

Burnham Parish Council

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on the 3rd of August 2026 at 4.30pm in Burnham Park Hall.

Committee members present:

Cllr Marie Hammon (Chair)
Cllr Inder Birdi

Cllr John Carey (Vice Chair)
Cllr Terry Gamble

Cllr Carol Linton

In attendance:

Officers of the Council:

Adam Killeya (Parish Clerk)
Laiba Malik (Deputy Parish Clerk)

Councillors:

None

Members of public:

60

P2627/27 Apologies

Apologies were received from Cllrs Pasha, Sommer and Bird.

P2627/28 Declarations of Interest

None

P2627/29 Public Forum

Many residents attended the Planning Committee meeting and expressed their concerns regarding Planning Application: PL/26/05353/FA -Land West of Lent Rise Road, Burnham, Buckinghamshire.

P2627/30 Minutes

The Committee **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes as an accurate record of the meeting held on the 13th of July 2026.

P2627/31 Decisions

The decisions made by Buckinghamshire Council on applications listed on the 3rd of August 2026 agenda were **NOTED**.

Signed:

Date:

P2627/32 Planning Applications

PL/26/05353/FA - Land West Of Lent Rise Road, Burnham, Buckinghamshire Hybrid application comprising of: Full application for the change of use of land to outdoor recreational use to function as Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANGs) together with a new access from Hitcham Lane, car park, footpaths, fencing, landscaping and ancillary works and; Outline application for the demolition of existing buildings/structures and removal of hardstanding; construction of up to 800 Class C3 dwellings; construction of buildings to accommodate up to 1,900sqm of Class E and/or Class F2 floorspace; land reserved for a potential primary school; principal accesses to be provided from Lent Rise Road and Bingham Road; and associated footway/cycleway connections and green infrastructure including open space, play areas, surface water attenuation, community garden, landscaping, retained woodland and ancillary works (matters to be considered at this stage: access).

The committee **RECOMMENDS REFUSAL**, on the grounds that:

- a. the site of the proposed development does not meet the grey belt criteria outlined in the national policy framework, and in particular the site strongly fulfils purposes A and B of the green belt:
 - i. Purpose A: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; in particular the sprawl of Burnham, which itself forms part of a larger developed area, into the countryside. We particularly note that the apparently regular shape of the overall site is misleading given where the proposed housing will be, which forms a more irregular and sprawling development pattern.
 - ii. Purpose B: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. Burnham itself, whilst its identity is of a large village, is the size of a town, and forms part of a larger developed area along with Slough. The site therefore prevents the significant closure of the gap between Burnham/Slough and Maidenhead, and its development would damage that purpose.
- b. The proposed site does not meet the test of being 'not inappropriate' as outlined in planning policy, with respect to sustainability. In particular the application does not do enough to establish or support sufficient good public transport links, walking routes, public rights of way etc, or sustainable links from the site to the existing settlement and village centre (this point is referenced further under d below). Furthermore, two specific pedestrian access proposals are inappropriate:
 - i. The pedestrian access to the Bishop's Centre is dangerous, with no appropriate footpath under the railway bridge.
 - ii. Footpath 56 emerges onto Hitcham Road at a dangerous and inappropriate point, and the increased volume of use of the path and access is therefore dangerous.

We also note that much of the site is not within a 15-minute walk of Taplow Station, further affecting its sustainability.

Signed:

Date:

c. The proposed site further does not meet the test of being 'not inappropriate' as outlined in planning policy with respect to the 'golden rules' regarding infrastructure. It does not have, or deliver, sufficient local and national infrastructure; specifically:

i. adequate healthcare provision, particularly given that healthcare in Burnham is already under sufficient strain and there is no viable plan to accommodate the additional demand. The statistics in the 'socioeconomics and human health' report which appear to show significant spare healthcare capacity are misleading; and the provision of space on site that 'could be used' for this function is insufficient;

ii. adequate secondary school provision, particularly given the lack of a local non-selective secondary school;

iii. adequate water supply, drainage and sewerage (this point is covered further under conditions below);

iv. roads with enough capacity to safely support the significant additional traffic that would be generated by the site. These issues are addressed further under point e below.

We note that this lack of infrastructure is referred to in the statement of community involvement, and this point was highlighted by a large number of respondents particularly with regard to education and health.

d. The proposals are not shaped by the functions and layout of the existing village of Burnham, which retains a separate rural identity despite its close proximity to Slough. The proposed links from the site to the existing settlement of Burnham, and in particular to the village centre, remain insufficient, meaning that the application would not function as an integrated part of Burnham Village, enhance the functions and identity of Burnham, or support the vitality of the High Street or its multifunctional role as a village centre with multifunctional green infrastructure links. These objectives are driven by several national policy provisions (§83, §90, §96, §98, §100, §105, §109, §110, §115, §117, §118, §135), and the Burnham Neighbourhood Plan and design code content.

e. The access proposals are inadequate and dangerous. In particular:

i. The exit onto Bingham Road and through to Eastfield Road will cause significant congestion and be dangerous for pedestrian safety. We note that a school bus stops on the corner of Bingham Road and Eastfield Road. There will be further knock-on impact on pedestrian safety and congestion at the junction of Eastfield Road and Hitcham Road, and on to Byways which will also see a significant increase in traffic.

ii. The access points to the site from Lent Rise Road will exacerbate existing significant traffic and safety issues in an already congested area with a significant accident history.

iii. The entrance to the car park at the SANG is dangerous, being on an S bend and at a planned pedestrian crossing point in an area with a significant accident history.

2. We request Buckinghamshire Council to also check to confirm whether:

Signed:

Date:

a. the application meets the technical standards and policies outlined in the Burnham Neighbourhood Plan in full, in particular policies BUR1 (Design Code); BUR2 (Green and Blue Infrastructure); BUR 4 (Urban Greening) achieving a Burnham Urban Greening Factor of at least 0.4; BUR5 (Sustainable Travel); and BUR8 (Addressing the Sustainability Performance Gap); AND,

b. all the technical documents, which the Parish Council is not qualified to assess, are in order; including confirming whether the proposed changes to highways arrangements offsite are appropriate, necessary and safe, particularly those in Lent Rise Road. We request that this is assessed via a full on-site assessment, not a desktop study, and believe that the surveys carried out by the applicant do not capture the full complexity of the traffic situation at the busiest hours.

3. Should Buckinghamshire Council be minded, against our recommendation, to approve the application, or should it be approved through another process, we request the imposition of 'Grampian conditions' to require that:

a. development cannot commence until adequate arrangements for water supply, drainage and sewerage, to be defined on the advice of appropriately qualified technical specialists, are in place;

b. development cannot commence until any required improvements have been made to the road network, to be defined on the advice of appropriately qualified technical specialists, to ensure that there is enough capacity to safely support the significant additional traffic that would be generated by the site.

4. Furthermore, should Buckinghamshire Council be minded, against our recommendation, to approve the application, or should it be approved through another process, the Parish Council requests that it be made a formal party to any Section 106 discussions. The Parish also states its potential interest in taking over management of some aspects of the development such as play areas on behalf of the community.

5. We request that the application be 'called-in' to the appropriate Buckinghamshire Council Committee to allow for a full and public discussion; due to the size and significance of the site, the complexity of the application, and the level of public interest.

The Council does recognise that the applicant has engaged with the Parish Council and has made some improvements during the process; and further recognises that the application has made reference to the design code and other policies in the Burnham Neighbourhood Development Plan, and has endeavoured to incorporate appropriate community spaces.

The Clerk and Members of the public left the meeting.

One Member of the public remained in the meeting.

Signed:

Date:

PL/26/05234/VRC - 14 Linkswood Road Burnham Buckinghamshire SL1 8AT
Variation of conditions 2 (Materials) and 6 (Approved plans) and removal of condition 3 (Landscaping) of planning permission ref: PL/25/0469/FA (Erection of part two-storey, part single storey side/rear extension, internal remodelling works, installation of automated electric gates and new front boundary wall) to allow for changes to external materials and windows and doors, front porch extension, installation of obscurely-glazed ground floor side window and ground floor rear window, installation of 5 no. air-con units on external side walls, loft conversion into habitable accommodation with front and rear rooflights, removal of chimney stack, installation of solar panels on side and rear roof slopes and installation of electric pedestrian gate (retrospective).
The committee **RESOLVED** to state that they had **NO OBJECTIONS**.

PL/26/04547/FA - 69 Nursery Road Burnham Buckinghamshire SL6 0JR
Proposed dropped kerb, removal of low-level boundary wall and 1.8m high brick wall and extension of permeable driveway together with the extension of 1.8m high boundary brick wall.
The committee **RESOLVED TO OBJECT** to the proposed boundary wall and the 1.8-metre-high brick wall positioned in front of the boundary line. The committee felt that the new wall shall extend from the existing (rear) wall to the front entrance/porch, and shall obscure the view of incoming traffic from Lent Rise Road entering Nursery Road. The view of Fern Drive (on the right-hand side) for traffic shall be partially obscured by the wall. Equally the view of incoming traffic from Fern Drive shall also be partially obscured for traffic entering into Nursery Road. The wall shall be high and potentially dangerous for traffic on the corner plot.

PL/26/04687/FA - First Floor 57-61 High Street, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 7JX
Change of use of first floor offices/storage areas to 3 flats and fitting of two new domestic kitchens/kitchenettes
The Committee **RESOLVED to OBJECT** to the proposed three flats. The Committee felt that the proposal would result in too high a density and that it would be more suitable to provide two flats rather than three.

PL/26/04688/HB - First Floor 57-61 High Street, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 7JX
Listed building consent for change of use of first floor offices/storage areas to 3 flats and fitting of two new domestic kitchens/kitchenettes.
The Committee **RESOLVED to OBJECT** to the proposed three flats. The Committee felt that the proposal would result in too high a density and that it would be more suitable to provide two flats rather than three.

PL/26/05364/FA - 20 Linkswood Road, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 8AT
Construction of a ground floor front extension & a first floor rear extension, partial conversion of existing garage, alterations to the existing roof structure and alterations to the fenestration.
The committee **RESOLVED** to state that they had **NO OBJECTIONS**.

Signed:

Date:

PL/26/05444/HB – Meadowsweet, 16 Church Walk, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 7AR

Listed building consent for the conservation-led repair and reroofing of the existing roof covering.

The committee **RESOLVED** to state that they had **NO OBJECTIONS**.

PL/26/05558/FA - The Orchards 3 Lent Green, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 7AT
Householder application for proposed first floor rear extension over existing ground floor extension.

The committee **RESOLVED** to state that they had **NO OBJECTIONS**.

PL/26/05569/FA - 1 Evelyn Gardens, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL6 0FG
Change of use of dwellinghouse (Class C3) to three child residential children's care home with non-resident carers (Class C2)

The committee **RESOLVED TO OBJECT** to the proposed three child residential children's care home. The committee felt that the proposed development is overdevelopment and high density that would generate a significant increase in traffic. The committee also stated that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and raised concerns regarding parking provision and highway safety.

P2627/33 Enforcement Updates

1. The committee **RESOLVED** to **APPROVE** the letter regarding Planning Application: PL/26/04919/FA 33 Coalman's Way for submission to Buckinghamshire Council.
2. The committee **NOTED** the appeal decision relating to Planning Application: PL/24/3673/SA - 38 Tockley Road, Burnham, Buckinghamshire, SL1 7DH.

P2627/18 Area Planning Meetings and Strategic Planning Meetings

The Committee **NOTED** the meeting dates.

Meeting Closed at 6:10pm

Signed:

Date: