

Granborough Parish Council

Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting of Granborough Parish Council held in the Village Hall
on Tuesday 26th May 2026

Present: Cllrs Anderson, Ellerton, Oakland (Vice Chair – in the Chair), Smedley and Watson.

Clerk & RFO: Lisa Prior and 3 members of the public.

MINUTES

37. Welcome & Apologies

- Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr de Niese and Cllr Fenwick.

38. Declarations of Interest

- Cllr Ellerton declared a non-pecuniary interest in application PL/26/03634/PIP, noting that he had previously lived adjacent to the site until 1971.

39. Open Forum

- Members of the public raised concerns regarding recent Planning in Principle (PIP) applications on land outside the village boundary and discussed the implications such approvals could have on future planning decisions. The differences between PIP and standard planning applications, the importance of protecting the Neighbourhood Plan, and the Buckinghamshire Local Plan, HELAA assessments and Call for Sites process were also discussed.

40. Planning

- a. Application **PL/26/03634/PIP** was considered. Cllr Smedley had circulated draft comments to councillors prior to the meeting. The draft comments were summarised during the meeting and, following discussion, it was **resolved** to object to the application on the grounds that the site lies outside the Granborough Neighbourhood Plan settlement boundary and due to concerns regarding development in open countryside. It was further **resolved** that the comments attached as Appendix A be submitted to Buckinghamshire Council.
- b. Application **PL/26/03915/PNAD** was considered. Cllr Smedley had circulated draft comments to councillors prior to the meeting. The draft comments were summarised during the meeting and, following discussion, it was **resolved** that the Parish Council had no objection to the application subject to Buckinghamshire Council being satisfied that the proposal met the criteria for Permitted Development. It was further **resolved** that the comments attached as Appendix B be submitted to Buckinghamshire Council.

The meeting closed at 8.01pm.

Signed: _____

Dated: _____

**Appendix A – Planning Application: PL/26/03634/PIP: LAND AT MARSTON ROAD
GRANBOROUGH BUCKINGHAMSHIRE. PERMISSION IN PRINCIPLE FOR A MINIMUM OF ONE
AND A MAXIMUM OF FIVE DWELLINGS.**

The Granborough Parish Council (GPC) considered the above application at its meeting held on Tuesday 26th May 2026

GPC resolved the following.

1. That GPC objects in principle to the “Permission in Principle application as this site lies outside the settlement boundary as determined within the Granborough Neighbourhood Plan (GNP).
2. That having regard to the objection in 1 above GPC notes that a larger parcel of land including this site has been considered by Buckinghamshire Council (BC) as part of the emerging Local Plan for Buckinghamshire within its HELAA sites survey. The consultation document included the following initial observations by BC.

Policy decision on site suitability - unsuitable

Unacceptable harm on landscape. Unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside. Unsustainable location and settlement pattern.

GPC supports these initial conclusions of Buckinghamshire Council as the Granborough Neighbourhood Plan settlement boundary is intended to prevent development in such a location. GPC hopes that BC maintains this position when the emerging plan is subject to further consultation during the summer.

3. GPC further objects to this proposal as should “Permission in Principle” be granted this negates the protection afforded to Granborough by its Neighbourhood Plan as it would set a precedent for speculative development of areas of agricultural land outside the settlement boundary confirmed in the GNP.
4. GPC considers that as this site forms part of larger site which was the subject of an application for five properties, which was refused by BC on 8th January 2026 (ref PL/25/5690/OA) that the grounds for refusal stated by BC are equally applicable to this application.
5. GPC further agreed to submit comments in respect of certain matters contained in the submission by “Smith Jenkins”

Firstly, that considerable weight is placed on a decision by BC in respect of an application at the edge of Twyford Buckinghamshire on the Bicester Road. GPC does not intend to address the detail of this application and decision, however of key significance is that Twyford does not have a made Neighbourhood Plan and consequently no defined settlement boundary. GPC does not consider this to be a like for like comparison and should not be seen as setting any precedent.

Secondly, reference is made to an approval for 5 dwellings on the Winslow Road. The applicant is not specific as to the exact location of the development, but there are two possible sites.

The first being on the eastern side of Winslow Road to the south of Bates Close, this application was approved before the GNP was made and was for an infill site between existing rows of properties, this development has been completed for a number of years.

The second is land on the eastern side of Winslow Road adjacent to no. 4 Winslow Road (ref 24/03223/APP) planning permission has been granted but no works have yet started. This site is inside the settlement boundary as contained in the GNP.

6. That GPC would submit to the Buckinghamshire Council (BC) an explanation as to why this site is outside the settlement boundary as determined within the Granborough Neighbourhood Plan (GNP). See below.

1. An explanation as to why this site is outside the settlement boundary as determined within the Granborough Neighbourhood Plan.

GPC notes that the land shown in this application is of a different size to previous applications and the suggestion under the HELAA, however GPC considers that the principles expressed in its response are relevant irrespective of the exact shape and footprint of the site in question.

GPC would wish it to be noted that the land between numbers 9 and 15 Marston Road was the subject of a planning application to the then Local Planning Authority, Aylesbury Vale District Council (AVDC) in 2016 ref 16/03612/APP for the erection of three detached houses. GPC did not object to the application nor were there any objections from residents, and at the time there was no GNP defining the limits of the settlement.

AVDC decided to refuse the application on the following grounds as contained in the officer's report.

"The application site comprises agricultural land beyond the edge of the built-up area and is in a rural location and the proposal would result in the loss of agricultural land and the loss of some trees along the site frontage. The site is clearly seen as part of the countryside and the openness and arable nature of the appeal site positively contributes to the character and appearance of the rural area. The character of the area is clearly defined such that the site would be seen as falling outside the built-up area of the settlement. It is considered that this would be an unsustainable development for the reasons set out above; and that it would unacceptably intrude into the open countryside and would have an adverse landscape impact. Therefore, the development would be contrary to the provisions of policy GP35 of the AVDLP and the core principles in the NPPF.

The assessment has concluded that the proposal would adversely impact on the natural environment such that it would be unacceptably alter the openness of the countryside altered detrimentally. The level of harm resulting to the countryside must be attributed significant negative weight in the planning balance.

With regard to sustainability, given the lack of integration with the settlement, the lack of sufficient facilities and amenities that the settlement has to offer and the limited availability of modes of transport other than the private car, it is considered that the proposal would not promote sustainable transport and it is not locationally sustainable, contrary to the NPPF, and as such this matter must be afforded significant negative weight.”

The applicant chose to appeal the decision and the Planning Inspector found in favour of AVDC.

The decision of the Planning Inspector contained the following: -

*Granborough is identified as a smaller village in the Council's Settlement Hierarchy Assessment July 2016. Although capable of accommodating small-scale development to help maintain existing communities, the village is categorised as a less sustainable settlement with poor access to services and facilities. The site is located between two residential properties and so may not be considered isolated in that sense. **However, it is situated outside the settlement boundary of Granborough and therefore within the countryside.***

The key words are in bold above.

When GPC through a working group with residents' involvement, considered the settlement boundary in drafting the GNP they took note of both AVDC's and The Planning Inspector's comments and concluded with advice from their consultant that this site was outside the settlement boundary. The settlement boundary at this location was further verified by the Examiner in confirming the GNP.

The GNP was overwhelmingly supported by residents of Granborough at the referendum.

Appendix B – Planning Application: PL/26/03915/PNAD

Prior Notification under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and County Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

Conversion of the steel framed agricultural building enclosed on three sides and facing onto a courtyard area into two residential units.

The Granborough Parish Council (GPC) considered the above application at its meeting held on Tuesday 26th May 2026

GPC resolved the following.

GPC notes that Buckinghamshire Council has already considered and refused this proposal under an application Reference PL/26/01067/PNAD and that this application seeks to supply further information to address a range of issues raised by BC.

Subject therefore to BC being satisfied that these detailed remedial proposals meet their previous reasons for refusal and therefore the proposals meet the criteria for Permitted Development, GPC has no objections to the proposal.

Should however BC still maintain their previous position of refusal and consider this not to be acceptable Permitted Development in accordance with the above Order then GPC would object to any full Planning Permission Application as the development of new dwellings would be outside the Settlement Boundary as defined in the Granborough Neighbourhood Plan.