



H A D D E N H A M
P a r i s h C o u n c i l

Parish Council Office, Banks Park, Banks Road, Haddenham, Buckinghamshire. HP17 8EE
Phone: 01844 292411 Email: clerk@haddenham-bucks-pc.gov.uk

DRAFT MINUTES

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday 10th November 2025, 7.00pm
Conference Room, Haddenham Village Hall and via Zoom

Present: Cllr. Hoare, Cllr Kidby, Cllr Matharu, Cllr. Smith, Cllr. Thawley and Cllr. Truesdale (Chair)

Clerk: Ms. Gilbert

Members of the public: 5 including the Stonehill House applicant

Joining Remotely via Zoom:

Members of the public: 4 and Cllr Millo

P26 80 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Cllr. Desmier and Cllr Millo.
Cllr Millo joined remotely via Zoom but did not participate.

P26 81 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Cllr Truesdale proposed taking comments with each application AGREED.

P26 82 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 27th October 2025 were AGREED as a true record and signed.

P26 83 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Council's responses to the following new planning applications were AGREED:

- (i) [PL/25/3536/FA](#) Demolition of existing garage and construction of 1.5-storey side extension with front porch
91 Willis Road Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8HG
The Parish Council has no objection
- (ii) [PL/25/3540/FA](#) Change of use from residential institution with housekeeper's accommodation (use class C2) to house in multiple occupation (a sui generis use) with separate two bedroom apartment
Stonehill House 106 Churchway Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8D

The Chair closed the meeting to allow the owner of the property to make a representation.
The following points were made:

- A similar property in Princes Risborough has recently be converted from a care home to an HMO very successfully.
- The tenants are very grateful to have more affordable accommodation of this type available to them as it is in very short supply locally.

- The tenants are a mixture of ages and occupations and generally work locally so are not car owners.

Questions from the committee:

- Has a housing needs assessment been carried out to quantify the demand for this type of housing?
No – the rapid uptake of the Princes Risborough rooms indicates high demand.
- Do you have any data to support the lower car ownership for an HMO as the number of spaces provided falls very short of the number specified in the VALP?
No – there has been an assumption based on previous experience.

The Parish Council objects for the following reason:

Whilst the Parish Council is supportive of the provision of much needed affordable rental accommodation locally it has a concern about the potential lack of parking provision, in conflict with VALP policy T6. The policy states:

‘Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) and converted student accommodation - there should be provision for parking spaces in line with other residential dwellings. As with all developments the standards allow for flexibility where there is evidence that they would not be appropriate. Where a local planning authority considers that other rooms are likely to be used as bedrooms, they may wish to consider including these within the calculation for parking provision’.

By our calculation the requirement in the policy for 1.5 spaces per bedroom would work out as 20 spaces for 13 bedrooms. Whilst there may be a justification for reducing the number, no evidence has been submitted to justify the significant shortfall when compared to the policy.

- (iii) [PL/25/4748/KA](#) Crown reduction by 1 - 1.5 meters (previous pruning cuts) to 1 x Crab Apple (T1) as excessive shading to public footpath and neighbouring property
5 Church End Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8AH
The decision on this application was issued prior to this meeting, it was therefore noted but not discussed.

P26 84 DECISIONS

The following recent Local Planning Authority decisions were NOTED:

[PL/25/4748/KA](#) Crown reduction by 1 - 1.5 meters (previous pruning cuts) to 1 x Crab Apple (T1) as excessive shading to public footpath and neighbouring property
5 Church End Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8AH

Buckinghamshire Council – No Tree Preservation Order made work may be carried out

Note: This is on the agenda and determined prior to commenting.

[PL/25/2954/FA](#) Construction of single storey rear extension and part garage conversion
34 Cricketers Way Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8FL

Buckinghamshire Council – Permitted subject to conditions

Note: The Clerk has chased a response from Bucks Council regarding the implementation of policy T6 but has still not received one.

Note: The Parish Council objected on the grounds of loss of a parking space. The officer’s report refers to a plan subsequently submitted which shows 3 spaces can be accommodated within the plot, however the plan is not available online.

P26 85 MAJOR APPLICATION RESPONSES

The following responses were noted having not been submitted in time to be noted at the meeting held on 27th October due to the amount of work involved in their preparation. Cllr Truesdale was thanked for his time in preparing these detailed submissions:

- (i) [25/02417/AOP](#) Land At Former Haddenham Airfield Haddenham Buckinghamshire
Outline planning application for the erection of up to 700 dwellings, public open space, landscaping, drainage, and other associated works, alongside land for a 1FE primary school (if required). All matters reserved, except for the principal means of access off Pegasus Way and Tibbs Road.

Overview

1. Buckinghamshire Council has failed to protect our community and has put Haddenham in an impossible situation by:
 - (a) failing to meet its undertakings and its legal deadline of adopting a Local Plan by 2025 within 5 years of becoming a unitary authority; and as a result having to find land for nearly twice as many houses;
 - (b) not bringing forward sufficient development under the VALP;
 - (c) never undertaking any assessment of Haddenham's infrastructure and ability to absorb growth. Unlike other settlements identified for growth, we have never had a supplementary planning document, area action plan, transport, reviews of schools and health facilities, or other community impact assessment of any description. The Neighbourhood Plan commitment to undertake an education needs review has not materialised.
2. The VALP's allocation of 1082 dwellings to Haddenham in the period 2013-33 has already been far exceeded. 1134 homes (about 2,800 people) have been started and indeed nearly completed, including all the major allocated sites, long before 2033. A further 103 dwellings have been approved and are expected to start.
3. Moreover new speculative applications for nearly 1300 dwellings (about 3,200 people) have been submitted or are known to be imminent:
 - (a) 23/04009/AOP Land south of Lower Rd – 86 dwellings
 - (b) 24/01624/AOP Land off Carwithen Close, Dollicott – 15 dwellings
 - (c) 25/02417/AOP Airfield north - c.700 dwellings
 - (d) 25/02006/AOP Station Road - 392 dwellings
 - (e) 25/01090/SO Call for Sites ref 693 Land east of Stanbridge Rd application expected imminently - c.100 dwellings
4. Doubtless yet other sites around Haddenham shown in the Local Plan's "Call for Sites" are being prepared to take advantage of the "tilted balance" open season for hostile development which has been created by the Council and is being fuelled by financial gain, not forward planning.
5. The concept of sustainability underpins both NPPF and VALP. It is clear to the Parish Council that this community has reached saturation point in its ability to absorb so much growth so quickly. Our public services - schools, doctors, dentist, water supply, drains, sewage, roads, and railway - are all struggling to cope. The Parish Council is not against

more housing, but objects to further development in the continued absence of a plan-led approach entailing a spatial plan and infrastructure impact assessment.

6. **The Parish Council objects to this application and seeks a moratorium on new permissions in Haddenham pending a review of spatial growth options and a full sustainability impact appraisal.**
7. **If the Council is minded to approve the application, the PC asks that our comments and suggestions are taken fully into account and that no further developments in Haddenham are permitted in advance of a full sustainability appraisal and adoption of the new Local Plan.**

The Development Plan

8. The Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013-2033 (VALP) provides the main basis on which this application must be determined. Its key policies are shown below, with text we have highlighted in bold.
9. Policy S1(c) requires that “All development must comply with the principles of sustainable development ... in assessing development proposals, consideration will be given to delivering **strategic infrastructure and other community needs to both new and existing communities.**”
10. Policy S2 states that “Strategic growth and investment will be concentrated in sustainable locations as follows ... Haddenham will accommodate growth of 1,082 new homes. **This will be supported by infrastructure.**”
11. Policy S5 requires that “All new development must provide appropriate on- and off-site infrastructure ... in order **to avoid placing an additional burden on the existing community** (and) avoid or mitigate adverse social, economic and environmental impacts ...”. It goes on to state that “In planning for new development, appropriate **regard will be given to existing deficiencies in services and infrastructure provision.** Development proposals **must demonstrate that these have been taken into account** when determining the infrastructure requirements for the new development. The provision of **infrastructure should be linked directly to the phasing of development to ensure that infrastructure is provided in a timely and comprehensive manner to support new development.**”
12. In respect of considering proposals on unallocated sites, Policy D3 states that “The proposal must **contribute to the sustainability of that settlement** ... and ... **provide appropriate infrastructure.**”
13. Finally, Policy I3 on Infrastructure states that “In considering applications for residential development, the council will **consider the need for new community facilities and community infrastructure arising from the proposal.** Conditions will be imposed on permissions, or planning obligations sought in order to secure appropriate community facilities, or financial contributions towards community facilities, reasonably related to the scale and kind of development proposed.” Its supporting text notes that “new development, depending on its scale, creates an additional need for community facilities and community infrastructure. This may be new provision or enhancement of existing provision. The type of facilities and infrastructure needed **depends on existing infrastructure facilities in the locality, and the type of development proposed**” (§11.28).

14. The position adopted by VALP is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF Feb 2025) as follows, again with key text highlighted:

- (a) The purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, **including the provision of ... supporting infrastructure** in a sustainable manner (§7)
- (b) Achieving sustainable development means ... **identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure** (§8)
- (c) Strategic policies should look ahead ... from adoption to anticipate and respond to long-term requirements and opportunities, **such as those arising from major improvements in infrastructure** (§22)
- (d) The supply of large numbers of new homes can often be best achieved through planning for larger scale development, such as ... significant extensions to existing villages ... **provided they are ... supported by the necessary infrastructure and facilities** (§77)
- (e) To provide the ... facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions **should ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing ... and community facilities and services** (§98)
- (f) It is important that a sufficient choice of school places is available to meet the needs of existing and new communities. Local planning authorities ... should give **great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools** through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications; and work with school promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to identify and **resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted** (§100)
- (g) To ensure faster delivery of other public service infrastructure ... local planning authorities should also work proactively and positively with promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies **to plan for required facilities and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted** (§100)

15. In our view the proposal is in clear breach of VALP Policy D3 which acts as a pressure valve in circumstances where allocated sites are not being delivered at the anticipated rate. It only allows larger scale proposals on non-allocated sites, like this one, in carefully worded exceptional circumstances. Such proposals are only to be approved “exceptionally”, i.e. wholly outside the norm and commensurately benefitting from an unusually robust justification. But a proposal must still contribute to the sustainability of that settlement and provide appropriate infrastructure provision. The following section shows that this has not been the case. There has been no delay in the delivery of homes at Haddenham, quite the reverse. Knowing the VALP-led growth would require improvements to infrastructure, it is not rational for Haddenham to be used to release pressure from under-delivery elsewhere in the VALP area, or indeed to counter the historic absence of any local plan in the south of the County.

The Impact of VALP Growth on Haddenham’s Infrastructure

16. The Parish Council considers there is a very clear thread running between policies S1, S2, S5, D3 and I3 that recognises the dependency on the timely provision of the right infrastructure in the right place if sustainable development is to be achieved. At Haddenham this must go beyond the LPA simply collecting S106 contributions in an unstructured way depending on what application is being submitted. Crucially it requires

the infrastructure is delivered which is clearly recognised by the VALP policies and the NPPF references highlighted above.

17. This has not been the case. Although the Parish Council estimates that approx. £5m has been collected in S106 funds over the last decade to invest in social infrastructure from approved schemes in the village, it has not had any effect in addressing education or health provision. The Feb 2024 Buckinghamshire Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS) shows that £340,000 has been spent on improving St. Mary's Infant School. Other funding has been allocated to improving a number of secondary schools that serve the village, none of which lie within walking, cycling or funded public transport distance of Haddenham.
18. The primary school place provision remains wholly insufficient and lagging behind demand. Evidence presented to the 23/00311/AOP appeal from the three primary (two infants and one junior) schools showed that all three schools are at capacity with classrooms at the maximum allowed numbers. The Junior School's roll has increased from 230 to 400, but with no extra money for additional classroom space beyond the existing school budget. The outcome is that contrary to the housebuilders' marketing brochures, some village children will have to find places in schools outside the village meaning inevitable car trips.
19. The secondary school position is also stark. The IFS shows that S106 funds have been collected, and some spent, from Haddenham schemes at a selection of schools. However the way in which transport to schools are funded means that only transport to the closest secondary school is funded. The closest secondary school to Haddenham is Lord Williams's School in Thame and transport to this school from Haddenham is funded. But Haddenham does not lie within the catchment area of Lord Williams's which is in the adjoining county of Oxfordshire with its own growth pressures at Thame. As a result, fewer students from Haddenham now attend Lord Williams's and benefit from the public transport to it. Most Haddenham students attend secondary schools elsewhere including Aylesbury, Princes Risborough and Waddesdon. This has led to local parents having to self-finance a service with a private company or inevitably to drive long distances for their children.
20. No funds have been collected to secure improvements to increase the capacity of the Haddenham Medical Centre until the new Integrated Care Board (ICB) requested a contribution of £85,000 (yet to be paid) towards relatively minor works at the Centre under 23/00311/AOP. The ICB's submission to the present application states there is insufficient capacity. This was evidenced to the Inspector at the 23/00311/AOP public inquiry by the Centre's Patient Participation Group. They result from a village population increase under VALP of around 2,800, almost all of whom have registered with the Centre. If approved, the current proposal will generate an additional 1750 patients, leading to an increase in demand for which no new capacity has been created. Yet the Centre contains unused space dating back to its construction, while adjacent land originally intended for the surgery has been sold off. Where's the plan? As appointments become increasingly difficult for patients to secure, so more will be forced to drive to alternative GP provision, counter to VALP policies.
21. Other services not coping include the dentist practice, which undertakes NHS work, but cannot serve its ever-growing waiting list without larger premises. The sewerage system is struggling to cope, as evidenced by recent spillage episodes in heavy rainfall incidents.

LLFA colleagues have advised that Thames Water's principal waste pipe exiting the village is insufficient for the demands now being made of it. The recently completed development on the southern half of the airfield (14/03289/AOP) requires the regular attendance of tankers at Tibbs Road to pump out stored sewage. In response to this new application Thames Water (itself close to bankruptcy and the worst performing water company in England) says they do not have capacity for additional water supply, sewage or drainage. There have been surface water flooding incidents (September 2024 and March 2025) damaging village properties. The LLFA has accepted that a formal Section 19 (Floods & Water Management Act 2010) flooding investigation should be carried out as referenced in the LLFA response to both the EIA and to the current application. This should be done before approving more development.

22. There is a significant and widespread parking problem, compounded by commuters parking on residential roads near the station to avoid station car park charges. The local authority undertook some initial double yellow lining on one local road in 2017 with the promise of a wider review. This still has not been done. Meanwhile the upper storey of the station car park was closed off a few years ago as unsafe, but no replacement funding has been forthcoming. Chiltern Railways is operating at or near capacity because of the cumulative growth of all settlements along on the Chiltern line; standing room only to London has become commonplace, and not only at peak times.
23. It has been a 30-year ambition to connect Haddenham to Thame, our principal service centre, by a dedicated safe cycle and walking route also to connect with Aylesbury. Despite a feasibility in 2016, inclusion in Bucks Council's LCWIP, active Thame Town Council support, inclusion in Oxfordshire CC's Strategic Active Travel Network, and a top 15 cross-boundary active travel links for modal shift potential identified by England's Economic Heartland, no viable plan has come forward. Yet every recent development has made a financial contribution to this project, with the increasing risk of repayment.
24. The Parish Council has done what it can to address the failure of infrastructure delivery to keep pace with new development. Notably we have worked with the Council's Parks & Recreation to provide significant additional facilities for pitch-based sports, including building a £1.6m Bucks Council design-awarded pavilion and adopting an asset management strategy with future earmarked reserves. We have agreed to pay for an extension to the dentist practice which is located in a building belonging to a local charity of which the Parish Council is sole trustee. We are becoming a burial authority following the closure of the local churchyard because it has no more space. The Parish Council has undertaken its "Streetscape" project with consultants Phil Jones Associates which has recommended a number of improvements to address speeding, pedestrian crossings, junction design, and the local environment, which Bucks Council Highways are helping to fund in part. The Parish Council is currently running a public consultation, "Future Haddenham" on options for growth and appropriate levels of infrastructure; no officers from Bucks Council attended.
25. The planned growth of Haddenham by VALP has been far exceeded. This growth should have been accompanied by timely social infrastructure improvements addressing the lived experience of the community but hasn't (with the exception of recreation). We now have the prospect of speculative applications for about 1300 more homes which will only exacerbate the problem of the failure of the plan-led system to meet the needs of the local community. Continuing to bat away the matter into the long grass via S106

agreements in the absence of approved plans to invest is not a sustainable strategy. An application like this one for another 700 homes surely requires a more considered approach.

Site-specific Comments

26. Viability. It is very likely that as a proposed 3rd tier settlement in the draft Local Plan for Bucks Haddenham will be identified for further allocation of development. The Parish Council is reviewing the Call for Sites. The land on the northern part of the former airfield is likely to be the most viable site for the following reasons:

- (a) Haddenham has already been substantially extended on its northern boundary. The permission for Pegasus Way opened up the airfield, to be followed by the airfield business park and Cala etc (14/03289/AOP) developments, while the adjoining HAD007 (17/02280/AOP - Redrow) site also moved the boundary northwards.
- (b) Proximity to the railway station, which is within walking distance.
- (c) The railway remains as the traditional settlement boundary. In past decisions, the railway has been established as the westernmost edge of the village for housing. Beyond is countryside, indeed open countryside. It is separated from the development in Haddenham by a physically robust and historically respected boundary – a busy railway.
- (d) Harm to the Parish Council's designated nature reserve at Snakemoor is avoided. This would certainly not be the case with sites west of the railway and north of Thame Road which surround Snakemoor.
- (e) Subject to confirmation, surface water discharge is unlikely to impact the Haddenham stream, an EA-designated main river, which was the source of recent flooding incidents in the village.
- (f) Similarly the catchment of the stream further east known as Folly Farm ditch is avoided, which will bring a whole new set of problems into play with any further eastwards extension.
- (g) Although in the last few years since the departure of the gliding club the land has reverted to agriculture, it has not been exclusively in agricultural use for several decades.
- (h) In assessing this site, the 2017 HELAA prior to VALP's adoption cited concern about the potential visual impact of the development from the designated AAL ridge further to the north. This proposal leaves a large area of landscaping on the higher ground towards the A418 which may help alleviate this matter.
- (i) Residents moving into the recently completed Cala development on the southern section of the airfield (14/03289/AOP) have been aware from the outset of likely proposals for the rest of the land up to the A418 which has been promoted by the applicant for some time. One well-attended session of our "Future Haddenham" consultation was held in the Airfield Pavilion and suggested a level of acceptance.

27. Tibbs Road access

The same consultation did find concern about the access from Tibbs Road because of existing parking problems, including commuter parking (para. 21 above). There is an outstanding TRO due to restrict parking by the Co-op which really needs to be implemented quickly. The drawings appear to include a road within the development connecting the eastern and western sections. This is a potential safety problem where it crosses the open space corridor, and may suggest that the Tibbs Road access is

unavoidable. If it really is not possible to design a development that directs all motorised traffic directly onto Pegasus Way, then not only should a parking scheme for Tibbs Road be included in the promised commuter parking review, but also significant improvements for pedestrians and cyclists in the area around the Coop, including priority raised crossings to help them negotiate the much busier roads as well as providing traffic calming on both sides of the Co-op building (Pegasus Way and Tibbs Rd).

28. Active Travel

The 'movement vision' in the design and access statement states that:

'Walking and cycling for trips within Haddenham would increase as a result of improved conditions delivered within the site itself, by the streetscape project proposals and the introduction of a 20mph speed limit throughout the village. Haddenham and Thame Parkway station's role as a mobility hub for the village and wider catchment would be enhanced, facilitating greater levels of integration of bus, rail and cycling for multi-modal journeys. Delivery of greenway connections to Thame and Aylesbury would enable trips from Haddenham and also improve the accessibility of the station from Thame.'

- (a) This is indeed a wonderful vision, but there is no suggestion of how or when any of this will be delivered. We have outlined the lack of progress on the Haddenham-Thame Greenway above. A safe connection to Aylesbury appears an even more distant prospect, with no active work currently underway. If these links are to be used as arguments in favour of the sustainability of a development, there must be some mechanism for their delivery included in the planning permission. The applicant's travel plan, for instance, lists Thame as being within cycling distance, yet the current road conditions mean that such a journey is unthinkable for almost all residents.
- (b) We are in full agreement with **Active Travel England's** comments on the application's failure to adequately promote active travel, in particular their assessment that the travel plan is 'likely to be highly ineffective in its current format', and their concerns over the status of active travel links out of the site. We too would like to see these secured by agreement at outline planning stage, otherwise we share the fear that they will remain 'merely as dotted lines on a plan' – as has already been our experience with the connection between the Redrow and Platers Road developments.
- (c) For the avoidance of doubt, we would like to see a clear commitment to create links suitable for walking AND cycling: to the south, via the industrial estate and onwards into the centre of the village; to the east into the Redrow development. Given the likely duration of works across the whole site, these should also be in place and accessible prior to first occupation. Otherwise, we will simply embed reliance on driving by failing to provide a direct, attractive alternative from the outset.
- (d) We are especially pleased to see ATE highlighting the importance of measures from the Parish Council's "Streetscape" study: allocating funds from this development to the measures they suggest would recognise the need for improvements beyond the limits of the proposed site. Future residents would clearly need to travel into the centre of the village and beyond: the current road network is already feeling the strain of existing overdevelopment, and without significant improvements as outlined in Streetscape, the addition of significant extra traffic from this development would have a particularly

detrimental effect on walkers, wheelers and cyclists. The Parish Council welcomes further discussion with Highways.

- (e) The Parish Council understands Land Improvement Holdings is committed to establishing active travel links to the station and the Co-op via the business park for both this and the HAD007 Redrow developments. These routes will utilise the former mobile mast track adjoining the Site N (19/01084/ADP) development, and Land Improvement Holdings land around the southern and western boundaries of the GGR factory including an access to the Land Improvement Holdings development site (24/01624/AOP) north of Carwithen Close. The Parish Council suggests that this all needs to be covered in an agreement between Land Improvement Holdings, Bucks, the Parish Council and the owners/managers of the Business Park.

29. Proposed School

- (a) The Parish Council prefers the “with school” option and notes it is shown as a full primary school (ie all ages to 11). A school provides an excellent focus for community identity. If this application is approved, the airfield will have c.1000 homes in a brand-new community some distance from the village centre. We are already aware of feelings of isolation, which are likely to be more pronounced further north. The school will greatly help foster relationships and community development, along with the sports facilities, and activities like the annual youth football tournament and summer beer festival now being held on the airfield.
- (b) The alternative is to grow the existing schools. This should be resisted because the existing schools may need to expand in the future irrespective of this development, and are better located to serve future potential growth closer to them. The distance from the airfield would very likely mean adverse implications of car journeys at the Woodways or Church End schools which both have problems enough with parking and traffic.
- (c) The Parish Council questions the proposed school’s location within the development because of the impact of parking and traffic around schools, including those ostensibly within walking distance. It is also possible that some intake could come from other parts of the village or villages nearby. We support Jo Haley’s (Designing out Crime Officer) comments about school parking causing neighbourhood issues for the surrounding homes, and here it may be difficult to avoid spilling over into Tibbs Road. Would an alternative location, perhaps closer to Pegasus Way, within the western parcel, be better?

29. Climate and energy.

Given that Haddenham has declared a climate emergency and set a 2030 target for carbon neutrality, we are disappointed with the lack of ambition in the applicant’s sustainability and climate change statement. This stands in stark contrast to the plans submitted by Greencore Homes for Land East of Churchway (25/02312/ADP). The proposals for an upfront embodied carbon target of 900kgCO₂/m² represent little more than business as usual, in contrast with Greencore’s target of below 300 kg excluding sequestration. Similarly, Greencore is planning to deliver onsite renewable generation exceeding usage across the development (‘better than net zero’), whereas the applicant merely states that residents will be ‘able to purchase certified renewable electricity’. The applicant states that heat pumps are “likely”. The Parish

Council has been advised during our “Future Haddenham” consultation that the water pressure on the recent airfield development is too low to support heat pumps which indicates further investigation given Thames Water’s comments about capacity.

30. Sport & Recreation

The Parish Council has concerns about the off-site proposals at the Junior School:

- (a) Whilst the PC doesn’t doubt the likely popularity of the proposals for the Junior School, there is a wider picture to be considered and potential for missed opportunities. Bucks Council are currently consulting the Parish Council on sports provision for their Sports Strategy. The Parish Council has its own priorities arising from the Neighbourhood Plan and VALP developments beyond pitch-based activities for an indoor facility to replace the Woodways pavilion and also for skateboarding. We are also aware of ambitions for Haddenham by Sport England. To allocate significant funding in the absence of a wider plan would undermine the new strategy.
- (b) The proposals leave little space for the further extension of the Junior School’s buildings given the likelihood that this will be needed under LP4Bucks and to accommodate approved and imminent applications for future growth of the village to the east.
- (c) The proposals require an assessment of their parking and traffic impact on and around Woodways which is already a major problem.
- (d) We question whether, in view of the Parish Council’s work on this subject, either Bucks Council or the School have the necessary asset management capacity, budget, and reserves to maintain, upgrade or replace these facilities over their life-time.
- (e) The Junior School has in the recent past expressed serious concern about public access on or around its premises for safeguarding and insurance reasons.

31. Community café

Along with a school, there is a clear requirement for further amenities in order to create a proper community for the Airfield development as whole. As mentioned above, the current residents already feel quite isolated from the rest of the village, likely to be amplified further northwards. A community café to support the new sports facilities, as appeared in earlier iterations of the design during the Sportsmith consultation for Land Improvement Holdings, would be ideal. The Parish Council would like to see this incorporate an art and exhibition facility to add a cultural element to the enhanced sporting provision and a shared workspace.

32. Considerations as Adjoining Owner

- (a) The central pitches and open space look likely to require an agreement with the Parish Council to facilitate work on the adjoining land which is now in the Parish Council’s ownership. Whilst this work may be acceptable, it will be opposed until a clear plan of how this will be achieved without disruption to the current users of the facilities and any loss of trees and hedging which are now well established.
- (b) The Parish Council notes the Local Lead Flood Authority comments about potential SUDS discharge rate westward under the railway being “agreeable to downstream water drainage network owners”. The first such owner after the railway land is the Parish Council at Snakemoor, a registered nature reserve. While some discharge may be acceptable, the PC will oppose unless we are properly consulted.

33. S106 Agreement

The Parish Council understands that Land Improvement Holdings is minded to pass the ownership of the public open space and other facilities to the Parish Council on completion in preference to a residents' management company. We ask Bucks Council to incorporate this preference in the draft S106 agreement so that it is also binding on any future developer or constructor.

(ii) [25/02312/ADP](#) Land At Churchway Haddenham Buckinghamshire

Reserved Matters application for the erection of 89 dwellings, including affordable housing, together with associated infrastructure, internal roads, car parking, public open space and landscaping, pursuant to Outline Planning Permission 23/00311/AOP

This is the best presented reserved matters application the Parish Council has seen for some time. The Parish Council is particularly impressed by its climate change and zero carbon response, which sets an exemplar for other developers. We have 2 comments.

1. We are concerned about the location of the southern exits of the footpath inside the boundary along Churchway and Stanbridge Road. Two exits onto Stanbridge Rd are shown. These may not be safe or comfortable for pedestrians, both because our Speedwatch surveys show regular speeding along there, and because of poor sight-lines northwards caused by the bend and hedge line in Stanbridge Rd which obscure the view of oncoming traffic. We suggest that this path exits only onto the Green Lane bridleway, where we understand a crossing to the Post Office will be sited.
2. It is not clear where surface water drainage will exit the site. There has been surface water flooding from recent storm weather incidents (September 2024 and March 2025) damaging village properties bordering the Haddenham stream, an EA-designated "main river". The stream is fed by old street and land drains exiting into Rudds Pond, and then runs southward through the village. It is also now taking discharge from the Redrow site opposite, and it seems likely that this development will do likewise. About 100 properties border the stream with riparian responsibilities and parts of the stream are in poor condition, unable to take the enhanced flow arising from heavy rainfall and new development. The Local Lead Flood Authority has accepted that a formal Section 19 (Floods & Water Management Act 2010) flooding investigation should be carried out. This should be done before permitting more development.

P26 86 UPDATES ON MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS

No updates to report since the last meeting.

P26 87 PROJECT UPDATES

New burial ground Aston Road

A revised quote from CDS, including additional reports for the planning application was challenged. The reports may not be needed so have been removed, although it is possible the Planning Officer may request them. The price increase as been reduced to inflationary only, as the original quote is over a year old, so the overall increase is modest.

Aston Road Pavilion

Bucks Council asked for confirmation that the access road to the pavilion can take the weight of a fire engine. Documentation has been forwarded by Dandara confirming that it can.

Village Hall Improvements

The next meeting of the working group has been postponed to allow the Village Hall Management Committee longer to review the plans.

Future Haddenham

Two community engagement events have been held, with good attendance at both. Submission of consultation responses following the events has been lower than hoped so the end date has been extended. Meetings have also been held with landowners, Fairhive and representatives of Greg Smith MP, who were all supportive of the undertaking. None of the Buckinghamshire Council Officers have agreed to meet with the Parish Council, but we have received written comments from several. Feedback from the engagement is being compiled to share with AECOM to support their environmental report.

P26 88 MVAS REPORT

The first set of data from the new Mobile Vehicle Activate Speed (MVAS) sign has been downloaded and analysed by the Speed watch volunteers. To summarise the period 06-31/10/2025 when the equipment was installed on Stanbridge Road monitoring southbound traffic:

Total number of vehicles: 69,777

85th percentile speed: 33.9mph

Highest speed recorded: 75mph at 01:42

P26 89 CORRESPONDENCE AND ITEMS FOR THE NEXT AGENDA

The following applications for tree work have been submitted, with comments requested by 27th November, prior to the next Planning Committee meeting.

As the applications are minor it was AGREED to submit the following responses:

[PL/25/5285/KA](#) T1 Holly - Reduce by 1-2 ft to clear cable and shape, T2 Pear - Crown Reduction up to 5m, T3 Plum - Crown Reduction up to 3m

43 Townside Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8AW

The Parish Council has no objection

[PL/25/5209/KA](#) Crab Apple Tree - Basic Pruning (up to 1.2m)

11 Station Road Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8AN

The Parish Council has no objection

Correspondence

Cllr Truesdale had received an email from the Parking Team at Bucks Council forwarding an update from Redrow Homes on the occupation of the new dwellings on their site at Churchway. The second half of the parking contribution is due to be paid on occupation of 50% of the dwellings, to date 85 are occupied out of 273 which equates to 31%, so not there yet, but making progress.

P26 90 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS

1st December 2025

CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

There being no further business to transact the meeting closed at 19:47.

Signed: _____ DRAFT _____
Chair

Date: 1st December 2025