



# HADDENHAM Parish Council

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

## MINUTES

### PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

Monday 21<sup>st</sup> February 2022, 7.00pm

Conference Room, Haddenham Village Hall and remotely via Zoom

**Present:** Cllr. Hoare, Cllr O'Hanlon, Cllr. Smith, Cllr. Thawley and Cllr. Truesdale (Chair)

**Buckinghamshire Cllr:** Cllr. Smith

**Clerk:** Ms. Gilbert

**Deputy Clerk:** Mrs Marsden

**Non-committee members:** Cllr. Garret and Cllr. Kidby (joined during the meeting)

**No members of public.**

**Joining remotely via Zoom:**

**Assistant Clerk:** Ms Griffiths

**Councillor:** Cllr. Sharp

**Members of the public:** 16

**Redrow Homes Representatives:** Charles Rafferty (Land Director) and David Owens (Technical)

#### **P22 101 APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Cllr. Sharp for not attending the meeting in person and from Cllr. Poole who was not in attendance.

The Chair agreed that Cllr. Sharp should be allowed to participate remotely on any agenda item, however cannot vote under current legislation which requires councillors to be present in the room.

#### **P22 102 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The Chair permitted public participation under to be heard under each agenda item.

[21/00215/ADP](#) Land West Of Churchway

1. The Planning Committee asked the representatives from Redrow the following questions:

1.1. Will the proposed witchert wall on the northern boundary be made from genuine witchert? It is difficult to access sufficient supplies, which are also needed for heritage repairs and use of alternative materials would not be desirable. A hedgerow would be preferable and beneficial for biodiversity.

A: Redrow had proposed a witchert wall on the northern boundary after discussions with the local authority in an attempt at place making and with the intention of staying as true to a genuine witchert wall as possible. Redrow are not wedded to the idea of the witchert wall and may consider the suggestion of a hedgerow instead.

1.2. Will any surface water run-off end up being diverted along the North-South water course through Haddenham?

A: On drainage, the second phase will contain a balancing pond, with a total of three within the site. Two of these ponds will be attenuation basins, which will store flood water and release it into the ditch course at the front of the site. The main central pond will provide soakage into the ground.

1.3. It was noted that Redrow are planning to use grey-coloured commercial render. Natural hydraulic lime is commonly used elsewhere, which would be preferred.

A: The render colour used will be off-white. Grey render will not be used.

1.4. Can Redrow address the questions raised within the Parish Council's December comments on the design code?

1.5. Will coloured street elevations be provided?

A: Redrow has these and is happy to share them.

1.6. Do you agree that post and rail is an unattractive way to finish the northern boundary?

A: Post and rail is a rural fence line but Redrow is happy to consider alternative suggestions.

1.7. Is witchert available on the site? The Parish Council is willing to assist with storage.

A: Redrow will look into this

1.8. On energy efficiency and renewables, are there any plans to go further than part L of building regulations (which is the minimum requirement of energy efficiency) and what heating will be put in? Rule 30 of Redrow's design code refers to renewables including solar panels and heat pumps as well as the electric vehicle charging points that currently feature as part of the plan.

A: Redrow is bounded by current legislation, buildings will be built to high standards but will not include add-ons such as heat pumps and pv solar panels. The design code outlines the various options available to accord with the building regulations that are applicable at the time.

2. Charles Rafferty, explained that Redrow have a good idea of what phase 2 will look like and it will include a connection along the northern edge towards the station. Redrow understands that the connection via Platers Road is more contentious and it can only provide a connection to the boundary on the land it owns.

3. David Owens explained that a noise study has been conducted for the whole site, not just phase 1 and Redrow are aware of the issues of the industrial site. Mr. Owens asked who the streetlights at the proposed junction with Churchway will be taken on by. Cllr. Truesdale confirmed that the Parish Council has said it was happy to take ownership of the streetlights subject to certain conditions to benefit wildlife. The Parish Council would also be willing to take on any open spaces and streetlights within the site.

4. Support was expressed for the idea of a hedgerow instead of witchert wall along the northern boundary due to the ecological benefits and potential issues with upkeep. A concern was raised regarding the connectivity of the site and about pedestrian access from the site on to Churchway.

A: Redrow confirmed that there is a legal requirement for Redrow to provide connections. There is a planned footpath from the site to Churchway. Redrow agreed to share the design for this.

5. Concern was expressed about Redrow's response to the public representation as it was felt that some of the comments are wrong and misleading and should be challenged. An additional concern was raised about the traffic implications of the development with cars taking a short cut through Rudds Lane and Dollicott.

6. A former Buckinghamshire Councillor reminded Redrow that they had agreed to help fund the repair of the existing witchert walls on the boundary site. Cllr. Truesdale confirmed that Redrow had also previously informed the Parish Council that it would help fund the repairs.

A: Redrow is still willing to explore this option but its current priority is obtaining approval for the reserved matters application.

7. Will Redrow reinstate the hedge that has been removed on Churchway?

A: Yes.

8. The Parish Council is willing to speak with Redrow and assist where it can with connections from the site and with restoring the boundary walls. The Parish Council has received very little communication from Redrow so far and much less than from the other developers within Haddenham.

## **P22 103 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> January 2022 were AGREED as a true record and signed.

## **P22 104 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Parish Council's response to the following planning applications were AGREED:

- (i) [21/00215/ADP](#) Land West Of Churchway Haddenham Buckinghamshire  
This reserved matters application (pursuant to outline consent ref: 17/02280/AOP) relates to Phase 1 of the site and seeks approval for 153 dwellings and associated landscaping and open space. (appearance, scale, layout, and landscaping)
1. The Parish Council (PC) has reviewed the further 30 drawings posted on 2<sup>nd</sup> February. These are essentially minor amended plans. The PC does not have the resources to check in detail and has no further comments save one on the boundary treatment set out below.
  2. The PC has also reviewed the applicant's letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> January 2022, and two Redrow representatives attended the PC's Planning Committee on 21<sup>st</sup> January – the first contact with the PC since November 2020. Unfortunately, we have not received answers from the applicant or from Buckinghamshire Council to the concerns expressed in the PC's response posted on 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2021, so the latter still stands as our formal response.
  3. In relation to the plans posted in February the PC does have a comment concerning the boundary treatment drawing no 082. This shows a witchert wall on the site's northern boundary from Churchway to the Public Open Space, and thereafter a 1.1 metre post and rail fence.  
The PC has concerns about both sections.
  4. Firstly, post & rail looks shabby (frequently just scaffold poles on timber struts), has a limited life, and is a poor boundary protection to prevent children or dogs gaining access to the open farmland beyond. The PC suggests this be replaced by a traditional hedgerow.
  5. Secondly, the PC doubts that the proposed wall will be traditional witchert. Witchert is in short supply and has become difficult to find. Where sources are found, the first priority should be for heritage restoration. It is expensive to lay traditionally, requiring hand application and waiting periods between the application of the berries (layers). This is unlikely to sit within the skillset or cost regime of a volume house builder. Our experience with all other new build developments is that this will be a blockwork wall on a reinforced concrete base with render (usually including at least some cement) over decorative

stones topped with modern clay tiles. It is likely to be entirely regular along its length, lacking the uneven character of true witchert (eg the present northern boundary to Rosemary Lane), and may indeed look rather prison-like viewed on the southwards approach along Churchway. In the future it will also pose maintenance challenges being in the public realm. On balance the PC would prefer the approach on other estates (eg Sheerstock, Spicers Yard/Printers Piece) of using rendered boundary walls at key junctions and elevations, and instead of the various walls currently shown on the drawing as brick. The PC therefore suggests a full hedgerow all along the northern boundary, and a condition that any witchert found on site be set aside for use in heritage restoration in Haddenham.

- (ii) [22/00425/APP](#) & [22/00426/ALB](#) 41 High Street Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8ET  
Erection of 1no. 2-bed dwelling with associated access, landscaping and demolition works, extension and alteration of existing dwelling

Haddenham Parish Council objects as follows:

**Harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and impact on the setting of the nearby listed building**

The Parish Council (PC) appreciates that the new dwelling proposal has a reduced footprint and more appropriate design. However, the refusal decisions of **both** the Inspector on the appeal against 19/00005/APP **and** of Buckinghamshire Council (BC) on 21/01350/APP & 21/01351/ALB contain objections in principle against development which must surely hold good irrespective of the size and design of the dwelling.

The Inspector's principal finding on 19/00005/APP was that the setting of the old garden, witchert walls and historic buildings combined to make "a valuable contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and to the setting of the listed building at no 43". The Inspector continues: "Given that I find the garden is of significance to the appreciation of the Conservation Area and the setting of the listed building, I find that the dwelling proposed would be significantly detrimental to the historic setting".

In refusing 21/01350/APP and 21/01351/ALB Buckinghamshire Council said that the siting and relationship to the existing development would be visually prominent in sensitive backland location and would have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenities of the site, its setting and the surrounding area. BC further said that the proposal would not preserve the architectural or historic interest of the adjacent listed building or Non-Designated Heritage Asset (43 and 41 High Street respectively) and would not preserve the character or appearance of the Haddenham Conservation Area, with no public benefits that would outweigh the less than substantial harm caused.

Taken together, the Inspector's and BC's own conclusions are strong objections to development in principle; any development would be a jarring inclusion in this setting and would harm heritage assets.

**Cumulative harm to the Conservation Area**

The applicant points to other developments in the vicinity as justification. The Parish Council is very concerned about the cumulative harm caused by creeping "garden grabbing" and back-land style infill developments, of which there have been several examples in the last 20

years along and/or adjoining the length of High Street. Over time, these developments change the special character of an area, damage the heritage legacy, as well as increase vehicle and parking intrusion. In this case, the new house would occupy a narrow garden plot still close to the existing boundaries with neighbouring properties to both east and west. The argument in the heritage statement that the form of building would emulate enclosure in the traditional style of, say, Manor Farm is fantasy; places like Manor Farm have evolved through centuries on spacious plots, not built on garden backland.

### **Harm to the amenities of 41 High Street**

41 High Street will be renovated as a 3 bed home likely to be suitable for a family with children. This proposal will cut 41 adrift from its natural and historic setting as a former farm or smallholding with an orchard, leaving only minimal amenity land for a family and which immediately adjoins a parking forecourt, thereby greatly reducing the desirability of this heritage asset. By contrast the new dwelling will be a smaller property but will have most of the garden.

### **Development close to a watercourse**

The application form states that the development is not within 20m of a watercourse. This is incorrect. The part culverted Haddenham watercourse is designated a main river by the Environment Agency. It flows north to south under the adjoining properties at The Croft and re-emerges a short distance away in both directions. Has the Environment Agency been consulted?

### **Tree Protection**

The PC still has concerns about tree protection per policies SRL3 of the Neighbourhood Plan and NE8 of VALP, particularly with respect to tree roots from the neighbouring gardens of The Croft. These concerns were supported by BC in its grounds for refusal of 21/01350/APP and 21/01351/ALB and presumably remain given the marginal change in position of the proposed dwelling.

### **Highway and pedestrian safety**

There are restricted visibility splays on exiting this site by vehicles. This is particularly important because High Street is well used by pedestrians as a safe north-south village connecting route. Although a no-through road to vehicles, pedestrians can pass through via the path immediately before the King's Head pub, and thereby forming an easy and relatively safe link between Church End and the village centre at Fort End/Banks Road. Intensified use of the access by introducing a second dwelling will increase the risk, particularly if walking northwards along the footpath on the east side of High Street. Moreover, vehicles exiting the site are forced well into the road in order to see whether it is safe to proceed, and encounter parked cars on the far (west) side of High Street. The Parish Council doubts from the Highway comments that their appraisal is aware of the full picture, or of the Parish Council's agenda to promote safer walking and cycling through our "Streetscape" project which BC is part funding.

### **Works to 41 High Street**

The Parish Council has no objection to the proposed dormer on the north elevation of the 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension.

(iii) [22/00447/APP](#) 43 Wykeham Way Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8BU  
Householder application for garage conversion to habitable accommodation  
The Parish Council has no objection.

## **P22 105 APPEALS**

It was noted that the following application has gone to appeal:

[20/00059/APP](#) Bigstrup Farm Aylesbury Road Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8TX

**Appeal Ref:** 21/00108/REF

**Planning Inspectorate Ref:** APP/J0405/W/21/3282202

The Parish Council's comments have been submitted directly to the Planning Inspectorate.

## **P22 106 DECISIONS**

[21/03951/APP](#) 7 Stokes Lane Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8DY

Change of use to hairdressing business (retrospective)

**Bucks Council – Approved**

[21/04717/APP](#) Albion House 11 Thame Road Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8EW

Householder application for single storey rear extension and first floor extension

**Bucks Council – Householder approved**

[21/04839/AGN](#) The Old Dairy Aylesbury Road Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8TN

Erection of barn for storage

**Bucks Council – Refused**

[21/04753/APP](#) 6A Church End Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8AH

Householder application for first floor rear extension with changes to fenestration

**Bucks Council - Householder refused**

[21/03925/APP](#) & [21/03926/ALB](#) St Marys Church Church End Haddenham Bucks HP17 8EJ

Repair to section of Wychert boundary wall, rebuilding of concrete block boundary wall

**Bucks Council – Approved & Listed Building Consent**

[21/04771/APP](#) & [21/04772/ALB](#) The Green Dragon 8 Churchway Haddenham HP17 8AA

Householder application for part demolition of existing single storey rear extension. Erection of single storey rear extension. Fenestration alteration and internal works. Removal of external signs and installation of solar panels

**Bucks Council – Householder approved and Listed Building Consent**

[21/01410/APP](#) 3 Hordern Close Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8NA

Single storey front extension

**Appeal Decision:** Allowed

**Appeal Reference:** 21/00093/FTHA

[21/04589/APP](#) 3 The Paddocks Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8AG

Householder application for single storey rear extension and refurbishment of existing attic conversion with new dormer windows and rooflights, New rooflights elsewhere. Windows and external doors throughout in existing and altered openings. Rear canopy. External wall insulation,

air source heat pump, rainwater harvester tank and photo-voltaic roof panels. Internal alterations & refurbishment

**Bucks Council – Householder approved**

[20/01816/APP](#) & [20/01817/ALB](#) 2 Fern Lane Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8EL

Erection of a trellis fence (retrospective)

**Bucks Council – Householder Approved & Listed Building Consent**

## **P22 107 GRANITE SETTS, CHURCH END**

Buckinghamshire Council has confirmed that the Parish Council is not able to appoint an alternative contractor to install the granite setts at Church End. In order to do this the Parish Council would need to be licensed by the Highways Authority. The Highways Development Management team at Buckinghamshire Council have stated that they do not have the capacity and will not licence parish councils at this time, at least until April 2023.

There are 2 different options for progressing with Transport for Bucks (TfB) as things stand:

- 1) Employ TfB to implement the work as outlined on the lump sum/fixed price Project Initiation Document (PID); or
- 2) Employ TfB under a “cost-reimbursable” basis, so the Parish Council only pay the actual costs. This is usually cheaper but the Parish Council would be taking the risk for any unforeseen things – so the overall price could be higher than the lump sum PID.

It was AGREED that the Parish Council will not proceed with either option whilst it looks at whether the Streetscape project may affect the proposals.

## **P22 108 UPDATES ON MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS**

### **Airfield site (CALA Homes)**

Nothing to update.

### **Aston Road (Glebe Site – Dandara)**

Dandara has reviewed the results of the topographical survey carried out in November 2021 and identified that the surface levels need to be raised further. To do this, the spoil from the phase 1 area (now the final phase that is waiting for a revised planning application to be determined) will be used to raise the levels once work begins on this area. The result is a delay to the handover to the Parish Council of the burial and pavilion land.

### **Dollicott (CALA Homes)**

No further progress has been made with the land transfer. Cllr. Smith’s help, in his capacity as a Buckinghamshire Councillor, was requested with resolving the breach of the s106 agreement when Cala homes signed over the roadway at the top of Platers Road to a management company, compromising future access from HAD007 to Platers Road. Cllr. Smith will assist with this.

### **Land West of Churchway (HAD007)**

An amended application is on the agenda.

### **Land South of Lower Road**

Nothing to update.

## **Land adjacent to Haddenham Garden Centre**

Nothing to update.

### **P22 109 UPDATE ON PROGRESS WITH TIBBS ROAD PAVILION CONSTRUCTION**

The monthly site meeting was held on 16th February with representatives from the Parish Council, Marlow and PCMS present. Material supply and labour availability have hampered progress in the last month and the project is currently 6-7 weeks behind schedule but it is intended to make up time with the superstructure build and fit out. Some minor changes to materials have been agreed to assist resourcing. The second valuation will now cover the 8-week period since the last valuation and an invoice will be issued at the beginning of March. The next meeting is on 16<sup>th</sup> March.

There was an incident during Haddenham Youth Football Club (HYFC) training on Saturday 12<sup>th</sup> Feb where an ambulance had to attend for an injured player. The ambulance was unable to drive onto the pitches as the old gate onto the field is within the building site. HYFC have asked if this issue can be investigated. It has been confirmed that once building work on the pavilion is complete, access to the field via that end of the car park won't be possible. Clarification is necessary on what requirements are needed for vehicular access to the field so the Clerk will commission a safety inspection of the site to determine if interim and / or permanent measures are needed.

### **P22 110 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT**

The Clerk has asked Buckinghamshire Council's Enforcement Team to investigate the following:

1. The installation of a large mobile home in the rear garden of the Rose and Thistle Pub.
2. Having confirmed that no lighting scheme was included in the planning permission for Tavis House on Haddenham Business Park, to investigate the issue of light pollution being suffered by residents of Chearsley and the potential impact on wildlife from the lights that are on all night at the units.

### **P22 111 CORRESPONDENCE AND ITEMS FOR THE NEXT AGENDA**

1. Following the statutory consultation for the Haddenham TRO Waiting Restrictions scheme on Tibbs Road, which ran 3<sup>rd</sup> November – 26<sup>th</sup> November, Transport for Bucks is proposing to proceed with 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions (double yellow lines) along Tibbs Road and at Tibbs Road junction with Pegasus Way and contacted the Parish Council for further comment. The Parish Council has no objections to the proposal.
2. A statement from South Cambridgeshire District Council suggests that the Oxford-Cambridge Arc is taking a back seat due to 'levelling up'.

### **P22 112 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Monday 14<sup>th</sup> March 2022.

### **CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

The meeting closed at 8.28pm.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Chair

Date: 14<sup>th</sup> March 2022