

IVER PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday,
19th October, 2010 at 6.00pm, at the Parish Council Office.

Present: Mrs Lidgate (Chairman), Mrs. Roberts, Mrs. Vigor-Hedderly. Mr.Gidar arrived at 6.20pm.
Mr. Wilson arrived at 7.15pm

Minutes taken by: Amanda Riley (Committee Clerk)

Meeting started 6.00pm

36 RECEIVED apologies for absence –Mr. Bradford, Mrs. Gibson, Mrs. Watkins

37 Disclosure of interest in items on the agenda. *Resolved that it be noted that the participation of those Parish Councillors who are also members of the South Bucks District Council Planning Committee, in both the debate and any subsequent vote on matters contained in the agenda, was on the basis that the views expressed were preliminary views taking account of the information currently available to the Parish Council. Parish Council members who are also District Councillors reserved their final views on the applications until they were in full possession of all relevant information both for and against.* – Mrs. Vigor-Hedderly known to solicitor Mr. George Curran Item 45 on the Agenda.

38 RESOLVED to sign the Minutes of previous meetings – 28th September, 2010

39 RESOLVED to make comments on planning applications received: as per list attached to these Minutes.

Mr. & Mrs. Samuels, residents of Richings Park, spoke to the Planning Committee about their concerns about Planning Application 10/01198/FUL which was considered at the meeting of 7th September 2010. Mrs. Vigor-Hedderly, in her role as a County Councillor, is to take the matter up with Mr. Bob Smith of South Bucks District Council.

40 RECEIVED & NOTED: Amended and additional plans for information only: None

41 RECEIVED & NOTED: Decisions on planning applications received: as per list attached to Agenda

42 RECEIVED & NOTED: Appeals and enforcement notices: None

43 RECEIVED & NOTED: 1) Letter to Tony Ralphs, Enforcement & Conservation Manager, SBDC and his response. The Planning Committee members will provide the Committee Clerk with details of cases that they would like Mr. Ralphs to investigate further. 2) Tree preservation orders: proposals for streamlining Consultation. Mrs. Lidgate is to look through the proposals and will then pass them on to Mrs Gibson on her return from holiday, to formulate a response. 3) Planning Investigation Complaint (Ref: 252562): Quinton, Wood Lane, Iver was noted.

44 RESOLVED to NOMINATE: Mr. Julian Wilson was nominated and unanimously elected to represent the Committee at the Pinewood pre-Inquiry meeting.

45 Discussed: with Mr. George Curran of F E Johnson & Co., the options available for the Pinewood Inquiry. It was decided that an informal arrangement would stand until the Project Pinewood meeting had taken place, and then a further meeting would be arranged to consider the way forward and future costs.

46 Core Strategy: Mrs. Vigor-Hedderly is to examine the Core Strategy Development Plan Document: Schedules of Proposed Changes and will respond to the Consultation and report back to the Planning Committee at the meeting on the 9th November 2010, as comments have to be returned by 5pm on the 12th November, 2010.

It was agreed that Mrs. Lidgate would work with Mrs. Matthews of Richings Park Residents Association and Mr. Hundal, a resident of Richings Park who is the only one who has a slot at the Public Inquiry, as his was the only representation received by the District Council in May.

(For information: Attached to these Minutes are the Minutes of the Special Meeting of Iver Parish Council held on 23rd April, 2009 which in Item 4 a), b), c), d), f), g), h) and i) record the Parish Council's response to the District Council).

Meeting closed at 7.47pm

Next Meeting Date: 9th November, 2010

Comments on Planning Applications

Application No	Proposal	Location	P C Comments
10/01468/TPO	Sycamore (T1) - cut back by 25% and reshape 9SBDC TPO NO 24, 2000)	2 Thorney Lane North, Iver	Refer to arboriculturist
10/01451/FUL	Single storey rear extension	31 Slough Road, Iver Heath	No Objections
10/01445/FUL	Single storey side & rear extensions.	56 Langley Park Road, Iver	No objections
10/01487/FUL	Replacement outbuilding	St. Lawrence House, Wood Lane, Iver Heath	Provided it complies with existing green belt regulations, no objections
10/01516/FUL	Part two storey, part single storey side/rear extension, first floor side extension & detached triple garage with storage accommodation above	Navarone, Wood Lane, Iver Heath	Object: overdevelopment, has this been extended previously 50% rule in green belt? Must comply with green belt policy.
10/01518/FUL	Two storey side and rear extensions	6 Woodland Grange, Iver	Object: we do not have sufficient information on the protection of trees on the site. L10 & EP4
10/01507/FUL	Conversion of double garage into habitable accommodation	2 Woodland Grange, Iver	No objections
10/01544/FUL	Replacement dwelling house	Gamekeepers Cottage, Pinewood Road, Iver Heath	Object: overdevelopment in relation to original building. Concerned about the effect on a sensitive area ie trees, flora, fauna, mammals and greenbelt policy & GB1/GB1/L6. As previously refer to Natural England because of the sensitivity of the site.
10/01555/FUL	Rear conservatory	216 The Parkway, Iver Heath	No objections

COPY FOR INFORMATION ONLY:

**Minutes of the Special Meeting of Iver Parish Council
held on 23rd April 2009
at the Parish Council Committee Room 63 Chequers Orchard, Iver SL0 9NJ**

Present: Julian Wilson (chairman), Jeanette Watkins, Malcolm Bradford, Carol Gibson, Pat Leech, Pat Roberts, Bill Lidgate, Sylvia Lidgate, Alan Oxley, Claire Mowat, Ruth Vigor-Hedderly

1. **Public Participation.** There were 2 members of the public present:

Dudley Mills of Kebbell Homes: He stated that Kebbell Homes want to work with the community. There is an opportunity to provide a relief road. The benefits are: environmental – HGV lorries taken off existing roads; traffic calming measures; pedestrianise the High Street; mixed residential development; affordable housing for young, old etc.; create open space; provide new cycleway to station/Crossrail station; bus service improvements; commercial improvements in village.

The other member of the public asked about the straw poll held at the end of the public meeting on 20th April and the chairman said that it was not conclusive but that there were 24 votes for the proposal to release Green Belt for a relief road and 14 against out of about 68 people in attendance.

2. **Apologies** for absence were received from: Ravi Gidar, Damon Clark

3. **Disclosure of interest** in items on the agenda – there were none.

4. **Core Strategy response: The Parish Council resolved to make the following comments to the District Council:**

- a. Having had a public meeting and the Parish Council having considered their response it is quite apparent that there is an overwhelming need for some method to be found to relieve traffic in Iver and Richings Park. The current proposals, by referring to changes at Court Lane, will not achieve that result as although certain HGVs would be removed from the roads, the bulk of HGV traffic does not emanate from Court Lane today.

If the Crossrail scheme is brought into effect there will be a large amount of work undertaken on the railway line between Thorney Lane and Market Lane/Mansion Lane at the Chequers Bridge. It is conceivable that an access road will be provided along the course of the railway and that road could serve as the relief road for traffic from the Ridge Way, Court Lane, Bardons to link up to the M4/M25 once Crossrail has finished using it for construction traffic. However, if that scheme does not go ahead a road to take HGVs away from Iver High Street and North Park/Richings Way is considered by the Parish Council to be essential to the future of Iver Parish.

Whilst the District Council does not consider that the traffic issue is significant enough to demand an alternative route for HGVs to the motorway network, the public meeting held by the Parish Council (attended by a significant number of people) was of the view that the problem would not get any easier in the future and therefore providing an alternative route was essential.

- b. The Parish Council agrees with the selection of Court Lane as a strategic site for redevelopment and would wish to see redevelopment that improves the area overall, reduces traffic movements and enhances the quality of this area, which is Green Belt.
- c. The Core Strategy refers to the regeneration of Iver High Street. In order to achieve that the view of the Parish Council and the public is to remove the main shopping area to a position that is off the High Street and incorporates car parking. In addition improved public transport must be incorporated into those plans. Any regeneration will not happen unless funds are available to purchase premises adjacent to Iver High Street to provide a shopping plaza and a parking area. There is a potential to move industrial/employment sites from the High Street to the Ridgeway or Thorney Business Park. That would leave space for the parking/shopping area.

- d. A significant proportion of local people work at Heathrow but it is noticeable that there is no direct public transport link from Iver to Heathrow. Such a link would relieve traffic in Iver.
- e. Whilst there has been a focus on Iver and Richings Park in the Core Strategy the potential of significant expansion on Green Belt by Pinewood Studios should not be ignored in the current strategy. It is noted that the strategy does not anticipate development on Green Belt land, however there is a potential that the Pinewood proposal would be considered to be in the national interest. If that were to be the case there need to be alternative strategies in place to relieve the population of Iver Heath, which would be greatly affected by the proposed project. For example, the road network that has been referred to by Project Pinewood as suitable is considered by the population of Iver Heath to be totally unsuitable on roads that are already over used throughout the working day. The Parish Council would like it to be confirmed that there will be no Green Belt development in Iver Heath.
- f. The Parish Council would be totally opposed to development on Iver Heath Fields whether or not the Pinewood Project went ahead.
- g. The Parish Council's preferred scenario was scenario 2 with elements of scenario 1. The Parish Council would be totally opposed to incorporating any elements of scenarios 3 and 4.
- h. Appendix 5: The Parish Council is opposed to all of the proposed development on Green Belt in Iver Parish that is included in Appendix 5.
- i. Section 106 and the Community Infrastructure Levy should always be considered in any development. The Parish Council would like to see that the return from S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy should be utilised for improvements and regeneration in the Parish of Iver generally and not just restricted to the area around the development.

The Meeting closed at 9.15 pm

Signed (chairman)

Date