

**Minutes of a Meeting of Little Chalfont Parish Council Planning Committee
Held in the Village Hall, Cokes Lane, Little Chalfont
Tuesday 28 May 2013 at 7.30pm**

Present: Cllr B Drew; Cllr J Hinkly; Cllr M Parker (Chairman); Cllr V Patel and Cllr D Rafferty.

In attendance: Mrs K Sterling (Assistant Clerk).

1. **Apologies for absence:** These were received from Cllr L Hunt and Cllr J Walford, OBE.
2. **Approval of the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Wednesday 8 May 2013:**
These were approved as a correct record and were signed as such by the Chairman.
3. **Proposal to suspend standing orders enabling members of the public to speak (10 mins):** There were no members of the public at the meeting.
4. **Declarations of interest:** None
5. **Chairman to approve and note items suggested for Any Other Business:** (i) Proposed technology upgrade of the existing base station adjacent at Boughton Group, Boughton Business Park, Bell Lane; (ii) Draft Delivery Plan Document (DDPD) Public Participation.
6. **To consider the following applications:**

Application number and address	Summary of Proposed Works	Little Chalfont Parish Council recommendations
CH/2013/0372/FA Land Between Chenies Parade and Garage Chalfont Station Road Little Chalfont	Redevelopment of site to provide 3 storey building comprising ground floor commercial unit (either Use Class A1 or Use Class A2) and 8 first and second floor flats	The Parish Council objects. (see detailed comments below)
<p>The Little Chalfont Parish Council ("PC") objects. It has already submitted its objection to the application and its intention to refute significant elements of the applicant's Transport Statement and to provide evidence illustrating the failure to address parking issues. The PC has subsequently provided some further detail about the operation of the private parking to the side and rear of the Parade, which totally invalidates the spurious statistics on rates of occupancy of parking spaces set out in the applicant's Transport Statement. (For completeness, we note again that the Chenies Parade Management Company runs a permit system for those who are legally entitled to park on this private land and has issued about 120 permits, for residents of the flats above the Chenies Parade shops and shop workers. If all 120 permit holders tried to park at once only a very small proportion would be successful. Should non-permit holders use the spaces, as the Transport Statement superficially assumes, notwithstanding that this land is not in the gift of the applicant to allocate, we have no doubt that the Management Company would review, and may well exercise its right to remove, the currently hypothetical provision of one hour free parking for customers.)</p> <p>The rest of this submission provides the PC's other comments on, and objections to, the application.</p> <p>As is indicated by the PC's initial response on the application, our main concerns relate to the continued failure to address parking issues, and not only by the invalid assumption (see above) used to calculate totally false "evidence" of availability of parking spaces at Chenies Parade.</p> <p>The Transport Statement claims to demonstrate that the (current) parking provision can accommodate parking at peak periods and that the proposed development will provide an additional 5 public parking spaces at the Parade. We totally refute both of these conclusions. The reality is that the viability of the shops in Chenies Parade is significantly threatened by the current underprovision of parking spaces for shoppers. This is the site identified by respondents to the PC's 2012 Little Chalfont Parking Survey (a copy of which was</p>		

attached to our earlier comments) as the highest priority area of concern.

Further, the claim that the proposed development will provide 5 "additional" public parking spaces at the Parade relies on the argument that the retail unit should be considered as forming part of an established local retail centre, so the requirement of CDC policy TR16 for 8 parking spaces for the retail/commercial unit should not apply. We reject this argument as blatantly false. The proposed additional retail or commercial activity must have adequate additional parking provision within the development itself. We see no reason not to require the 8 parking spaces suggested under TR16 for this purpose.

Strictly, the parking space requirements (of TR16) would suggest these 8 spaces for the commercial or retail unit and 16 spaces for the residential units, calculated as 2 spaces per Category 2 residential dwelling. We are aware that in the Appeal Notice Decision (Ref: APP/X0415/A/09/2117331) it was suggested that this requirement may be relaxed because of the proximity of public transport links and local shopping, so the provision of only 11 spaces for residential parking may be acceptable to CDC. Nevertheless, we consider that traffic flow to and from the proposed residential parking will add to the current problems of access to the relief road.

The Transport Statement Section 7.4 of the Transport Statement suggests that illegal parking on yellow lines is related to long-term parking and Section 7.7 proposes that this parking can be re-located to spare capacity in surrounding roads. We are more minded to agree with the conclusion reached in the aforementioned Appeal Notice Decision that shoppers are parking illegally simply because there are no spaces available in Chenies Parade and that this illegal parking continues to be a clear indication that there is, and always has been, a need for the 16 garages and 16 parking spaces, and consequently the need for the release of the derelict garage site for parking. (Improving the parking for shoppers in the Village is not only part of the Local Measures recorded for Little Chalfont, it is also part of our Community Action Plan. Indeed, we draw your attention to the community's formal request that this land be specifically highlighted within the Delivery Development Plan Document for car parking use only. This request is to be renewed when we respond under the current Public Participation.)

Section 7.3 of the Transport Statement refers to the high turnover of spaces giving rise to the concept that someone is almost always "just about" to leave their space. This is not just a concept, it is reality. The high turnover of parking spaces means that traffic sometimes has to wait as drivers wait and then manoeuvre in and out of spaces and can, and does, lead to traffic dangerously backing up on to the A404, on occasions as far back east as the railway bridge. This backing up of traffic can occur in both directions as cars wait to turn into the Parade, and is an increasing problem and one that will undoubtedly worsen even more, should this development be permitted.

Access Issues

Another aspect of the planned parking spaces that are proposed to adjoin the site is that it appears that the road, as it enters the service road to Chenies Parade, would have to be narrowed. This would require the consent of Chenies Parade Management Company, which consent we understand (but you may need to confirm) would not be given. In practice, any such narrowing would exacerbate the tailback problem mentioned above and the problem already faced by the existing volume of delivery and refuse lorries as they try to negotiate a narrow turn, complicated by parked cars. We remind CDC of the concern raised in the aforementioned Appeal Notice Decision that "congestion and conflict between the public and residents of the proposals may lead to vehicles waiting on the public highway, affecting traffic on Chalfont Station Road (the A404) and thus resulting in conditions likely to be prejudicial to highway safety".

Design

We do not consider the proposed design of the building to be in keeping with the adjacent street scene.

Amenity Area

One of the reasons for rejection of the previous application was inadequate amenity space for residents. We note that this issue has also not been addressed in that the amenity area proposed to be situated to the rear

on the 1st floor falls short of local planning regulations. Under these regulations, an area the size of this development should provide an amenity area of 240sqm but the planned amenity area measures just 205sqm (and see below for our comments on the proposed development of the Donkey Field and its impact on the proposed amenity space).

Development of the Donkey Field

While we acknowledge that the recent Planning Application CH/2012/1842/FA was withdrawn and therefore that there is no application extant, we understand that it is expected that Countryside is shortly to submit a further application for the development of the Donkey Field with a similar site layout to that proposed under CH/2012/1842/FA. If this expectation is realised, then there would be an unacceptable amenity/privacy issue. The positioning of the block of flats 10 – 17 under Countryside’s site layout drawing number N00233-PL-001, shows one end of the block virtually on the border with the applicant’s land and the proposed roof garden area would therefore look out partially on to the end of the block and partially into the planned private garden area of the block. Equally, some upper windows of the block of flats in the Donkey Field, will overlook the proposed roof garden.

Therefore, if you are minded to approve the application CH/2013/0372/FA, despite the concerns of inadequate parking and amenity space, we would agree with the suggestion already made by the LCCA that you should at least delay a decision on application CH/2013/0372/FA, until the also strategically important Donkey Field development application is resolved.

<p>CH/2013/0697/FA Woodland Cottage Cokes Lane Little Chalfont HP8 4TX</p>	<p>First floor side/rear extension and single storey side extension</p>	<p>The Parish Council objects on the same basis that it objected to the previous application CH/2013/0174/FA. Although there have been some small changes to the application, the proposed extension remains an overdevelopment of the site and would make the building appear cramped on the plot. If application is approved, the Parish Council would ask that a condition is applied restricting the garage from ever being used as or turned into a dwelling.</p>
<p>CH/2013/0640/FA 29 Pavilion Way Little Chalfont HP6 6PZ</p>	<p>Single storey side/rear extension incorporating raised roof extension, front porch, rooflights to rear elevation and fenestration alterations.</p>	<p>The Parish Council objects for the same reasons it objected to the previous application CH/2012/1486/FA. The bulk of the roof is out of keeping with adjacent houses and detrimental to the street scene.</p>
<p>CH/2013/0720/FA 3 Chessfield Park Little Chalfont HP6 6RU</p>	<p>Replacement front dormer window and dummy pitched roof to existing garage.</p>	<p>No objection</p>
<p>CH/2013/0725/FA Priors Doggetts Wood Lane</p>	<p>Part two storey, part single storey front/side/rear extension, canopy roof</p>	<p>No objection</p>

Little Chalfont HP8 4TH	to front and fenestration alterations	
CH/2013/0629/FA Ayasofya Ltd Nightingales Corner Little Chalfont HP7 9PY	Change of use of ground and first floor of building from Use Class A1 (Shop) to Use Class A3 (Restaurant) with associated new shop front and extract ducting/flue/housing	The Parish Council objects. (see detailed comments below)
<p>Although not recorded in the Case Officer's report, the Parish Council registered its objections to the previous application CH/2013/0067/FA, and made unrewarded personal representations to the CDC Planning Committee, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The change would be inconsistent with CDC "policy", and the Parish Council's wishes, to encourage and maintain a variety of shops in the village, the centre of which has 12 eating establishments. Another restaurant is not needed. The Parish Council does not want to lose a large and attractive Class A1 (shop) premises in the village. Contrary to the claim made in the Design and Access statement parking is already an issue at the location of the shop and with additional staff as well as a large number of clients this would only get worse. Despite other attempted reassurances in the Design and Access statement, and in view of the experience from another eating establishment very close to the proposed new restaurant, the Parish Council has concerns about the potential risk of unwelcome cooking smells and noise from the proposed change of use. <p>These Parish Council objections still apply.</p> <p>The Parish Council has further objections to CH/2013/0629/FA, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> CDC's alarming decision to approve application CH/2013/0067/FA was conditional on the then proposed Class 3 use "not at any time being extended into the retained Class A1 retail shop". The now proposed development into the retail shop immediately flouts this condition, with no justification for the viability of an excessively large 118 seater restaurant in the village centre which already has 12 eating establishments. Another condition imposed for the approval of application CH/2013/0067/FA was restaurant use only until 11pm on Mondays to Saturdays and 10.30pm on Sundays and Bank Holidays. Again, it is proposed to flout these conditions immediately, with proposed restaurant hours until 11.30pm on Mondays to Fridays, 11.30pm on Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays. Should this current application be approved, the Parish Council asks again for a restriction to be imposed that no takeaways from the restaurant are allowed, in the interests of hygiene and the amenities of nearby shops and residential properties. 		
CH/2013/0738/AV Skipton Building Society 5 Nightingales Corner Little Chalfont HP7 9PY	Replacement non-illuminated sign	No objection
CH/2013/0737/FA Skipton Building Society 5 Nightingales Corner Little Chalfont HP7 9PY	Replacement shop front	No objection
CH/2013/0757/FAE Pollards Wood Grange	Single storey side/rear extension incorporating swimming pool and	No comment

Nightingales Lane Little Chalfont HP8 4SL	detached pool plant room (extension to time limit of planning permission CH/2010/0565/FA)	
CH/2013/0315/FA Stoney View 111 Elizabeth Avenue Little Chalfont HP6 6RS	Two storey front/side/rear extension and front and rear dormer windows	No objection
CH/2013/0764/FA Dr Challoners High School Cokes Lane Little Chalfont HP7 9QB	Extension to southern side of sports hall to form gym, two storey infill extension between existing gym and curved building to form sixth form centre, installation of solar panels on existing buildings and alterations to existing car park	No objection. Even though the site is within the Green Belt, the Parish Council welcomes this proposal and is of the view that the development does not impact on the openness of the Green Belt, and should be allowed.

7. **Decisions of Chiltern District Council's Planning Committee:** The updated schedule, previously circulated, was discussed.
8. **Appeal notices and decisions:** The following were noted: (i) CH/2013/0330/FA – 3 Chessfield Park, HP6 6RU – Two front dormer windows to replace existing dormer window and dummy pitched roof to existing garage. Appeal in progress; (ii) CH/2013/0054/FA – Roughwood Croft, Nightingales Lane, HP8 4SJ - Demolition of existing outbuilding, erection of detached garage with associated garden walls and gates, extension and external alterations to existing garage to form garden store/workshop, and laying of hardsurfacing. Appeal in progress.
9. **Licensing applications:** None.
10. **Enforcement updates:** None.
11. **Any Other Business:** (i) **Proposed technology upgrade of the existing base station adjacent at Boughton Group, Boughton Business Park, Bell Lane** - it was agreed that the Clerk would respond to the e-mail stating that the Council would provide comments after the next Planning Committee meeting scheduled for 18 June 2013; (ii) **Draft Delivery Plan Document (DDPD) Public Participation** – The draft letter to Mr Winwright, Temporary Planning Policy Manager, previously circulated, was discussed and Cllr Parker will update the letter to include the comments made. Once the LCCA committee has also made any comments a revised combined document will be issued for final approval before sending to Mr Winwright to meet the 7 June deadline. The suggested Community Communication Proposals, previously circulated, were agreed, and it was noted that it was likely that a joint Parish Council and LCCA communication would be distributed with the next LCCA newsletter to explain the details of the joint response to the Public Participation document. A copy will also be put on the Parish Council web site.
12. **Date of next meeting:** Tuesday 18 June 2013 at 7.30pm in the Village Hall.

Signed.....

Date.....