned about the proposal, in paragraph 36, to remove prior approval requirements for fixed broadband apparatus as it applies to article 1(5) land for a period of five years. Statutory undertakers have a duty under

the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000) to have regard to the purposes of AONB designation when making decisions in relation to or affecting land within AONBs. If enacted the Board considers that this proposal would significantly undermine this 'duty to have regard' and it would strike at the heart of the framework that has helped nurture and safeguard the country's AONBs. The Board considers that this would set a precedent that could have significant negative and long term consequences.

115. The consultation then asks, in Question 10: 'Do you agree that the prior approval requirement for the installation, alteration or replacement of any fixed electronic communications equipment should be removed in relation to article 1(5) land for a period of five years?' The Board's answer to this question is 'no' because it considers that the removal of the prior approval requirement for the installation, alteration or replacement of any fixed electronic communication equipment in relation to article 1(5) land would set a dangerous precedent by introducing an exemption for development from the duty to have regard to the purposes for which AONBs are designated, and the equivalent duties relating to the National Parks and the Broads.
116. The Board fully supports the government in forming policy based on clear evidence and the best advice available, but fails to understand what evidence and advice underpins the proposal detailed in Paragraph 36. We are not aware of any issues arising from the current prior approval requirement that have slowed down any installations, placed any undue burdens on developers or hindered the rollout of superfast broadband in protected areas. The Board therefore considers that the permitted development rights regime should remain as at present in connection with article 1(5) land.
117. The Board is also extremely concerned about the inference in paragraph 38 of the consultation document (which states that the prior approval will continue to apply in SSSIs in order to ensure that these 'sensitive sites are not damaged') that AONBs, National Parks and other protected areas aren't themselves sensitive and therefore don't matter as much in connection with this issue. Statements such as this will immediately introduce inconsistencies into the planning system and should therefore be avoided.
118. The Board is aware that the National Association for AONBs (NAAONB) has been extremely clear in its recognition of the importance of reliable, high-speed, and affordable broadband services within AONBs and that it has stated the need for high quality mobile communication within AONBs. The Board understand that this sentiment has been formally documented in a joint AONB partnership/NPA statement to the Broadband Policy and Programmes Team in September 2010, the NAAONB submission to the Rural Economy Growth Review and is being supported by a host of practical initiatives on the ground in the AONBs. The Board is supportive of the sentiments that have been expressed on its behalf.

DfT Major Infrastructure Reform – Amendments to the definitions for Highways and Rail NSIPS in the Planning Act 2008

119. The Chilterns Conservation Board notes the contents of the consultation document and is disappointed that no reference is made to the potential implications of the

proposed changes in connection with nationally protected landscapes (National Parks and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty for example).

120. Question 4 – Do you agree that the area thresholds for highway schemes are the right size? Should the limit include land required for the purpose of construction? The national importance of protected landscapes is recognised in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 113, 115 and 116. Even short lengths of road can have significant detrimental impacts on protected landscapes and their enjoyment. Therefore, the Board does not consider that the thresholds for highway schemes are the right size and that for schemes within protected landscapes or their settings (where a scheme is likely to have an impact) the thresholds for all types of road scheme should be significantly reduced. However, the Board is not in a position to be able to suggest specific thresholds and as a result of the possible implications it is probably necessary for the current situation to apply within protected landscapes. Should the thresholds ultimately change then the Board considers that the limit should include all land required for the purpose of construction.
121. Question 5 – Do you agree that the rail threshold should be based on length of track? Do you agree that the limit should be set at 2km of continuous track, and include both single and multi-track schemes? The national importance of protected landscapes is recognised in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 113, 115 and 116. Even short lengths of new railway can have significant detrimental impacts on protected landscapes and their enjoyment. Therefore, the Board does not consider that the threshold for rail schemes is the right size or type and that for schemes within protected landscapes or their settings (where a scheme is likely to have an impact) the threshold for rail schemes should be both significantly reduced and altered in extent. However, the Board is not in a position to be able to suggest a specific threshold/extent and as a result of the possible implications it is probably necessary for the current situation to apply within protected landscapes. Should the threshold ultimately change then the Board considers that the limit should be area-based, should include all land required for the purpose of construction and not just the length of track and should include both single and multi-track schemes.

UK Power Networks Business Plan 2015-2023

122. Q17. What are the current initiatives and issues that concern you surrounding our impact on the environment?
123. In relation to the increased demand for off-shore energy production in the East and South East of England, we want to see a commitment from UKPN that the infrastructure associated with bringing this energy production onshore does not have a detrimental impact on Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Parks within the two regions. New infrastructure should seek to avoid passing through Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Parks, where this is unavoidable, and there should be a presumption against new overhead infrastructure.
124. Q18. What should we be doing more of in the future? For example: Extending our programme of undergrounding overhead electricity lines beyond AONBs to other sensitive areas.

125. Please note that this should also (and does in practice) include National Parks. We support the continuation of the programme for undergrounding existing overhead power lines within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Parks. The collaborative approach taken by UKPN to identify, prioritise and implement schemes is supported. This involves those working in AONBs and National Parks and in turn, they are involved with local communities and other organisations this appears to be working successfully in the East and South East of England and we would like this to continue.
126. We consider that there should be an increased level of flexibility to look at the setting of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Parks. Currently, the fund is only applied to work within the boundary of the protected landscape itself – we consider that there is value in considering undergrounding schemes which cross boundaries where there is a clear visual relationship between the protected landscape and its setting.
127. There are many more potential schemes than funding available to implement them – we would like to see an increased level of funding for undergrounding overhead power lines within Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and National Parks. This has been stated in responses to Ofgem and their consultation on RIIO-ED1.

Recommendation

1. **That the Committee notes and approves the responses already made on behalf of the Board in connection with the consultation exercises on the development plan documents detailed above.**

Item 11 Planning Applications Update**Author:** Colin White Planning Officer**Lead Organisations:** Chilterns Conservation Board**Resources:** Staff time.**Summary:** Representations have been made regarding a number of planning applications and appeals and a number of previous cases have been determined.**Purpose of report:** To inform the Committee about, and seek approval of, the responses that have been made under delegated powers in connection with the planning applications and appeals as listed and to update the Committee on any outcomes.**Background**

1. Since the 1st April this year the Board has been consulted on 121 applications and has responded to all of these. There have been 21 formal representations (all objections).
2. The applications that have resulted in formal representations in 2012/13 include:

Objections

- Major development east of Aylesbury (not yet decided, understood to be going to appeal for non-determination)
- Redevelopment of sheltered housing site at Goring (approved)
- Stables, barn and hardstanding at Ibstone (refused)
- Redevelopment of CABI site at Wallingford (approved subject to call in)
- 8 floodlights on 6 columns at a school at Great Kingshill (approved)
- Gates, piers and walls, Heath End near Berkhamsted, (approved)
- Coachway, new sports and leisure centre, offices, hotel, food store, amenities building, landscaping and open space at Handy Cross, High Wycombe (approved subject to obligation)
- Redevelopment of Carmel College, Wallingford (not yet decided)
- Change of use from agriculture to campsite, near Princes Risborough (approved)
- Creation of new access and stationing of mobile home, Spurlands End Road, Great Kingshill (access refused, mobile home approved)
- Winery building, Little Marlow (approved)
- Wind turbine, Ford (refused)
- Importation of inert waste, Loudwater (refused)
- Athletics track and associated development, plus amended information, Little Marlow (approved subject to obligation)
- Wind turbine, Henton (refused)
- Replacement dwelling and new equestrian centre (dwelling not yet decided, equestrian centre refused)
- Alterations to Luton Airport (not yet decided)

- Permanent agricultural workers' dwelling, Sarratt (not yet decided)
3. The outstanding formal representations are detailed in Appendix 2, and where decisions have been made by the local planning authorities these are detailed.
 4. The Committee is asked to take particular note of the response that was recently submitted in connection with the planning application for the expansion of activities at Luton Airport (page 42). This follows on from a previous response in connection with the revised master plan document as detailed above (item 10) and responses to the emerging master plan previously reported earlier in 2012. The Board has written to the national planning casework unit (part of DCLG) to request that the application be considered as an NSIP or at least called in. This is being considered at present.
 5. The Committee will also note that a number of applications that the Board had objected to have been subsequently approved. At present, 16 of the applications on which the Board has made comments this year have been decided and less than 40% of these have been decided in accordance with the Board's comments. Though not all applications have been decided this represents a significant departure from previous years.
 6. Previously the numbers decided in line with the Board's comments had ranged from 66 to 100% with the average being 80%. This year's figure may be due to a number of reasons. However, the most likely one is that Councils are taking much greater account of the NPPF and the need to encourage developments that lead to economic activity or which would lead to the creation or retention of jobs. In addition, it is also likely that in some cases Councils are considering that it may not be prudent to refuse some applications as these are likely to lead to costly appeals, the outcome of which in some cases may not be certain. This situation will continue to be monitored and will be discussed at the next AONB Planning Forum.

Recommendations

1. **That the Committee notes and approves the responses made in connection with the applications listed in Appendix 2.**
2. **The Committee notes the situation in connection with those cases that have not been decided in line with the Board's comments.**

APPENDIX 2

| Location | LPA | Development | Ref. No. | Status | AONB Planning Officer's Response | Date |
|--|-----|---|-------------------|----------------------------|---|----------|
| Meadhams Farm Brickworks | BCC | Variation of conditions | CH/2011/60006/BCC | Approved – 28.09.12 | Support - Based on the need to continue to provide good quality local building materials into the future. Development conforms to AONB Management Plan (policies D3 and D4). The Board would be concerned if inappropriate waste was to be deposited in the voids that will be left and trusts that, should permission be granted, this will be adequately conditioned to ensure that it is carefully screened, closely monitored and involves totally inert waste due to the fact that the site is in close proximity to the River Chess and sits on the chalk aquifer. | 28.09.11 |
| High Heavens Waste Site, Clay Lane Booker | BCC | New access road | CC12/9002/CM | Refused – 08.08.12 | Object – development neither conserves nor enhances the natural beauty of the AONB and is contrary to the AONB Management Plan and development plan for the area, the road would be additional to highway improvements already considered as part of an application that is likely to be approved shortly and there is no overriding need and no special circumstances that would require an additional road (applicant refers to the road as an alternative despite the fact that it would be used by HGVs whilst the existing road would be used by cars and other light vehicles). | 27.04.12 |
| Wycombe Heights Golf Centre, Rayners Avenue, Loudwater | BCC | Importation of inert soils and remodelling of golf course and formation of irrigation reservoir | CC12/9005/CM | Refused – 18.12.12 | Object - The assessment of the plans is very difficult and hampered by the use of 0.5m contours. The Board considers that the proposal that has been submitted would have detrimental impacts on the natural beauty of the AONB and on the users of the public rights of way within the site. Though the driving range is set down in the | 23.10.12 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>landscape at present the alterations that are proposed would raise some of the activity up by up to 10 metres (greater than the average height of a normal house). This would mean that the driving range and the associated activity would become more visible in the landscape. The raising of the land would be brought about by the importation of a massive amount of waste material and the Board considers that there must be more appropriate ways of improving the driving range (such as cut and fill of an appropriate scale) that meet the requirement to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. Re-siting of the driving range (to a position that would have less impact on the AONB) may also be an option that needs investigation if the form and drainage are such a problem. The construction of the irrigation lake would also raise that part of the site by up to 8 metres with more waste material being imported. The Board considers that other methods of water capture and storage ought to be investigated and implemented before such a change is made to the landscape. The importation of the waste would lead to huge numbers of vehicles accessing and leaving the site to the detriment of users of the public rights of way and this would impact on users' enjoyment of the AONB. The Board is concerned about lighting in the countryside and though the lights that exist on site will no doubt benefit from planning permission their increased use (or replacement with something bigger) may impact on the tranquillity of the area. The Board considers that the application fails to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB and also fails to increase the understanding or</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---|---------------|---|--|----------|
| | | | | | enjoyment of the special qualities of the AONB and as such considers that the application should be refused. | |
| Caversham Quarry, Sonning Eye | Oxon CC | Quarry extension | MW.0158/11 | Pending | Object – although outside the AONB the site is within its setting and is clearly visible from the Thames valley sides. The development would involve mineral extraction and site restoration with inert waste over a considerable period of time. There would be lorry movements on roads that lead into the AONB. The LVIA has not taken proper account of the need to consider the setting of the AONB. | 26.01.12 |
| Hampden Fields, between Wendover Road and Aston Clinton Road, Weston Turville | AVDC | Mixed use development including 3,200 dwellings, 120 bed care home, park and ride site, 10ha of employment land, local centre, Green Infrastructure and open space (amongst other things) | 12/00605/A OP | Pending – subject to appeal against non determination | Object – lack of building designs means a full assessment of the proposal is difficult, particularly as some elements may be up to 15m high (or higher), the development would lead to the loss of a strategic green gap between Aylesbury and Weston Turville, the proposal is likely to lead to detrimental impacts on the setting of the AONB due to the effects on views of the Vale of Aylesbury from within the AONB and effects on views of the AONB from within and beyond the application site, the proposed development is on previously undeveloped land and is unallocated for development, whilst recognising that the proposal would have significant effects on views from the AONB these are dismissed, views of the AONB are not considered in any detail, no illustrative material is provided to show how the proposed development would appear, the proposal is not in accordance with the Development Plan and the Chilterns AONB Management Plan, the applicant should be requested to provide sufficient detail to show the visual impact of the development once | 30.04.12 |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------|---|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---|----------|
| | | | | | completed and should permission be granted then conditions should be imposed requiring landscaping to mitigate the adverse impacts and details of building materials to be provided. Maintain objection – revisions to EIA submitted which following examination fail to address the Board's previously stated objections. | 20.12.12 |
| Lower Waldrige Farm, Ford | AVDC | 101.5m turbine and associated development | 12/01806/A PP | Refused – 17.01.13 | Object – although various viewpoints are considered within the AONB the impact is considered to be greater than that claimed in the LVIA. The turbine would be the most significant vertical structure in many of the views from the scarp-top, and would be much more prominent as it would not be seen in the context of other human influences (apart from very limited numbers of pylons). The consideration that has been given to the impacts on the setting and enjoyment of the Chilterns AONB does not reflect the importance of the designated landscape or its sensitivity to change. The consideration of receptors is inadequate as many people will be in the landscape to take the view and will linger at sites, and contrary to submitted information the AONB receives a great many visitors. The development is likely to have an impact on the AONB and its enjoyment as well as its setting (position statement forwarded with representation). The Board is concerned about the method of illustration through the use of photomontages that would not represent what the eye would see, though they may be compliant with GLVIA the movement of the blades cannot be taken account of. | 21.09.12 |
| Valley View, Hemel Hempstead | CBC | Proposed gypsy site (5 caravans) | CB/11/0380 7/FULL | Pending | Object – very limited amounts of detail in the application, no information about scale and appearance of buildings on the site, development | 29.11.11 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|------------------|---------|--|---------------------------------|
| Road, Dagnall | | | | | <p>would have materially greater impact on the AONB than any currently approved development, current and proposed hedge includes species not appropriate in the AONB, application is very similar to a recently refused and dismissed on appeal application that would have involved less development on the site and the development would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB.</p> | |
| Newland Park, Gorelands Lane, Chalfont St Giles | CDC | Redevelopment of site to provide 326 dwellings, fitness and sports facilities and energy / recycling centre | CH/2010/09 76/FA | Pending | <p>Object – (see copied information sent out for full details) the Board does not object to the principle of the proposal and a redevelopment of parts of the site would bring about enhancement of the AONB if undertaken in the most sensitive manner, using the best designs and most appropriate materials. There are elements of detail the Board objects to including: the design and materials for various buildings (both parkland dwellings and apartment blocks), the lack of provision of solar pv and solar hot water, provision of extra lighting (particularly in association with the playing pitches), the lack of provision of affordable housing, lack of facilities such as shops and employment and lack of public transport provision thus leading to significant amounts of car traffic on minor local roads and the likely impacts of large numbers of lorries on the same roads during construction (to bring materials in and take spoil away).</p> <p>Revisions to design – object – the revisions do not address the Board’s concerns, in fact despite the changes to the appearance the buildings are all taller and more bulky, also object to inclusion of basements in some buildings (spoil issue) and other objections remain from previous response.</p> | <p>03.11.10</p> <p>24.01.12</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|--------------------|-----------------------------|---|----------|
| Little Meadows, Horseblock Lane, Heath End | DBC | New front entrance gates, piers and walls | 4/00963/12/ FHA | Permitted – 19.10.12 | Object – the intrinsic rural character of the lane and its surroundings would be detrimentally affected by the construction of two brick piers, up to 40m of brick wall and the introduction of either large wrought iron ‘feature’ gates or ‘fully boarded timber gates’ (which are both included on the same drawing) which both appear to be of a solid construction of either metal or wood and which would replace a perfectly acceptable 5 bar gate. These elements would introduce, along with a formal entrance arrangement, a series of alien and wholly suburban features into an otherwise rural area. These features neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB and the Board considers that they should not be permitted. The plans that have been submitted are confusing and very difficult to read, and therefore very difficult to interpret. It appears that the piers and walls would be sited too close to the stems/trunks of both the hedgerow plants and the trees within it and therefore almost certainly within any root area that would need to be protected from such a construction. Construction of the walls and piers would be likely to lead to the loss of both the hedgerow and the trees within it which is objectionable and which would clearly be to the detriment of the area. Another area of confusion arises in connection with the length of wall that is proposed. The application talks about a section of brick wall to ‘run a maximum of 20m either side’ of the entrance piers. It appears from the plan that accompanies the application that from the proposed pier to the boundary of the property to the north is no more than about 11m (clearly it would not be possible to construct 20m of wall | 22.06.12 |
|--|-----|---|--------------------|-----------------------------|---|----------|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>without consent from a third party). If the proposed wall was constructed up to 20m to the south of the proposed pier then it would stop about a third of the way along the current hedgerow. This would look very odd indeed and therefore be completely out of keeping with the area. The Board would not support a wall running the full length of the property as this would lead to an even greater detrimental impact on the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB. These objections would be addressed by the removal of the walls, piers, gates and formal entrance arrangement from the proposal. However, if, despite this objection, the Council decides that the application should be approved then the Board considers that full account should be taken of the hedgerow regulations. In addition, any approved brick wall should be far enough away from the hedge to ensure that the hedge is not damaged during construction and that its integrity is maintained in perpetuity. A clear gap of at least 1.75m from the back edge of the hedge to the front side of the wall should be required. This is not shown on the plans as currently drafted. These appear to show that the wall would be too close to the hedge. The Board considers that the hedge appears to be affected in part by the amount of tree cover in the vicinity. It would therefore be sensible to introduce shade tolerant hedging species (such as holly) which would help to improve the integrity of the hedge. If the application is approved the Board considers that conditions should be attached which require planting to fill any current gaps and the replacement of any plants within the hedge should they die in the future. The applicant should clearly</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|--|---------------|---------|---|----------|
| | | | | | be happy with such a condition as the application implies protection of the hedge. The Chilterns Conservation Board considers that, as proposed, the application neither conserves nor enhances the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB and as such the application ought to be refused. The Board would be happy to comment on any revised details that may be proposed to address these objections. | |
| Luton Airport, Airport Way, Luton | LBC | Proposed alterations and extensions to terminal buildings, car parks and new taxiway | 12/01400/F UL | Pending | Object - the proposal is for development that would allow an expansion of passenger numbers from about 9 million passengers per annum (mppa) to 18 mppa by about 2028 (with, strangely, no increase in numbers from then until 2031). The upper limit appears to be contrived in order to limit the likely expansion to less than 10mppa and thus negate the need for the application to be considered as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). The Board is concerned about this and believes that the application should be considered as an NSIP or, at the very least, called in for determination. The Board is concerned about the future use of London Luton Airport (LLA), particularly arising from the overflying of aircraft over the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and its setting, both during the day and at night. The Board considers that the application is premature because the proposed form of development and the likely implications have not been incorporated into an adopted national aviation strategy (this has yet to be published). If the aircraft type were to remain as at present, the number of aircraft movements would roughly double with a rough doubling in the numbers of passengers. We understand that the size of aircraft is generally | 05.02.13 |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | <p>increasing, and even so this would still mean that such an increase in passenger numbers would be likely to lead to a significant increase (about 60%) in the number of flights, with consequent detrimental impacts on the Chilterns AONB and its enjoyment. Larger aircraft are noisier so the detrimental impacts that are likely to arise are more than likely to be at least the same if not worse. A significant increase in the number of flights by larger aircraft would mean that there would be a significant increase in the frequency of flights leading to a significant decrease in the intervening quiet periods. As a result average noise levels are likely to rise. The Board is not convinced that the expansion would be taken forward in an environmentally sensitive and sustainable way. The Board previously made comments on the EIA Scoping Report and requested that the statutory Chilterns AONB Management Plan should clearly be referred to alongside the Board's Position Statement on Development Affecting the Setting of the AONB. There is no EIA, neither of these documents appears to have been referred to in the Environmental Statement and no account is taken of the impacts of the operational phase on the Chilterns AONB and its setting – the impacts on the AONB are summarily dismissed because the changes to the buildings and new development would not be clearly visible from the AONB. The Board is extremely concerned about the likely impacts of overflying aircraft, especially at night, on the tranquillity and enjoyment of the Chilterns AONB, and this should clearly have been fully assessed as part of the Scoping and EIA process</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>prior to the planning application being made. In addition, the EIA should also have addressed landscape and visual effects arising from the use of the airport and the proposed extended taxiways especially because there will be a huge number of aircraft that, when they are not on the ground, would be clearly visible from many miles around. Even when on the ground aircraft are visible from many areas including the Chilterns AONB. The likely effects on the Chilterns AONB should have been fully considered because the AONB is clearly a sensitive receptor. For potential noise impacts the Chilterns AONB should have been subject to specific detailed consideration outside the normal confines of L_{Aeq} assessments. In addition, the impacts of night noise should also have been fully considered and should have included assessments from within the AONB and its setting. This does not appear to have taken place. The Board is also concerned about the likely noise impacts arising from the increase in the number of taxiing aircraft. The Board is concerned about the likely impacts on traffic flows on roads within the AONB arising from the traffic associated with additional passengers.</p> <p>The Board is concerned about the likely development pressures for new housing for example to cater for the projected large increase in the number of employees. Despite the recent adoption of the Airport Noise Action Plan (2010 to 2015) the Board considers that there is no clear commitment from London Luton Airport Operations Limited (LLAOL) towards effective noise and environmental controls and the Board considers that restrictions should be put in place to</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>significantly reduce the number and frequency of night time flights. In connection with this issue the Board understands that Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted all have strict night noise controls with Government setting limits on noise emissions and aircraft movement numbers. We understand that London City has a night and weekend curfew. The Board is aware that there are no such limits placed upon LLA and we therefore consider that stringent limits on the number of night flights should be introduced to protect the local environment and to provide people with certainty. In addition, we consider that these should reflect the limits imposed by Government at the other three major south east airports. The current planning application should have been treated by the applicant as an opportunity to seek significant improvements and mitigation to the noise impacts on the environment which are created by the airport. This does not appear to have happened. The Board had hoped that the planning application would contain a comprehensive analysis of the future noise implications of the growth proposals and for it to be proactive in coming forward with positive proposals for improvements and mitigation. The proposals should have included the imposition of night flight limitations consistent with those at Heathrow, Gatwick and Stansted. The Board would expect such limitations to be imposed through a Government body, which would be independent of the airport owner or operator, in order to ensure that environmental concerns are not biased by, and/or offset, commercial gains. The Board would be grateful if it could be involved in the discussions or consultation about any</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|-----------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|--|----------|
| | | | | | <p>revisions to the existing Night Noise Policy. The Board considers that any expansion plans must be developed in the light of existing operational constraints. These include the proximity of Heathrow airspace and the Bovingdon stack, as well as possible route changes affecting Luton Airport. In addition, the future mix of aircraft and type of flight (for example passenger, corporate or cargo) also need to be taken account of.</p> <p>In addition, the Board understand that NATS has plans to substantially review the structure of the airspace in the south east of England. This may involve changes to the Bovingdon stack which, with other things, may result in changes to departure and arrival routes at Luton Airport. It is not clear to what extent the proposed growth has taken such factors into account. The Board considers that LLAOL is failing in its statutory duty of regard to the purpose of the AONB (to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area of outstanding natural beauty, in accordance with Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000). The Board would welcome the opportunity to discuss its representation and would like to ensure that it is closely involved in the implementation of the Noise Action Plan's key action to 'assess the impact of London Luton Airport traffic on the Chilterns AONB and explore potential for operational improvements'.</p> | |
| Icknield Road, Goring | SODC | 19 affordable housing units | P11/W1724 | Approved – 03.10.12 | Object – The design fails to take account of the fact that the site is within the AONB, various elements of the design should be amended (balconies, small gables, tile hanging, chimneys should be functional, lack of detail about fences which should be post and wire with hedge and not | 29.11.11 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|---|-----------|----------------------------|---|----------|
| | | | | | close boarded and permitted development rights should be removed and very odd string course details should be amended), development should be more sustainable with renewable energy being included, greater consideration needs to be given to materials and great care is needed with lighting. Comments – revisions made to elevations (removal of balconies and replacement of doors at first floor with windows, removal of small gables [though some elevations still appear to show these] and removal of tile hanging) which are welcomed and remove objections on those issues. However, chimneys should be added to some plots to lessen impact of large expanses of roof. The Board's other concerns would have to be addressed by further changes or carefully worded and monitored conditions. | 15.12.11 |
| Betts Farm, Old Reading Road, Crowmarsh Gifford | SODC | Variation of condition 2 (soft and hard landscaping of P11/W0190) | P11/W1965 | Pending | Object – the proposal would lead to a huge decrease in both the number of trees and the number of shrubs provided as part of the approved development which in turn would mean that the development would be much more prominent in the landscape to the detriment of the natural beauty of the AONB. The original condition was imposed presumably following discussion and was not appealed against. It should therefore be implemented. | 20.01.12 |
| Icknield Place, Goring | SODC | Redevelopment of Sheltered Accommodation with Extra Care Apartments | P11/S0098 | Approved – 20.11.12 | Object - The Board considers that the proposal represents a significant over development of the site, the form, scale and massing of the building all fail to take account of the context of the site which sits within the nationally protected Chilterns AONB where development should conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area, most of the development is significantly taller than that which is | 01.05.12 |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------|--|-----------|--|---|----------|
| | | | | | <p>on the site at present and appears to be taller than the previous proposed building, though with the lack of a scale this is difficult to measure, there is a large extent of flat roof which appears to have been designed in order to lessen the bulk of the building yet results in a contrived appearance with many half hipped roofs, contrary to the advice in the Board's Roofing Materials supplementary technical note, it would be better to remove one of the three storeys and break up the building form more than at present which would enable the introduction of fully gabled roofs with chimneys in order to lessen the impact of large expanses of roof, the Board considers that the design of the building neither takes account of the context of the site within the AONB nor does it accord with the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide or the Board's supplementary technical notes on Chilterns building materials (particularly the Brick and Roofing Materials notes), some of the proposed materials (concrete roof tiles and render in particular) also fail to take account of this advice, the proposal neither conserves nor enhances the natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB and as such the application should be refused.</p> | |
| CABI site, Nosworthy Way, Wallingford | SODC | Redevelopment of site to provide office, care village, key worker housing and leisure facilities | P12/S0436 | Approved – 17.10.12 (and not called in) | Object – the proposal would represent a greater than doubling of the floor area on the site, much of it on undeveloped land including woodland with ecological interest, this impact could be lessened by removing this part of the development or moving it to the east, it is not possible to undertake a thorough LVIA as the proposals lack detail, much of the development could be 4 storeys high and much in close proximity to the bridleway to the west, there is a lack of detail as the application is | 24.05.12 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|---|-----------|---------|--|----------|
| | | | | | in outline and the design and access statement does not achieve its purpose for this reason, the site is remote from services and facilities and will lead to a significant increase in traffic, the historic environment will need very careful consideration (Grim's Ditch is within site) and the proposal fails to meet the purposes for which the AONB is designated. | |
| Carmel College, Mongewell Park, Mongewell | SODC | Redevelopment to provide 166 dwellings, refurbishment of listed buildings and provision of restaurant, café and swimming pool | P11/W2357 | Pending | Object – proper account is not taken of the NPPF, there is confusion between the many documents that accompany the application (particularly in connection with lost and gained footprint), the application does not include a full design and access statement (what is submitted fails to meet expectations), the design of many of the buildings is inappropriate in the AONB and fails to enhance the natural beauty of the area, the scale and mass of many of the buildings would be greater than the buildings they replace, only previously developed parts of the site should be considered for new buildings (which should only be on the footprint of existing buildings), the transport assessment does not take account of the NPPF and fails to deliver a modal shift away from the private car, public transport provision is inadequate, 'upgrading' of rights of way are likely to lead to detrimental impacts on users and their enjoyment, closure of the Ridgeway National Trail (even temporarily) is objected to, the lighting plan is confusing and likely to lead to an increase in light emissions from the site, there will be significant numbers of HGV movements to the detriment of the character of the narrow local roads (spoil generation being one cause), renewable energy generation is not adequately addressed, the proposal does not | 02.08.12 |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|-----------------|------|-------------------|--|---|----------|
| | | | | | conform to the Local Plan or emerging Core Strategy and as such should be refused. | | |
| Rowan Farm, Henton | SODC | 15kW turbine | wind | P12/S2041/ FUL | Refused – 03.12.12 | Object – Contrary to the assertions made in the application the Board considers that the proposal would represent a significant vertical visual intrusion into the landscape of the Vale which would be about half the height of the Buckinghamshire County Hall building and would be much more obvious within the landscape due to the movement associated with the turbine blades. The Board is of the view that the consideration that has been given to the impacts on the setting and enjoyment of the Chilterns AONB does not reflect the importance of the designated landscape or its sensitivity to change resulting in the suggestion that any impacts are generally not significant. The Board does not agree with this general assessment. The Board considers that the landscape is highly sensitive to change, the magnitude of change is medium to high and the effects are medium or high with the result that there will be significant or potentially significant visual effects overall. Although the proposal does not affect the whole of the AONB, it does have a significant effect on a number of locations within the AONB. The turbine would be the only major vertical intrusion in most of the panorama that is experienced from the sites within the AONB that have been assessed. The Board considers that the likely impacts of this proposal should also be considered alongside current proposals/approvals for other wind turbines at Ford and Quarrendon in Aylesbury. The Board notes that the application is accompanied by a report that is entitled 'landscape and visual assessment'. However, the Board would | 23.10.12 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>have expected a more thorough document which also went into detail about the likely impacts. Landscape and visual impact assessments (LVIA) would generally accompany such applications and would detail the likely receptors and their sensitivity. For the AONB, users of the rights of way, including the Ridgeway National Trail, will be sensitive receptors that should receive an appropriate level of consideration and assessment. The Council will no doubt be aware that the AONB receives about 55 million visitors a year (2007 Visitor Survey). This is a significant number and many will be visiting the sites chosen as viewpoints on a regular basis. The Guidelines for LVIA (GLVIA) states that walkers, especially those walking in places where enjoyment of the landscape is a key factor, are of the highest sensitivity. The Board considers that many of the views are open with the wind turbine being prominent and out of keeping with the rest of the view. The magnitude of change is probably medium to high and the resulting impact would be substantial or moderate/substantial. From an assessment of the landscape and visual assessment it appears that what has been produced does not accord with the GLVIA. The Board considers that the development would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB, would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the AONB and that it would be dominant in views both from and to the AONB. The Board has become increasingly concerned about developments such as this and the likely impacts on the AONB and as a result has adopted a position statement on development affecting the</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|------|--|------------------|---|--|----------|
| | | | | | setting of the AONB. A copy is attached. The Board considers that the photomontages produced do not represent what the eye would see, do not conform to the GLVIA and they are therefore not an accurate representation of the likely visibility and likely landscape impacts of the proposed turbine. In addition, the fact that the blades of the turbine are supposed to move cannot be taken account of in the montages. Any movement will immediately make the turbine more visible in the landscape. | |
| The Mulberry Bush, Dawes Lane, Sarratt | TRDC | Permanent agricultural workers' dwelling | 12/2377/FU L | Pending | Object – should an agricultural workers' dwelling be considered appropriate then careful thought should be given to the siting and design. Previous advice has been given about this but has not been taken on board. The Board objects to: the scale of the dwelling which would be prominent (it should be reduced in height to no more than 5m); the design and materials (pantiled roof and use of flint do not comply with the Design Guide and Flint technical note); excavation and land raising are proposed but insufficient detail is provided to enable the implications to be assessed. | 05.02.13 |
| Grange Farm, Widmer End | WDC | Agricultural building to be used as potting shed | 07/06948/F UL | Finally disposed of (no decision will be taken by LPA) | Object - The proposal seeks to construct a very large (30m by 15m and 5.6m high) utilitarian, agricultural, building that will be clearly visible to users of the local rights of way. The principles of the AONB appear not to have been taken on board by the applicants. The development could not be assimilated into the Chilterns AONB. The proposal could create a dangerous precedent. The Board is mindful of the need to facilitate growth in the local economy and the evident importance of the applicant's business, however, it considers that the proposal would neither conserve nor enhance the | 07.09.07 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---|--------------------|--|---|----------|
| | | | | | natural beauty of the Chilterns AONB. | |
| Sanfoin Farm, Riding Lane, Wooburn Moor | WDC | 2 static caravans, 2 touring caravans, hardstanding, parking and portable utility vehicle | 12/05443/F UL | Approved – 20.09.12 | Object – the development would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB, much of the development has already taken place and with other developments in the vicinity has led to the exacerbation of the detrimental impact and an increase in the urbanisation of the area, the development is contrary to various planning policies and does not accord with Circular 01/06. Enforcement action should be taken. | 04.04.12 |
| Wycombe Sports Centre, Marlow Hill, High Wycombe | WDC | Coachway, park and ride, sports and leisure centre, offices, hotel, food store and amenities building | 12/06261/R 4OUT | Approved subject to obligation – 12.12.12 | Object – the application lacks detail about the bulk, mass, design and materials of key elements and the landscape and visual assessment fails to take proper account of the impacts of the development on users of a right of way within the AONB. There is confusion between the landscape and visual assessment and the parameter plan which do not deal with the same proposal (the buildings are taller on the parameter plan and not therefore subject to a proper assessment). The right of way in the AONB is a highly sensitive receptor and any proposals must be considered accordingly. The Board cannot agree with the conclusion that the proposed development will be ‘a significant visual benefit’ in the long term. No detail is provided in connection with the 11 wind turbines that are proposed and which the application claims should be visible from the M40 to allow the provision of advertising. The design and materials are not really detailed and what detail is provided shows that the proposal fails to take account of the context of the site and its proximity to the AONB. | 10.07.12 |
| Brimmers Farm, | WDC | Change of use of farmland to | 12/06341/F UL | Approved – 14.11.12 | Object – the application lacks detail - visual assessment in particular, as well as plans to show | 09.08.12 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|------------|--|--|---|--|-----------------|
| <p>Brimmers Road, Princes Risborough</p> | | <p>campsite and change of use of building to toilet block</p> | | | <p>all elements of the development ('ready pitched luxury tents'), concern about what might ultimately get implemented as this may be different in form with greater potential impacts, semi permanent installations take on a degree of permanence and may remain all year (requires conditions and enforcement), there is no landscaping plan, the site is prominent in various views from local rights of way as it is in a natural bowl, access from one field to the proposed washing facilities would require users to cross the main road leading to danger for pedestrians and a desire or need to site toilet and other facilities north of the road leading to further detrimental impacts, the proposal fails to meet the purpose of the AONB designation, economic benefits are likely to be limited and are outweighed by the detrimental impact on the AONB, the proposal is contrary to the AONB Management Plan, NPPF, Local Plan and Core Strategy and should be refused.</p> | |
| <p>Field Farm, Spurlands End Road, Great Kingshill</p> | <p>WDC</p> | <p>Two applications – creation of access and stationing of mobile home</p> | <p>12/06651/F UL (track) and 12/06652/F UL (mobile home)</p> | <p><i>Track <u>refused</u> and mobile home <u>approved</u> (3 year temporary) – 16.01.13</i></p> | <p>Object – despite assertions in the application the site is within not outside the AONB, the track would be an inappropriate and urbanising feature out of keeping with the area, it would undermine the separation between Great Kingshill and Widmer End, a large gap in the hedgerow increases the visibility of any buildings on the site, the existing access appears to be adequate, the proposal for the mobile home suggests the site is occupied by a number of mobile homes already – this does not appear to be the case as the buildings are agriculture in nature, the development may lead to further similar developments in the future to the detriment of the landscape.</p> | <p>17.08.12</p> |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|---|---------------|----------------------------------|--|----------|
| | | | | | <p>magnitude of impact arising from the proposed development is at least 'medium' and not 'slight/negligible' as stated in Table 5.2.1. Table 5.2.2 suggests that the overall effects on the AONB would be 'nil' both at year of opening and at year 15. The Board would question this based on an assessment of the likely impacts arising from the use of the site at night in the winter. This would necessitate the use of the floodlights and would represent the worst case scenario because it would be dark and with limited mitigation arising from any existing vegetation due to leaf loss. Table 5.2.2 has changed markedly from the previous version such that the overall effects are all now 'nil', whereas previously most were 'negligible'. The change appears to have occurred without any real discernible change in the proposal itself. The Board objects to the lack of visualisation (particularly at night time) of the development from viewpoint 4 at Bloom Wood. Should planning permission be granted, then an adequate condition should be included that both limits the hours of use and requires the retraction of the floodlights after each period of use. The Council should be fully prepared to enforce such a condition.</p> | |
| Valentine Farm, Shogmoor Lane, Skirmett | WDC | Demolition of agricultural and equestrian buildings and erect private equestrian development with riding area, stables, tack rooms, other | 12/07127/F UL | Refused – 28.12.12 | <p>Object - The Board notes that the current application has arisen after a number of minor changes were made to a previous application that was withdrawn (11/06837/FUL). The Board had objected to the previous planning application. The current application is very similar in scale and design to the previous proposal, and, though changes have been made, the Board does not consider that these have addressed the concerns previously expressed. As the proposal is very</p> | 24.10.12 |

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>rooms, and walker</p> <p>office horse</p> | | | <p>similar in design, scale and bulk to the previous application the Board therefore objects to the current planning application for the following reasons: The Board would have preferred to see the re-use of the existing buildings if at all possible. This does not appear to have been considered in any depth as part of the application. The Board considers that the design does not accord with the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide. The Board has concerns about the scale and mass of the buildings and their impacts on the landscape. This would be a very large development apparently for the personal use of one family. The riding arena and stables would appear as a single, very large building when viewed from both the north and east. These elevations and roofscapes would be particularly dominant in the landscape, especially when this is the most visually accessible part of the site, because it is immediately adjacent to the footpath. The height and unrelieved rooflines are out of keeping with the village. Any hedge and tree planting that has been proposed may possibly help but could not soften the impact of the height of the roof or its dull uniform profile. It is noted that the planting proposal would appear to seek to hide the development from as many views as possible. This could not be achieved, even if it were desirable, for a significant number of years. It is considered that the bulk of the arena and stable building could be lessened by reducing their height, sub-dividing the walls and roofs in order to produce three buildings rather than one (but on a footprint that is not greater than that proposed), and with the facades having more door and window openings (not just blind openings). Other ways of reducing the</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | | <p>apparent mass include expressing structural elements on the exterior, overhanging eaves (much greater than at present) and the use of dark-coloured and non-reflective roofs (which is quite feasible in this case). Materials should be traditional, however, the application form states that these are 'to be agreed'. The Board considers that it is vitally important that these are detailed from the outset as the use of certain materials may help to lessen the impact. With no real detail it is not possible to be sure what the impact would be. Bricks are specifically mentioned, these should be locally produced and their use should accord with the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and the Brick supplementary technical note. Roofs should be clad in a non-reflective and textured material in order to allow weathering to take place, and any wooden cladding should be dark in colour. The application mentions cutting in of the arena. The excavation required to bring this about would lead to a significant amount of spoil that would have to be dealt with. This is likely to lead to a significant number of extra HGV movements on the local road network to the detriment of users of the AONB and their appreciation of the special qualities of the protected landscape. If the Council is considering approval of the planning application, it is considered particularly important to try and reduce the potential impact of the proposal on the landscape. In addition to changes in the roofs and facades, sensitive planting of small clumps of standard trees at the corners and along the longer facades may, in the longer term, provide some means of mitigating any remaining ugly roof lines and dominant walls, but that would be many years</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----|---|---------------|---------|--|----------|
| | | | | | <p>away and may not be satisfactorily achieved. Enforceable conditions must be placed on any permission to avoid the proposed facility becoming a large scale commercial operation. As it is, it is a very large development for the personal use of one family. Therefore, if given, any planning permission should be personal to the owners and a planning obligation entered into in order to ensure that it remains a private facility. The applicant has said that the proposal is for one family's private use in the documents that accompany the application so this should not be a problem. The Board is also concerned about urbanisation arising from this proposal, especially that caused by light pollution. The best way to ensure that this does not happen would be by having no lighting. This is probably impractical, therefore strict conditions would be required if permission is granted in order to ensure that light pollution, particularly that caused by floodlighting, would not be an issue and that any lighting proposed should be switched off when not in use (the use of controllers would help in this instance). Finally, the Board is concerned about hedge and tree planting immediately adjacent to The Chiltern Way. The buildings that are part of the proposal will themselves reduce the quality of experience and views for walkers. However, any additional planting along the edge of the site and next to the footpath may further affect the experience and thus deter people from using the route. The impacts on this promoted route need to be very carefully considered.</p> | |
| Valentine Farm, Shogmoor | WDC | Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of | 12/07129/F UL | Pending | Object - The design of the replacement dwelling generally appears to accord with the principles outlined in the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide | 24.10.12 |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Lane, Skirmett</p> | | <p>3 bed dwelling with basement and loft and change of agricultural occupancy condition to incorporate equestrian use</p> | | <p>and the supplementary technical notes on Brick and Roofing Materials. However, there are three key elements where the design fails to take account of those principles. The first relates to the use of a balcony at first floor level. This would appear totally out of keeping with the rest of the design and the Board considers that this element should be removed to make the design more acceptable. The second element is the proposal to include a basement. Though the basement would clearly not have a landscape impact, the excavation required to bring it about would, because it would lead to a significant amount of spoil that would have to be dealt with. This is likely to lead to a significant number of extra HGV movements on the local road network to the detriment of users of the AONB and their appreciation of the special qualities of the protected landscape. The third element where the design fails to take account of the principles in the Chilterns Buildings Design Guide and associated supplementary technical notes is the proposal to include a second floor, which, when combined with the other floors, would make the building a four storey one which would be much more bulky than the current dwelling on the site. The Board considers that the second floor, which has all the appearances of two more bedrooms, should be removed from the design. This would enable the roofline to be lowered and the resultant building to take on a bulk and form that is more in keeping with the existing dwelling. The Board also objects to the changes proposed to the agricultural occupancy condition. This was presumably placed on the original dwelling for a good reason and</p> | |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|--|--|

| | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | unless this has changed in the intervening period it should remain in place. | |
| | | | | | | |