

AMERSHAM TOWN COUNCIL

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF
THE PLANNING AND FOOTPATHS WORKING GROUP
HELD ON 17th November 2025

PRESENT: Councillor K Thornton (In the Chair)
Councillor D Pinkney
Councillor H Amarshi
Councillor A Vyas
Councillor J Wilkinson
Councillor S Woodhead

IN ATTENDANCE: Mr M Warren – Administration Officer
Councillor M Roberts
Councillor M Day
Councillor J Barnes
Mr S Catanach (Town Clerk)
Mrs L Richardson (Town Clerk)

62. APOLOGIES: Councillor J Allum
Councillor M Brady
Councillor J Brown

63. ABSENT NO APOLOGIES:
Councillor Joe Noaman (Chair)

64. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:
None

65. BUCKINGHAMSHIRE CHILTERN MATTERS:
There were no Buckinghamshire Chiltern Matters arising

66. PLANNING APPLICATIONS: LISTS DATED 24th, 31st October and 7th November
(Please see attached Appendix I)

67. LICENSES:
There were no licenses to discuss.

68. MATTERS FOR REPORT:
There were no matters for report.

The meeting closed at 9.50pm

..... Chairman

17th November 2025

Appendix I

PL/25/3658/TP	Blaauwklippen 3 Batchelors Way Amersham Buckinghamshire HP7 9AQ	T1 - Ash - Crown reduce 4 metres. T2 - Ash - Crown reduce by 4 metres. T3 - Cherry - Remove to ground level. (TPO/1986/013).	No comment (17/11/25)
PL/25/4745/KA	27 Whielden Street Amersham Buckinghamshire HP7 0HU	Apple (T1) - Winter Prune / thin by 20% (Amersham Old Town Conservation Area).	No comment (17/11/25)
PL/25/3800/FA	43 The Meadows Amersham Buckinghamshire HP7 9AR	4.6m dropped kerb	No Objection (17/11/25)
PL/25/3881/TP	Kylesku 75 Stanley Hill Amersham Buckinghamshire HP7 9HH	T1-T3 Sycamore - 3m reduction T4 Ash - 3m reduction	No comment (17/11/25)
PL/25/3961/FA	Syresham 44 Grimsdells Lane Amersham Buckinghamshire HP6 6HH	Front porch canopy, removal of existing side dormers and rooflights and replacement with 6 no. side dormers and fenestration alterations.	Recommend Refusal (17/11/25) Members felt that the proposed plans showed a contrived roof design. The additional dormer windows were considered to be imposing, overlooking the neighbouring properties, as well as being out of keeping in the vicinity.
PL/25/3762/FA	Unit 7 Corinium Industrial Estate Raans Road Amersham Buckinghamshire HP6 6JQ	Adaptions and extension to unit 7 increasing depth and height with change of use from B2/B8 to E(d) padel court, demolition of single storey office and erection of building containing 1 padel court (in place of the existing office)	Discussed (17/11/25) Members were not opposed to the proposed change of use to padel courts. However, as with the previous outline application they were concerned about the lack of parking in an area that already has parking issues. Concern was also voiced about the noise generated by

			the use as padel courts and Members would like to see this issue addressed if the planning application were to be approved.
PL/25/3550/FA	King George V House King George V Road Amersham Buckinghamshire HP6 5AW	Erection of Class E discount foodstore with associated car parking, landscaping, engineering and drainage works and new vehicular access	<p>Recommend Refusal (17/11/25)</p> <p>Members have requested that this application be called in for discussion at the Buckinghamshire Council Planning Committee.</p> <p>In the last couple of weeks Amersham Town Council has conducted a survey amongst local people. Of the 551 responses received, the vast majority of were opposed to the development of a Lidl food store on the King George V House site. Amersham Town Council's Planning Committee would like to call in this application, recommending refusal on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access and parking -we are particularly concerned that the planning HGV turning area is close to the entrance to the store and the parent and toddler parking bays. Insufficient weight has been given to the number of commuters, school children and infants who will be using Chiltern Avenue, Chiltern Lifestyle Centre and the cut-through across King George V Fields. 2. Impact on high street – in our survey 70.26% of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed with Lidl's assertion that the store would have little impact on existing high street businesses. Concerns included negative effects on independent shops, cafés, and existing supermarkets, as well as potential reductions in high street footfall. 3. Traffic and Parking- in our survey 37.17% strongly disagreed that the proposed

			<p>entrance on King George V Road would be appropriate. Many highlighted risks of congestion, safety issues, and parking pressures in an already busy area. We believe that King George V Road does not have capacity for the volume of traffic expected. Lidl's data on this does not account for the cut-through traffic from Hyrons Lane, over the bridge and Orchard lane. This will be used as a through route to access the new store and it is a pedestrian route for children and elderly; it is also single file traffic. Insufficient weight was also given to the fact that the nearby police station will require 24/7 access and the fact that Amersham health centre operates an out of hours on call doctor service.</p> <p>4. Impact on neighbouring properties- we would specifically like to highlight the risk of light pollution due to extended opening hours, noise pollution including from out of hours HGV deliveries. These issues are made more acute by the fact that there is sheltered housing for older people next to the site. In our survey 72.68% strongly disagreed or disagreed with Lidl's claim that the store would have limited impact on nearby residential areas. Issues raised included increased traffic, noise, pollution, and pedestrian safety concerns— particularly for children and older residents.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>5. Design and character- we do not feel the proposed design is in-keeping with the local area especially the massing on the King George V Road side. The lack of pitched roof is not in keeping with other brick tiled pitched roofs in the area. The lack of flowers and trees is not fitting in with the more sustainable and green design of the Chiltern Lifestyle Centre or the green space, King George V fields, opposite. In our survey 39.78% of respondents strongly disagreed that the proposed design fits the character and architecture of Amersham. The design was widely described as out of keeping with the town's historic and residential feel— likened to a “warehouse” or “box-like” structure.</p> <p>6. Ecology and environment- we note that the development will include the loss of 3 mature trees and 28 trees overall. We do not believe that the landscaping plan is sufficient and we have not seen clear evidence that Lidl plan to offset carbon emissions from the demolition of the existing buildings on the site nor is there a plan to recycle the building materials from the site. In our survey 34.94% of respondents strongly disagreed that the proposal respects environmental and sustainability considerations.</p> <p>7. Use of site- we note that the Local plan and core strategy, townscape study 2011 and numerous other policy documents allocate this site as a site for employment which</p>
--	--	--	---

does not include retail. Therefore, the presumption in favour of business, storage or distribution business use is in play in this application and Lidl would need to show that there is a need for another food store. We do not believe this to be true because by the time Lidl opens on this site there will be an Aldi, Tesco, Marks and Spencer's Food, Little Waitrose and Tesco Express all within walking distance of the site. Therefore, there is no justification for retail outside the core retail area. Previously this site was capable of supporting hundreds of jobs and yet Lidl's plans only account for 40 employed roles on this site and therefore this development also represents a loss of potential local employment opportunities. We also note that there is no evidence that Lidl have marketed the site as an office site and therefore they cannot assert that a change of use for this site is needed.

If the officer is still minded to recommend granting planning permission for this application despite the grounds raised above, we also respectfully ask the officer to consider adding conditions to the planning application including the following:

1. Condition of a post development review after 3 years.
2. S106 agreement contribution for road improvements e.g. pedestrian crossing, loss of parking on King George V Road, loss of disabled bays, 20mph limit around the area

			<p>to protect pedestrians and contributions towards filling potholes on roads set to see a tripling of traffic, according to Lidl's own data.</p> <p>3. Mixed usage of the site including affordable, high quality, sustainably built housing.</p> <p>We would also like to note that this application was all the more difficult to analyse due to the lack of portal access to key documents on the Buckinghamshire Council Planning Portal.</p>
PL/25/3817/CONDA	44 London Road West Amersham Buckinghamshire	Application for approval of details subject to condition 8 (lighting design) of planning approval PL/21/1309/FA	No objection (17/11/25)
PL/25/5020/KA	4 Forge End Amersham Buckinghamshire HP7 0JP	T1 - Laburnum - Reduce height by approx. 3m and sides by approx. 1.5m (Amersham Conservation Area).	No comment (17/11/25)

[illegible]

