



# 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 4<sup>th</sup> August 2025, 7.15pm  
Conference Room, Haddenham Village Hall and via Zoom

The meeting started later than scheduled as there was not a quorum. The Vice Chair of the Council has ex-officio membership of the Committee so Cllr Wheeler was called and asked to join the meeting as soon as possible, which he did.

**Present:** Cllr. Hoare, Cllr Matharu, Cllr. Truesdale (Chair), and Cllr. Wheeler.

**Clerk:** Ms Gilbert

**Committee and Communications Officer:** Mrs Hull

**Members of the public:** Six members of the public including Jake Collinge (Jake Collinge Planning Consultancy Ltd) and Paul Fincken (Astonhill Group).

### Joining remotely via Zoom:

Buckinghamshire Council Cllr. Mormina

Deputy Clerk: Ms Marsden

Seven members of the public.

### P26 33 CO-OPTION TO COMMITTEE

The CO-OPTION of Cllr. Matharu to the Planning Committee was **AGREED**

### P26 34 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received and accepted from Cllr. Kidby, Cllr, Millo, Cllr. Smith and Cllr. Thawley.

No apologies for absence were received from Cllr. Desmier.

### P26 35 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

Cllr Truesdale proposed bring forward the signing of the minutes to allow public participation with the consideration of the planning applications. **AGREED**

### P26 36 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 14<sup>th</sup> July were **AGREED** as a true record and signed.

It was **PROPOSED** and **AGREED** to move public participation to allow questions to follow an introduction to the planning application.

### P26 37 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

- (i) [25/02006/AOP](#) Land At Station Road Haddenham Bucks HP17 8DD  
Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except for means of access for mixed use development comprising up to 192 residential units in total (of which up to 32 units would be provided in the Local Centre; with 25% of all homes to be affordable housing) and

a Local Centre comprising up to 1400sqm of Class E (Commercial, Business and Service) floorspace (excluding convenience/comparison retail) with residential (up to 32 units), together with access and footways, highways and drainage works, car park/parking, amenity space, landscaping, play area(s) and associated infrastructure.

Cllr Truesdale invited Mr Collinge to introduce the application.

Mr Collinge outlined the history of the current conceptual plan and how it has progressed over the last 12 to 18 months. The key issues raised were;

- A revised plan is being developed to deal with surface water. Comments have been submitted by Network Rail regarding the proximity to their land to a pond.
- The Buckinghamshire Council's Rights of Way officer has requested improvements to some linkages to other offsite rights of way to the South West, which will be accommodated in the revised plan.
- This application is outline only so will only be to approve the principle of development and the means of access to the site.

Cllr. Truesdale invited questions from the committee members with the following key issues being raised;

- What is planned for the commercial area shown in orange/beige on the plans?
- Mr Collinge advised that the plans are conceptual ideas are to create a hub for the village with ideas to be led by Haddenham residents. There will be 14,000sqft of commercial space, with a public square and units with residential above, which is not intended to be convenience shopping to compete with the Co-op or Morrisons.
- Concern was raised about the feasibility of obtaining utility connections for water, electricity and the sewerage system. Cllr. Truesdale raised that Thames Water have already objected as the system is at capacity and we are aware of sewage overspill in heavy rainfall on the new development on Stanbridge Road. Mr Collinge agreed there are issues but confirmed that a contribution is paid to Thames Water for very home built so they are legally obliged to upgrade the infrastructure, although this could take 20 months to do .
- A new pedestrian connection via the 1890 bridge over the railway on Station Road is shown, but the bridge is very narrow and the road has a weight limit, so how can this be safely achieved?  
Mr Collinge said that the bridge had been surveyed and widening of the footway on one side can be accommodated for vehicles to safely pass.
- What will the parking provision be for residents on the site?  
The parking per dwelling will be provided to meet the required parking standards.
- With the close proximity to the station will parking restrictions be included to prevent the same commuter parking issues we already suffer from on Sheerstock and Tibbs Road.  
Mr Collinge suggested that a residents only permit scheme could be considered

## **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Cllr Truesdale then invited questions from the members of the public:

Q. What use is proposed for the 33 commercial units?

A. An alternative proposal could have been submitted for residential use only, but the mixed-use approach was chosen to support local services and provide local employment, which seemed an opportunity that shouldn't be missed to provide services that are lacking at the moment.

Q. Cllr. Truesdale raised the question of whether any market research had been conducted to justify the inclusion and scale of commercial units.

A. Fields have carried out some work and have had interest from pubs, hairdressers and a nursery.

Q. As local pubs have been closed, this would not seem to be an appropriate business, however retail, childcare, or indoor leisure facilities might work..

Q. Haddenham lacks a centre, if you were going to create one would this be the right place for it on the edge of the settlement?

A. This location would mainly support commuters who can drop off children at nursery or pick up shopping on their way to/from work

Q. Concerns were raised regarding the additional traffic that would be generated by the proposed development, particularly in relation to the 33 commercial units and overall increase in residential dwellings. All services such as schools, dentist and medical centre are quite some distance from the site on the other side of the village. How will traffic be managed, including road capacity, junction improvements, and pedestrian safety?

A. Bucks Highways will carry out a assessment and condition any road safety improvements required.

Chiltern Railways is struggling to cope with passenger numbers, with growth all along the line to Banbury, surely it is near to capacity.

## **The Parish Council's Response:**

### **Overview**

1. Speculative planning applications like this are the consequence of Buckinghamshire Council's failure to protect our community by (a) not meeting its legal deadline and undertakings given of adopting a Local Plan within 5 years of becoming a unitary authority and (b) not bringing forward sufficient development under the VALP.
2. Our local authority has further failed this community by 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, schools and health facilities reviews, or community impact assessment of any description.
3. The VALP's allocation of 1082 dwellings to Haddenham in the period 2013-33 has already been exceeded. 1134 homes have been started or completed, including all the major allocated development sites. A further 103 dwellings have been approved which are expected to start. This application will add 192 units; another speculative application for up to 800 units on the former airfield is imminent. Together these 2 sites would add nearly 1000 more dwellings. 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.
4. 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, sewage, roads, railway) are 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 including a spatial plan and infrastructure impact assessment. We think there may be better options for future spatial growth than the Station Rd site. The PC is initiating action to help the local authority with this.
5. **The PC objects to this application and asks for a moratorium on new approvals pending a review of spatial growth options and a full sustainability impact appraisal.**

## The Development Plan

6. The Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2013-2033 (VALP) provides the main basis on which the application must be determined. Its key policies are shown below, with text we have highlighted in bold.
7. 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.**”
8. This intent is elaborated on by Policy S2 which 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.**”
9. 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.**”
10. 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.**”
11. 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).
12. 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)

### Overall planning context comments

- 13. 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 goes beyond the LPA simply collecting S106 contributions and crucially requires the infrastructure is delivered which is clearly recognised by the VALP policies and the NPPF references highlighted above.
- 14. 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.
- 15. 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 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 well outside the village for which car trips are inevitable.
- 16. 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. However, 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, few

students from Haddenham 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 drive long distances for their children.

17. No funds have been collected to secure improvements to increase the capacity of the Haddenham Medical Centre until the local 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. Yet the Centre contains unused space dating back to its construction. The evidence provided by the ICB and presented as additional information to the Inspector at the 23/00311/AOP public inquiry by the Centre's Patient Participation Group describes the significant capacity problems. They result from a village population increase since 2012 of around 2,500, almost all of whom have registered with the Centre. If approved, the current proposal will generate an additional 480 patients, leading to an increase in demand for which no new capacity has been created. As appointments become increasingly difficult for patients to secure, so more will be forced to drive to alternative GP provision, counter to VALP policies.
18. 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 made of it. There have been surface water flooding incidents (September 2024 and March 2025) damaging village properties. There is a significant parking problem, particularly by commuters on residential roads in the vicinity of the station, which the local authority undertook to review 5 years ago. Chiltern Railways is operating at or near capacity because of the cumulative growth of all settlements along on the Chiltern line; standing room only has become commonplace, and not only at peak times.
19. The Parish Council has addressed the failure in infrastructure delivery keeping pace with new development as far as it can. Notably we have worked with the Council's Parks & Recreation to provide significant additional facilities for pitch-based sports, including building a £1.6m BC design-awarded pavilion. We have agreed to pay for an extension to the dentist practice located in a building belonging to a local charity of which the PC is sole trustee. We are becoming a burial authority following the closure of the local churchyard. The PC 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, but of course this needs BC Highways funding to implement.
20. The planned growth of Haddenham by VALP has not been delivered as expected *but has been exceeded*, as detailed in para 3. This population 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, including this one, for nearly 1000 more homes being approved, 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. The school, health and other contributions for 192 homes will be very different if this really turns out to be 1000 (or more) homes.

21. 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. That is not the case here. 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 territory, or indeed to counter the historic absence of any local plan in the south of the County.

### Site-specific Comments

22. Spatial growth. 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 developments, while the adjoining HAD007 (Redrow) site also moved the boundary northwards. This could suggest a pattern for future development rather than extending the boundary in an entirely new direction westwards, hindering the longer-term proper planning of the village and causing avoidable harm to the surrounding area’s rural character. What’s missing is the plan for spatial growth.
23. Open countryside. In past decisions, the railway has been established as the westernmost edge of the village for housing. This land is firmly in the countryside, indeed open countryside. It is separated from the development in Haddenham by a physically robust and historically respected boundary – a busy railway, itself in a deep cutting. On one side of the boundary is the development of built-up Haddenham; on the other side of the boundary is entirely undeveloped greenfield land. It is not connected to the utilities networks. It is the definition of open countryside. There is a strong steer in the VALP through policy S3 against new development in the countryside. It says: **“new development in the countryside should be avoided”**.
24. Landscape setting. In failing to respect the natural boundary of the railway by seeking to grow the village westwards, the proposal will diminish the visual setting and rural character. The local authority certainly agreed when the VALP’s HELAA review (2017) rejected this site (referenced as HAD014) as **“Unsuitable. The site is beyond the existing village edge defined by the railway line without other built-up sites west of the line. The site has limited screening and is open to views from public vantage points with panoramic long-distance views to the south”**.
25. BMV. The site is moreover “Best & Most Versatile” agricultural land. It is not peripheral ex-orchard or ex-equestrian style uses often found on the edge of settlements. It has been in active food production for cereal crops for very many years. Both VALP and NPPF say that loss of BMV land should be resisted. It seems to have become accepted to give low priority to this matter in planning decisions (see for example 23/00311/AOP). But this disregards the cumulative impact of repeatedly down-playing BMV and food production, which is surely rash and irrational.

26. Connectivity. Although close to the railway station, the site is actually some distance from the village centre, schools, doctors' and dentist's surgery. These are towards the eastern part of the village, so car use for local trips will be encouraged. Historic separation from the village by the railway cutting, means that the site is not well connected to the utilities network for water supply, electricity, sewerage and cable networks. We note the comments of both Network Rail and Thames Water. There would seem to be practical issues not addressed in the application, for example how exactly will this site connect to the sewerage network on the far side of the railway cutting? Even if connection is possible, the PC has been advised that the sewerage network can no longer cope - see para 18 above, in which case surely an appropriate S106 contribution should be levied. Can the water and electricity supply networks cope and how will they connect? Where exactly will surface water discharge to once collected?

27. Access issues.

- a. Station Road is a rural C class road with a weight restriction, albeit frequently ignored, and an awkward bend part way down with restricted distance from the proposed southern facing exit. The PC would want a 20pmh zone to include Station Road all the way from Thame Road into Church End.
- b. The Parish Council would object to a standard Buckinghamshire Council wide bell-mouth junction on the site's southern boundary in this rural setting. A more modest pedestrian friendly width would be appropriate.
- c. Proximity to the station makes it inevitable that commuter parking on residential streets will be an issue here which must be addressed from the outset alongside proposals east of the railway.
- d. The northern road exit would seem more sensibly incorporated with the existing roundabout outside the station. The pedestrian crossing arrangements towards the station should be conditioned by provision of a raised parallel pedestrian and cycle crossing, ideally signal controlled. This would provide a safe crossing for new and existing residents accessing the station and other village amenities, as well as slowing traffic entering the village and encouraging through traffic to take the A418. This work needs to complement current proposals for Thame Road east of the railway bridge.
- e. The overall carriageway width on the Station Road railway bridge is limited, with a poorly defined narrow footpath on its northern side which is single file only, and easily mounted by passing vehicles. This requires review as planning permission would significantly increase both pedestrian and vehicle numbers.
- f. We are pleased to note the retention of the line of the current permissive path, but see para. 28 on Greenway to Thame for more detail.
- g. Creating a footpath access across Station Road to the well-used permissive path on the field opposite is supported, but a safe pedestrian crossing should be secured as part of any planning permission.

28. Greenway to Thame. It has been a 30-year ambition to connect Haddenham to Thame, our principal service centre, by a dedicated safe cycle and walking route. Despite a feasibility in 2016, inclusion in BC'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, yet again no plan has come forward. Although we cannot be certain of the route, this site is likely to be involved. An obvious option is to reserve a route inside the northern boundary of this land which should be secured as a condition of approval. On leaving the site westwards, the route would then continue onwards besides Thame Road to Scotsgrove, or possibly via

the Miller's Way bridleway. Another possibility is that the Greenway follows a route via Tythrop, in which case, the Rights of Way Officer's suggestion of upgrading the permissive path beside the railway to cycleway standard makes a lot of sense. Indeed, given the likelihood of significant cycle traffic between Thame and the station once the greenway is in place, separation of cycles and pedestrians, at least in any section passing through a housing development, would be appropriate to avoid conflict (see the LTN 1/20).

29. Noise. Although not picked up by the noise survey sampling, the Parish Council is concerned that the K2 agricultural machinery factory is known to be noisy at times, with machinery stored on open land, raising a question about its suitability as a neighbour to residential properties. The success of Chiltern Railways does mean that noise from passing trains has become very frequent and will be a fact of life for people living here, as will continuing emissions, particularly when accelerating away from the station towards London, in the absence of any plan to electrify the line.
30. Heritage. The Parish Council is very concerned about heritage damage to the Conservation Area at Church End and its approach from Station Road caused by the growth of both through traffic, particularly since completion of the Aston Road and Stanbridge Road developments, and school-related parking chaos. This proposal is likely to add to both those problems. A radical approach is needed and should be considered and funded alongside the Parish Council's Streetscape proposals, including a 20mph village zone, the current Conservation Area review and its proposed CA management plan.
31. Local centre. The proposal includes a "Local Centre comprising up to 1400sqm of Class E (Commercial, Business and Service) floorspace". The research and evidence base for this inclusion is unclear. We understand the intention is to open up another "centre" in addition to those recently built at Tibbs Road and Stanbridge Road (both the Garden Centre and Bradmoor Farm), and potentially in competition with the long-established parade at Banks Road. These proposals could be beneficial and worthy of discussion, but suggest the need for a retail needs assessment. We are aware of an unmet demand for child care places in Haddenham. We also have an ambition for an indoor multi-use sports centre (eg badminton, basket/net ball, pickleball etc), although not necessarily located here: we can advise further. Once again, this should be informed by an assessment and overall plan.
32. Consultation. Ultimately, the open countryside on which this development is proposed to be built, is very important to the people of Haddenham as is evident from the public responses received. The Parish Council is proud of the area's rural character; it makes an essential contribution to the pleasures of living in the village. We understand the importance of development but seek to emphasise that it should not come at any cost. The point of the planning system is to develop in a sustainable way without needlessly compromising vital amenities. We do not feel well-served by the planning system, and do not support development on this site.

### **Considerations in the event of approval**

33. In the event of planning permission being granted, the Parish Council:
  - a. Will shortly provide Parks & Recreation with projects for S106 funding;
  - b. Requests that Highways consult the PC about incorporating proposals from the "Streetscape" project;

- c. Requests that the S106 agreement gives clear priority to the Parish Council over and above a resident management company to take transfer public facilities including open spaces, playgrounds, planted areas, streetlights etc.
  - d. Stands ready to discuss the issues in paras 26 to 31 above.
- (ii) [25/01902/APP](#) - 16 Stokes Lane Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8DY  
Householder application for single storey rear extension  
**The Parish Council has no objection.**
- (iii) [24/03072/ADP](#) - Phase 2 Land West Of Churchway Haddenham  
Submission of Reserved Matters (landscaping, appearance, scale and layout) pursuant) for the erection of 120 dwellings pursuant to planning permission 24/00041/VRC (Variation of condition 14 (Off-site highway works) 23 (Bridleway upgrade) relating to application 17/02280/AOP (Outline application with access to be considered and all other matters reserved for the erection of 273 dwellings with access, parking, amenity space, landscaping, drainage, works and play area (AMENDED PLANS)

The Parish Council submitted comments posted on 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2024 and included below for ease of reference. We have reviewed our comments following the submission of further documents on various dates during July 2025. The numbering refers to the 8 points made in our previous “summary of comments”.

1. We note that a full 6m acoustic barrier by a specialist manufacturer is now proposed.
2. We can find no reference to implementing the “standard” level of façade mitigation recommended in the approved acoustic report ref 17/G2280/DIS;
3. Similarly with the “uprated” level for the flats, particularly at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.
4. We remain concerned about landscape mitigation on the western boundary and trust this will be evaluated by BC’s landscape adviser.
5. We note that the decision on the adjoining sports building at 24/01070/APP included a condition that details of the floodlighting/external lighting should be further submitted, which appears to be outstanding.
6. The 3 path connections to adjoining land appear to have been downgraded to pedestrian only. They should be designated for cycling as well as pedestrians as shown on the outline permission, and should be of the correct width. Some paths are still shown as grass or hoggin. Hoggin has been provided by Dandara on the Aston Road development. It becomes very muddy and slippery in wet weather, and degrades easily. It is not fit for purpose for walking, cycling, wheelchair users or mobility scooters. Target users will include commuters going to catch a train so will not want muddy shoes or clothing. Can all paths please be specified, or conditioned, as asphalt, as advised by the charity “Wheels for Wellbeing”.
7. We can advise that Land Improvements Holdings have confirmed their ownership of the strip of land to the south and west of the GGR factory due to be accessed from the south west corner of the development, and that it can be made available. However, we understand the land is not registered, which LIH will address.
8. Clustering along the western edge still appears to be the situation.

#### **Haddenham Parish Council comments posted 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2014 on Bucks web-site**

The Parish Council is pleased to have had the opportunity to comment directly since the project was moved between Redrow offices. Our comments relate to the matters below. We do not have the resources to review all the different house types, materials, surfaces and planting.

## Summary of Comments

1. Acoustic barrier should be 6m with a long-term surface density of at least 10kg per square metre per the approved Acoustic Report ref 17/G2280/DIS.
2. The “standard” level of façade mitigation should be implemented throughout.
3. Consider the “uprated” level for the flats, particularly at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.
4. A full planting scheme with large tree species all along the western bund to soften impact of factory wall and acoustic fence.
5. Carry out an appraisal of potential flood-lighting nuisance, including from the adjoining sports proposal at 24/01070/APP.
6. Paths to the south-west corner access to be tarmac instead of hoggins and grass, and to be wide enough for cycling.
7. Action by BC to facilitate walking & cycling connectivity with adjoining land, including with current application 24/01624/AOP. The PC is happy to discuss and help in any way possible.
8. Affordable units to be less clustered.

## Relationship with the GGR crane factory, noise impact and landscaping

Acoustic Barrier. This layout is a considerable improvement on that shown in the outline planning permission when we objected to the density in the south-west corner and proximity of properties up against the GGR factory on the western boundary.

The decision to approve residential development next to “B2 general industry” was by definition always likely to cause problems. The Acoustic Report approved under 17/G2280/DIS specifies that the acoustic barrier on the south-west boundary should be: “6m high; extend along the south-western boundary of the site; no holes or penetrations; may be a close-boarded timber fence, but must have a long-term surface density of at least 10kg per square metre after it dries out”. Even so, the Acoustic Report says there could still be “potential significant adverse impact in some locations during the day”. However, the Design Compliance Statement submitted with the current application only provides for an acoustic barrier of 4m height (section 4.4). ***The PC recommends that the full specification in the Acoustic Report should be implemented.***

Façade mitigation. The Acoustic Report included a façade mitigation scheme to achieve acceptable internal noise levels in each dwelling with “standard” and “uprated” specifications for glazing and ventilators. We may have missed this, but the PC has found no reference to this matter in the submitted documents. ***Should this be a requirement, particularly in properties close to the factory?***

The Acoustic Report states that the acoustic barrier only “provides partial screening for second floor levels”. ***The PC therefore asks whether the “uprated” façade specification (originally only for properties fronting Churchway) would also be appropriate for the blocks of flats with a 2<sup>nd</sup> floor near the factory?***

Landscaping mitigation. The combined appearance of the factory wall and acoustic fence will be stark when viewed from the front of the properties opposite. The layout drawing shows a bund of grass and some trees. ***The PC suggests a fuller planting scheme with large trees to fill out along the entire length of the bund, but retaining easy access to the acoustic fence to facilitate longer term maintenance, so not planting right up against the fence.***

Potential lighting pollution. Both the GGR factory and the “Plot N” Tavis house units have floodlighting in various forms. The Parish Council has received complaint about night-time light

pollution at Tavis House from as far as Chearsley. Bucks Council are also currently considering an application by the GGR building for a gym building and padel court under ref 24/01070/APP which appears to have yet more floodlighting. A higher acoustic barrier and more trees would both help lessen the impact, but **the PC asks that an appraisal of potential flood lighting pollution be carried out.**

### **Walking & Cycling Connectivity**

For several years the PC has been pursuing walking & cycling connectivity from the HAD007 site west to the station, sports fields and Co-op store, and south to the village centre and schools. We are pleased to see connectivity points are included. **We appreciate that linking with adjoining land is out of the applicant's hands; however the PC looks to Buckinghamshire Council as both the planning and highway authority to help realise them**, which was an undertaking by Officers to the inspector at the VALP public inquiry. Redrow's application shows 3 connections. The location of each and its current situation is shown below. All connections are possible as land has been retained for this purpose during previous development.



Link from north-west corner of HAD007 to Tavis House and the business park (shown in red).

The approved plans for Tavis House (aka Plot N) ref 19/01084/ADP include a path to HAD007 shown in red. This path has not yet been constructed. An obligation to provide it is included in the land transfer from Lands Improvement Holdings (LIH) to the present owners. The access to Tavis House from HAD007 could be further south, but is ruled out because it would require a gap in the acoustic barrier. In the longer term, it may also be possible to make a link northwards to LIH land.

Link from south-west corner of HAD007 to path around part of GGR factory to business park and southwards to Dollicott via site 24/01624/AOP (shown in green)

LIH have retained ownership of land to the south and west of the GGR factory for a potential path from HAD007 to the business park. This land is currently overgrown and has small unauthorised structures. Ownership could be transferred from LIH to either Bucks or the PC to create a path, and the cost of laying out could be a S.106 obligation under 24/01624/AOP. This path could also connect southwards to Dollicott via the current application by LIH ref 24/01624/AOP, thereby creating a convenient

route to the village centre and schools. This would require BC to create rights of access. Redrow's drawing shows the approach to the link point in the south-west corner of HAD007 as being part hoggin and part grass. **The PC suggests this should be entirely tarmac and sufficient width for cycling.**

Link southwards to Dollicott via Platers Road (shown in blue). Application 15/02123/APP was intended in the Planning Officer's report to deliver a pedestrian/cycle link to HAD007. The farmer's original gate remains in position on the border between the 2 sites. Unfortunately, AVDC/BC neglected to include this proposal as a delivery obligation, and failed to adopt the adjacent section of highway. There is a retained right of way for the owners of the HAD007 site through to Platers Road, and vice versa, but public rights of way were removed during the land transfer of the private section of Platers Road. This leaves a difficult situation, with resistance from the residents of Platers Road to allow public access, but with no means of differentiating between the general public and new residents of HAD007. This will inevitably end up causing problems in that residents from HAD007 will try to create a desire line through the farmer's gate, which BC will have to deal with. Creating a route south via 24/01624/AOP and Carwithen Close may now be an easier option.

### **Other matters**

The PC supports the comments of the Housing Officer requesting that the affordable units are less clustered.

- (iv) [25/01810/APP](#) and [25/02161/ALB](#) - 57 Townside Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8AW  
Householder and Listed building application for gate put into a wall that was built in 1986 (Retrospective)

**The Parish Council has no objection.**

- (v) [25/02059/APP](#) 13 Willis Road Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8HL  
Garden room

**The use is unclear. The Parish Council objects if this is to be used as habitable accommodation. It should remain and be conditioned as ancillary to the host property.**

- (vi) [25/02090/APP](#) 5 Rosemary Lane Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8JS  
Demolition of existing garage, conservatory and removal of front porch and dormer.  
Construction of new single storey front extension and two storey side and rear extension and insertion of rooflights.

**The Parish Council has no objection subject to no daylighting infringement of the adjoining party.**

- (vii) [25/02270/APP](#) 38 Cricketers Way Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8FL  
Single storey side and rear extension with the insertion of three rooflights.

**The Parish Council has no objection**

## **P26 38 DECISIONS**

The following recent Local Planning Authority decisions were noted.

[25/01679/APP](#) 58 Sedgwick Street  
Householder application for single storey front and side extension  
**Buckinghamshire Council – householder approval**

[25/01599/VRC](#) 8 Stockwell Furlong Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8HD

Variation of condition 2 (plans) relating to application 24/01622/APP (Householder application to raise section of roof and addition of dormer window to side elevation)

**Buckinghamshire Council – householder approval**

[25/01528/APP](#) The Horridge Aylesbury Road Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8TU  
Householder application for single storey side extension and demolition of existing garage and replacement with new double garage with integral shed to rear

**Buckinghamshire Council – householder approval**

[25/01453/APP](#) 2 Victoria Court 15 Windmill Road Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8JA  
Erection of single storey rear extension

**Buckinghamshire Council – householder approval**

[25/00276/APP](#) Ibstone Cottage 40 Dollicott Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8JG Householder application for removal of all render and replace with traditional lime render, replace 8 no. leaded windows with box sash windows, replace faux leaded window with metal frame window, removal of existing porch and single skin timber frame double doors and replace with metal frame double doors Ibstone Cottage 40 Dollicott Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8JG

**Buckinghamshire Council – householder approved**

[25/01438/APP](#) 1 Hotspur Close Haddenham Buckinghamshire HP17 8QE  
Householder application for loft conversion with dormer extensions to front roof slope, dormer extensions to rear / rear side and rooflights to rear / rear side roof slopes

**Buckinghamshire Council – householder approval**

## **P26 39 UPDATES ON MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS**

The following updates were received on current major development sites.

### **Airfield Site**

The transfer of phase 2 land is still in progress, and we are waiting for confirmation this has been completed.

Lands Improvement Holdings have notified the Parish Council that an application for the remainder of the Airfield site is about to be submitted. This is likely to be included on the agenda for the next meeting.

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

Representatives from the England Cricket Board and Bucks Cricket Board were invited to inspect the new cricket pitch. They raised some concerns about lack of maintenance after the installation, they are also checking the work done against the original specification. A pitch specialist will now visit the site with a view to writing up a report to be shared with Bucks Council and Dandara.

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

The section of the public right of way from Rosemary Lane to the site has been closed for surfacing. The Clerk has contacted the Rights of Way Officers to ask for more information and has been told that the work to surface the section from Rosemary Lane to the site should be completed within a week and then re-opened. The path through the site has also been diverted all the way around the site perimeter, it is expected that the original path will be surfaced and re-opened in September

### **Land East of Churchway**

No updates

## **Land At Dollicott to the rear of Carwithen Close**

No updates.

### **P26 40 PROJECT UPDATES**

The following updates were received on current projects:

#### **New burial ground Aston Road**

A working group meeting was held on 30<sup>th</sup> July 2025, where work was started to draft the Regulations for the new burial ground, which will determine the layout and management of the site to a large degree. Site surveys are underway in preparation for the planning application submission.

#### **Aston Road Pavilion**

A meeting was held to run through the detail specification prior to going out to tender. It was agreed to proceed with submitting the plans to Building Control to start that process. The Clerk will be presenting an update for the S106 funding for the project at the full PC meeting which follows this meeting.

#### **Village Hall Improvements**

The working group met on 18<sup>th</sup> July and reviewed the Design Brief and Concept Design for improvements to the Village Hall. The plans will be shared with the Village Hall Committee and once finalized will be shared at a community consultation. The progress of the project will be dependent on available funding, which is determined by the Aston Road pavilion building costs. It seems unlikely the funding can come entirely through S106, so other grants or loans will need to be investigated.

#### **Haddenham 2045**

Following agreement by the Council to move ahead with the community consultation a meeting was held with O'Neil Homer's Community Engagement team and the PC's Officers to plan the process. The aim is to hold a community engagement event in September.

### **P26 41 SPEEDWATCH REPORT**

Thames Valley Police have visited Haddenham with their own hand-held speed gun and monitored speeds on Stanbridge Road with the Facilities Manager and Speedwatch co-ordinator. They witnessed speeds in excess of 40mph, and as a result have agreed to arrange for the speed camera van to visit the site.

### **P26 42 DELEGATION DURING AUGUST RECESS**

It was AGREED to DELEGATE to the Clerk, after consultation with the committee by email, to respond to minor planning applications requiring a response before the next meeting.

### **P26 43 CORRESPONDENCE AND ITEMS FOR THE NEXT AGENDA**

1. The Clerk has received correspondence raising concerns about lack of progress, working hours and noise from the House of Spice building site.  
The development management team at Bucks Council have confirmed that there is no condition within the planning permission to limit working hours so the matter has been forwarded to the Environmental Health team to investigate. The neighbours have been asked to keep a record of disturbance.

2. A freedom of information request was submitted to Bucks Council to obtain copies of the comments submitted by members of the public to the Station Road application. The comments have been circulated to the committee before the meeting.
3. There have been several emails and phone calls to the Parish Council Office about the Station Road application, with some confusion about the date the public consultation will start and end. The Planning Officer has confirmed the site notices will go up next week and the consultation will run until 28<sup>th</sup> August 2025.

**P26 44 DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

8<sup>th</sup> September 2025.

**CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

Meeting closed at 20.30

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

Date: 8<sup>th</sup> September 2025