



Clerk's Planning Report **18th May 2026**

Decisions

1. [PL/24/03072/ADP](#): Submission of Reserved Matters including details of landscaping, appearance, scale and layout for the erection of 120 dwellings, including parking, hard/soft landscaping and the inclusion of a substation 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 AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION).
Phase 2, Land West of Churchway, Haddenham, Buckinghamshire.
Buckinghamshire Council grants approval to the appearance, layout, landscaping and scale.
2. [PL/26/01531/FA](#): Extension to existing drop kerb.
2 Marriotts Close, Haddenham, Buckinghamshire, HP17 8BT.
Buckinghamshire Council permits subject to conditions.
3. [PL/26/01778/FA](#): Construction of a single storey rear extension.
5 Hedgehog Way, Haddenham, Buckinghamshire, HP7 8FX.
Buckinghamshire Council permits subject to conditions.
4. [PL/26/01909/KA](#): Apple tree – reduce to previous pruning points by removing up to 2.5 metres reactive growth.
21 The Croft, Haddenham, Buckinghamshire, HP17 8AS.
Buckinghamshire Council: No tree preservation order to be made, work may be carried out.
5. [PL/26/02781/UA](#): Notification under the Electricity Act 1989 – The Overhead Lines (Exemption) (England and Wales) Regulations 2009 for diversion of low voltage overhead line from pole 851976 to 851974 and replacement of 1 95ABC span required between poles 851973 and 851974.
Os 4849 Stanbridge Road, Haddenham, Buckinghamshire.
Buckinghamshire Council raises no objection subject to any informatives.
6. [PL/26/02817/KA](#): Bay Tree 1 – Remove, Bay Tree 2 – Remove, Buddleiah – Remove.
4 The Clays, Haddenham, Buckinghamshire, HP17 8JT.
Buckinghamshire Council – no tree preservation order to be made, work may be carried out.
7. [PL/26/02764/KA](#): Sycamore – remove.
13 High Street, Haddenham, Buckinghamshire, HP17 8ES.

Buckinghamshire Council – no tree preservation order to be made, work may be carried out.

Enforcement

The following have been reported to Bucks Council with no updates to report:

1. 13/11/25 - Post Office 165-167 Churchway: New illuminated signs installed without planning permission
2. 13/11/25 – 7 Woodways: unauthorised change of use for car sales business
3. 12/01/26 - House of Spice: rooflights installed on front elevation of the roof. Planning permission was for rooflights on the rear elevation. An earlier application was refused with rooflights on the front elevation.
This has been added to enforcement ref: 25/00977/NAPP
4. [EN/26/00061/OPHH](#) 9 Church End: Alleged construction of an outbuilding in the rear garden without planning permission. Reported 15/01/26 and an enforcement case was opened 11/03/26.

The following have been reported to Bucks Council with an update to report:

1. 27/04/26 – Blackbarn Farm: Enforcement notice served at Blackbarn Farm address on 27th April 2026.

Updates on Major Developments

Airfield

After months of being unable to make contact with anyone at Cala Homes the Clerk has now been in touch with two new representatives and a site meeting has been arranged for 28th May 2026 to carry out an inspection of the phase 2 public open space with a view to progressing the land transfer. The Clerk and Facilities manager have carried out their own site inspection ahead of this meeting and have identified fewer issues than on the previous inspection in February 2025, they found the site to be in generally good condition.

Aston Road (Dandara)

The PC's solicitor dealing with the land transfer has now received an undertaking from Dandara to pay the PC's legal fees, she will be going on maternity leave so the work will be transferred to another solicitor.

The Clerk and Facilities Manager met Dandara representatives on site on 7th May 2026 and discussed the outstanding maintenance issues. Overall maintenance on the site has improved, the grass had been cut, hoggin paths had been repaired and spring maintenance to the cricket square. It came to light that the landscaping plan HPC had downloaded from the online plans had been superseded so the issues with confirming trees had been planted according to the plan was due to the wrong plan being used. Dandara have now provided a copy of the approved plan so the Clerk and Facilities Manager will repeat the tree survey the end of May. It was clear that there are quite a few dead or dying trees, and the number will be confirmed after the next survey. Dandara undertook to carry out their own survey.

There is a potential issue with the closing off of the bore holes used to monitor groundwater that may need to be resolved, see project update for the burial ground.

Land west of Churchway (Redrow)

A Rosemary Lane resident has raised concerns about the lack of a barrier between the end of the public bridleway that joins Rosemary Lane from the Redrow site as a child on a bike cycled straight out into the road from the path and was nearly hit by her car.

This has been reported to Bucks Council's Rights of Way Officer who has confirmed that no barrier was specified in the upgrade of the path by Redrow Homes. He advised to monitor the situation as it is preferable not to use barriers that cause inconvenience to all users if this was a one-off incident. Residents should monitor the situation and if it becomes clear there is a danger it would be for the Parish Council to consider installing a suitable barrier as there is no funding available from Bucks Council for this.

Land East of Churchway (Greencore)

No updates.

Dollicott (rear of Carwithen Close)

No updates.

Land at Station Road

No updates

Lower Road

The Clerk noticed that the draft S106 agreement was uploaded with the documents for application 23/04009/AOP in April 2026, over 15 months since the previous document was uploaded, so it would appear work on the application has recommenced. The draft S106 includes details of the provision of public open space and its adoption for future management, as in previous agreements it is left open for the developer to choose if the land is transferred to the Parish Council or a Management Company. After consulting the committee by email the Clerk has submitted the following additional comment to Buckinghamshire Council:

The Parish Council remains opposed to this application for the reasons previously stated, however it is noted that a draft S106 agreement has recently been uploaded with the other documents for the application.

The draft S106 as currently worded leaves it to the developer to decide whether, on completion of the development, the public open space is transferred to the Parish Council or to a Management Company.

The Parish Council asks Buckinghamshire Council and Rectory Homes to consider rewording the S106 to allow the Parish Council to have first refusal on adoption of the public open space. It is Haddenham Parish Council policy to adopt public open space on new developments as it considers this is the best outcome for the residents. If this application is approved the Parish Council confirms it would like the option of adopting the public open space. If necessary the Parish Council would be willing to be a party to the S106 agreement.

A copy of the comment has been sent directly to Rectory Homes to ask for their support with this amendment.

Project Updates

New burial ground Aston Road

An online meeting was held with Cemetery Design Services (CDS) where the issues with the progress and advice given to date were discussed. Although an apology for the time taken was received it was still not clear that the requirements of the project were fully understood, with little acknowledgement of the poor advice given.

The project has always been rather complicated, hence the appointment of CDS as specialists in managing the planning and permissions needed for a new burial ground. When CDS were first appointed the Parish Council was of the view that as the new burial ground had been included in the outline application (14/02666/AOP) and the phase 2 reserved matters application (17/04543/ADP) for the development of the Aston Road site as a whole it had planning permission. What we needed specific help with was obtaining the necessary permission from the Environment Agency (EA) to carry out burials.

CDS were appointed to carry out a ground water risk assessment which would be submitted to the EA to obtain the permission for burials. This was completed at the end of 2024, however CDS advised us that the EA would only look at the ground water risk assessment if it was submitted as part of a planning application. We were passed to the planning group at CDS who quoted for the work to put together the necessary documents for a planning application. The application would include more detailed design of the memorial garden and landscaping. An initial plan was approved which showed new pathways and an area for additional parking. Arboricultural and ecological surveys were carried out as we were told these would be required. There was a lot of back and forth over this time with CDS staff asking for information relating to the approved plans, we were asked to obtain a copy of the planning officer's report for 1/044543/ADP which wasn't online. At the end of 2025 we were told that we were ready to submit a planning application. Nothing happened until we followed up in Jan 2026 when we were asked about the planting plan, the Clerk responded to ask if there was going to be a landscaping plan as without that how can we agree a planting plan. It eventually came to light that staff had left CDS and others were trying to pick up the project and we were being asked a series of questions that revealed there were significant gaps in the work required to submit a planning application. It was suggested that CDS come to Haddenham to meet with us and visit the site to get a better understanding of what is needed. We were told that a site visit wasn't included in the quoted work so would cost £500, the Clerk refused to authorize this and suggested a remote meeting, we were then asked to send updated photos of the site. Eventually the online meeting was scheduled.

At the meeting it was suggested that after a review there were new options open to the Parish Council

Option 1 - Certificate of Lawfulness

This approach would confirm with the council that burials are permitted at the site (from a legal perspective). The layout of the site would remain the same however, CDS would be able to provide a mapped plan of all the burial plots for your maintenance team (this wouldn't be submitted to planning).

Timeline - (dependent on LPA workloads)

- Preparation of submission - 4 weeks
- Validation - 1 to 2 weeks
- Determination - 8 weeks

Option 2 - Section 73

To undertake a redesign of the site we would have to submit an application for the variation on the conditions of the original reserved matters application. This could require ecological, drainage and arboricultural assessments of the finalised design works to demonstrate alignment with planning policies.

Timeline - (dependent on LPA workloads)

- Preparation of submission - 2 months (including consultant inputs)
- Validation - 1 to 2 weeks
- Determination - 13 weeks

Option 3 - Mixed approach

We could initially undertake a Certificate of Lawfulness, allowing for the commencement of burials on the site in the same timeframe as Option 1. Following this, to allow for more customisation of the site smaller separate applications could be submitted to develop the memorial gardens, new footpaths, and car parking area.

The discussion at the meeting did not reassure us that good advice was being given as the advice has changed again. The Deputy Clerk initiated a direct email exchange with the EA to see if it was possible to deal with them ourselves without the need for a planning application. She received a fairly quick response and has been in discussion with one of their officers. To summarise their discussion

1. As far as the EA are concerned the burial ground has planning permission which was granted with the Dandara application.
2. As planning permission was granted before October 2023 when the rules changed and there will be fewer than 30 burials a year we meet the criteria for an exempt status. This means we could carry out single depth burials and ashes interments.
3. Ground water testing was carried out in 2017 by Dandara and again in 2023, after the ground levels were raised, by HPC/CDS for the tier 2 ground water risk assessment.
4. The ground water testing was done quite a long time ago now so may be considered out of date and need repeating if we wish to do double depth burials. Ashes interments and single depth would be allowed.
5. When asked if the bore holes were still accessible for a repeat test Dandara have confirmed they are not. This has now raised concerns about how the bore holes were dealt with after the testing was complete. So we now have questions to answer from the EA:

What is the status of the boreholes? If they are buried they will need decommissioning.

Was a final topographic survey of the site ever undertaken, following the placement of the material to raise the levels?

Where is the elevation of the unaltered bedrock across the site? (This data is available already I think)

What is the projected depth of the double depth burials? 1.8 m seems quite shallow.

Does the water level monitoring vs double depth burial depth allow for factors of safety, e.g. climate change raising the max water table elevation?

These need to be determined before proceeding with any burials or ash placement. The unknown status of the boreholes is a serious concern here.

Providing we can resolve the above, it could be possible to avoid more groundwater monitoring, but let's see. It is frustrating that they did not extend the boreholes while building up the site topography and then continue to do groundwater monitoring until this was all signed off.

Since it is now clear that we can have a conversation with the EA without the need to submit a planning application it confirms the advice received from CDS was incorrect and has wasted over a year of our time.

Although it is not a straight forward decision to make at this stage it seems to be time to terminate the project with CDS, deal with the EA directly ourselves and appoint a new architect to design the layout of plots once the concerns raised by the EA have been addressed.

Aston Road Pavilion

The tenders have now been reviewed and slightly revised following some clarifications and negotiation. When expenditure to date, construction costs and contract management fees are taken into account the S106 funding available falls short of covering the cost by £160,748. Alternative funding sources will need to be identified and a conversation with ECB has been started.

Banks Cottage Extension

The tenders have been reviewed in detail and a meeting held with Dr Patel to discuss the options. The value of the tenders and difference between them is a concern. The lowest bid is likely to reflect the true cost of the project, but in order to reassure that this is the case it is proposed that an independent QS assessment is undertaken on the final detailed specification. Changes made by the planning officer and architect after the original QS estimate will have changed to specification they were working to. The cost of the QS estimate would be £1,480 +VAT. Expenditure to date is £26,311.

It is agreed between the Parish Council and Dr Patel that the lowest bid is not affordable. The cost could be brought down by taking out the phasing which is currently included to allow the dentist to remain operational during the work. PCMS have been asked to review the specification with the lowest bidder to see if costs could be reduced in this way, the savings would be off-set by loss of income or use of a temporary unit in the grounds of Banks Park. If the QS estimate comes back significantly lower than the lowest bid this would be justification for going out to tender to see if a more affordable bid is possible.

The project could potentially go ahead if the cost can be reduced and the financial contributions from each party increased.

Village Hall Improvements

No updates.

Future Haddenham

No updates.

Speedwatch Report

We had planned 5 sessions during w/c 13/04, but unfortunately, our equipment had some major charging issues, so not all of the vehicles were captured on camera.

Two sessions had to be reported as cancelled, and those on 15th April and 16th April (both Stanbridge Road / Cricketers Way) only captured a handful of vehicle details, due to the camera timing out early on during the session.

The successful morning session on 16th April captured 31 speeders out of 250 logged (12%), with the fastest being recorded at 49 mph. This indicates that drivers are continuing to ignore the 30mph signs and other road users.

The faulty equipment has been sent for repair by Ian Final. Hopefully it will be back before the planned sessions in May.

Thanks to our team of volunteers for continuing to attend sessions (luckily no rain this month). Many thanks to Lee Turnham earlier this week, when I had issues uploading data! The MVAS equipment is unfortunately still having issues and no data (traffic volumes & speeds) has been able to be downloaded for several months. The suppliers have been contacted yet again by Ian Final and David Moore, as collecting and reporting this data is key to submissions for traffic calming measures (Bucks Highways) and to BCC when opposing future housing developments that do not include sufficient infrastructure planning.

Correspondence

An informal consultation has occurred with Buckinghamshire Council and HPC concerning the re-consultation for the implementation of double yellow lines around the co-op site. The Parish Council requested the addition of no verge parking on Pegasus Way. However, the officer at Bucks Council has responded to say the cost of implementing signage for that element would be around £10,000, the cost of which is not included in their funding from the developer. It was proposed that this could be funded through developer contribution in the future.