

Minutes of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** meeting held on Monday 3rd July 2017 at 7.00pm in the Council Chamber, Town Council Offices, Cornwalls Meadow, Buckingham

Present:

Cllr. M. Cole	(Chairman)
Cllr. J. Harvey	
Cllr. P. Hirons	(Vice Chairman)
Cllr. D. Isham	
Cllr. A. Mahi	
Cllr. Mrs. L. O'Donoghue	
Cllr. Mrs. C. Strain-Clark	
Cllr. R. Stuchbury	(from agenda item 186.2/17)
Cllr. M. Try	

Also present: Mrs. C. Cumming (co-opted member)
Mrs. N. Stockill (Committee Clerk)

For the Town Clerk: Mrs. K. McElligott

182/17 Apologies for Absence

Members receive and accepted apologies from Cllrs. Smith and Bates and County Councillors Whyte and Clare.

183/17 Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations of any personal or prejudicial interest under consideration on this agenda in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 Sections 26-34 & Schedule 4.

Cllr. Mahi declared an interest in agenda item 6 (17/02112/AOP Land at Lace Hill) as a member of the Swan Practice Patients Group.

The Planning Clerk notified Members that the applicant of 17/01978/APP 1 Lace Lane, MK18 7RD (agenda item 2) was the proprietor of the nursery at Lace Hill Sports and Community Centre.

184/17 Minutes

To receive the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Monday 5th June 2017 ratified at the Full Council meeting held on 26th June 2017.

AGREED

185/17 Buckingham Neighbourhood Plan/Vale of Aylesbury Plan

To receive any update from the Town Clerk.
None

186/17 Action Reports

186.1/17 To receive action reports as per the attached list.

Cllr. Cole drew Members' attention to the continued lack of response from Carol Paternoster, Mark Shaw and the Street lighting Executive. Cllr. Isham suggested asking our District Councillors to chase response on our behalf. Members **AGREED** for the Planning Clerk to expedite. **ACTION PLANNING CLERK**

Franciscan Building – Cllr. Strain-Clark suggested seeking a preservation order on the poplar trees overlooking the Franciscan Playing Field. **AGREED**

ACTION PLANNING CLERK

186.2/17 (954/06) Response from BCC re Cycleway

Cllr. Mahi noted an absence of data recording the number of pedestrians using the Cyclepath.

Proposed by Cllr. Harvey, seconded by Cllr. O'Donoghue and **AGREED** for the Planning Clerk to contact Padbury Parish Council, suggesting a joint clean of the Cycleway to and from the respective boundaries. **ACTION PLANNING CLERK**

Proposed by Cllr. O'Donoghue, seconded by Cllr. Harvey and **AGREED** for the Planning Clerk to seeking confirmation from AVDC on the original specification for cleaning the Cyclepath and suggest a regular schedule of cleaning with a mechanical sweeper. **ACTION PLANNING CLERK**

Cllr Stuchbury entered the chamber at 19.15

186.3/17 (982/16) Cllr Stuchbury's motion: Minutes of AVDC meeting

Cllr. Stuchbury spoke to Members on the outcome of the AVDC meeting noting that an amendment to the original motion was carried. However, Cllr. Stuchbury felt the amendment was radically different from the substantive motion.

Proposed by Cllr. Stuchbury, seconded by Cllr. Harvey and unanimously **AGREED** for the Planning Clerk to write to the LGA, DCLG and NALC and assemble information on Government good practice surrounding Section 106 funding.

Proposed by Cllr. Harvey, seconded by Cllr. O'Donoghue and **AGREED** for the Planning Clerk to make a Freedom of Information request seeking the following details:

- How many Parish/Town Councils responded to the section 106 email of the 9th June 2017?
- How was it decided that Section 106 funding would only be allocated to sports and leisure facilities?
- Examples from the 1st January 2017 to date of when the Section 106 Officer had consulted with any Parish/Town Clerk in Aylesbury Vale – especially Buckingham Town Council.
- Evidence of how and when the Section 106 Officer has corresponded with AVALC – beyond email correspondence.

ACTION PLANNING CLERK

Members **AGREED** that all District Councillors receive a copy of the correspondence.

186.4/17 (982/16) Response from Olney Town Clerk: “Whenever a planning application is submitted that will require a S106 agreement, we are consulted on what is to be included, and given the opportunity to comment and suggest alternatives. It seems to work well here in Milton Keynes.” The attached MKC Draft Protocol, was circulated with the agenda.

Noted

Response from Brackley Town Clerk: “For the Major Applications in our area, we have a seat at the table and are signatories to the agreement. We have used a firm of London Solicitors to represent us, with the developers meeting their costs. On the largest site (100 houses) the developers are also meeting the cost of surveyors to represent us on the installation/landscaping of a new park, and on the building of a Community Hall.”

Noted

Cllr. Harvey led a discussion on the principles of Secure by Design and whether it should be adopted by Buckingham Town Council when considering future planning applications.

Proposed by Cllr. Harvey, seconded by Cllr. O'Donoghue and unanimously **AGREED** for the Planning Clerk to investigate the principles of Secure by Design and consider application against future plans that are submitted for consultation.

ACTION PLANNING CLERK

187/17 Planning Applications

For Member's information the next scheduled Development Management Committee meetings are **Friday** 21st July 2017 and **Thursday** 10th August, with SDMC meetings on **Thursday** 20th July and **Wednesday** 9th August 2017.

To consider planning applications received from AVDC and other applications

17/01968/APP

OPPOSE & ATTEND

The Villas, Stratford Road

In fill development between existing dwellings and above existing parking to provide new one bed apartment

Members saw no reason to change their views on this application; the parking was inadequate for 4 dwellings, and the under-arch bin space would not take 8 bins. There was no evidence of the 'feature bay window' in the drawings and there are no bays on the rear of the adjoining buildings to reference anyway; also the applicant persists in showing the street elevation bay window over the archway as matching those on Nos. 1 & 2 The Villas, though the decorative panel was replaced by PVC cladding (contrary to the drawings for 09/02070/APP). The approved garage (14/02882/APP) which is supposed to form the ground level of this infill building has never amounted to more than a single-skin wall with a doorway in it (also contrary to the approved drawings) and a heap of building debris.

The applicant also states that "the proposal will not affect daylight/sunlight to any neighbouring properties", which does not address the loss of the windows in the side elevations of Nos.3 & 4 The Villas.

The purpose of the collection of photos submitted was not entirely clear; all were in the town centre, not on the entrances to the town, and few could be considered 'infill' development.

17/01978/APP

OPPOSE & ATTEND

1 Lace Lane

Change of use from residential to Class D1 (day nursery)

The position of this site so close to the main entrance to the estate caused concern, and it was noted that the roads on this estate are not yet adopted. 15-18 babies implies 5-6 members of staff, and there is no indication of where they will park; the three parking bays opposite were all occupied when the site was visited before the meeting. This is a material change of use for a semi-detached dwelling, some distance from the school and community centre car parking, and parents with other children to deliver will all choose the same drop-off & pick-up times. Dropping a baby off takes longer than dropping off older children, and this will lead to congestion at the main road access during peak hours.

17/01985/APP

NO OBJECTIONS

National Westminster Bank, Market Hill

Remove existing NatWest signage brand signage, ATM and night safe. Infill existing ATM and Night Safe apertures with new stainless steel blanking plate

Members noted the necessity for the application, but felt that steel plates were inappropriate in the heart of the Conservation Area, and asked that some other material/texture be substituted.

17/02091/APP
1 Balwen
Single storey rear extension

NO OBJECTIONS

17/02103/APP
32 Moorhen Way
Extension to front porch

NO OBJECTIONS

17/02112/AOP
Land at Lace Hill [*Employment site*]

NO OBJECTIONS

Outline application with access, appearance, layout and scale to be considered for the erection of a health centre

Members noted this was an Outline Plan and asked that some changes be made before the detailed plans were finalised:

- *The site should be separated from the bypass by a berm and dense evergreen planting to keep the traffic noise down;*
- *Paths should be wide enough for mobility scooters or wheelchairs to pass*
- *A drop-off area should be provided at the main door;*
- *The spine road (Needlepin Way) should be completed before construction starts and left open for the benefit of existing residents to relieve pressure on the only other access to this large estate;*
- *There is no description of the proposed lighting of the building or car park*
- *When considering the Care Home application (17/01940/APP) Members asked whether the medical centre car park might be available for overflow parking for events/open days; they would like to have this discussed and an answer given.*
- *A number of other design details need to be addressed or clarified, and Members felt these were well described in the clerk's briefing note, and asked that it be attached to the response.*

17/02178/APP
131 Needlepin Way
New first floor window to side elevation

NO OBJECTIONS

Members noted the unapproved extension, and look forward to a formal application in the near future.

17/02206/APP
20 Hubbard Close

OPPOSE & ATTEND

Two storey side and single storey front extensions

Members noted the unaltered aspect of houses on this Close, with the stepped frontage, separation by garages and bow windows providing a unified street scene, and felt that the proposed flat front with patio doors was detrimental to this and the second storey infilling the space over the garage constituted overdevelopment of the plot.

The officer was also asked to check an alleged encroachment on the bridleway at the rear of the site.

The following two applications were considered together:

Wipac Group, London Road, MK18 1BH

17/02220/APP

SUPPORT

Proposed Storage/Warehouse facility to the rear of the existing building

17/02323/APP

SUPPORT

2 storey extension to existing offices and factory with associated external works to the existing car park

Members suggested that the construction of a footway in the verge, linking the new London Road crossing to the existing path at the corner by the access road roundabout would make a safe route for residents of the new estate at Lace Hill, and perhaps a pedestrian crossing at a safe distance inside the access road with new path on the northern side might encourage the use of the many bus services serving the site.

17/02256/AAD

NO OBJECTIONS

S. H. Harrold Ltd, 3 Bridge Street
Illuminated fascia sign (retrospective)

17/02266/ALB

NO OBJECTIONS

4 Nelson Street
Removal of cement render, restore underlying brickwork and replace with breathable lime render
Members expressed concern at the possible obstruction with scaffolding of the footway/ roadway on a difficult slope at the junction of School Lane with Nelson Street.

17/02354/APP

OPPOSE & ATTEND

Land adj. Verdun, Western Avenue
Erection of 4 dwellings and associated external works
Members remain concerned at the cramming of 4 dwellings on to this site, and feel it contravenes ¶6.9 of the Neighbourhood Plan: "The density of development should create a character that is appropriate to the site's context." which is of detached houses, well spaced. The site is also adjacent to the Conservation Area, and materials should be specified to reflect this, using the Vision & Design Statement SPG.
They also question whether the reversal of room designation on the southernmost one is necessary, leading as it does to access via a narrow (unlit?) passage to a door at the rear; Members could see no reason why the pattern of the other houses, with bedrooms upstairs, could not be followed, allowing a front door to match the other houses. Nor is there any explanation of why the three larger dwellings are not identical, with one having the cloakroom opening off the kitchen.
Members also noted that later in the agenda the LPA had refused permission for 17/00693/AOP for the primary reason that "The proposed development by virtue of its layout and siting will result in a cramped form of development which fails to respect the character and appearance of the area, will obscure views of the listed building to the detriment of its setting and will erode the historic character, appearance and integrity of the Conservation Area. The development will therefore conflict with policy GP35 and GP53 and Government guidance contained within the NPPF." and hoped that the same criteria would be applied to this site.

The following **Minor Amendments** had been received:

17/01428/APP

OPPOSE & ATTEND

4 Honeycomb Way
Two storey rear extension and loft conversion with dormer
Members had responded (15th May): Oppose & Attend
Members expressed concern that the very large second-floor balcony on the rear of a building on a corner plot would overlook neighbouring gardens both to the rear and to each side, and the two storey extension beneath it added considerable bulk to a mid-terrace property. The Clerk had asked the nature of the 'customers' mentioned in the D&A Statement, but no response from the officer had yet been received. Parking for the property appeared to be a car port (omitted from the ground-floor plan) with drive parking for one vehicle in front of it, and guidelines indicated space for three within the curtilage for a four-bedroom dwelling. The adjoining dwelling to the south, on the corner of

Honeycomb Way and Needlepin Way (the spine road for the estate), had no parking of its own and there was little space to accommodate extra vehicles.

Members opposed on the grounds of overdevelopment of the plot, overlooking of neighbours, parking provision. Some indication of the traffic volume to be expected from the 'customers' should also have been provided.

The applicant had supplied a parking layout, showing that three cars can be parked in the carport; and had reduced the large loft-level balcony to a Juliette-style ornamental railing to a french window.

Members felt that they needed information on the 'customers' referenced in the D&A Statement; what is the business, how many traffic movements might be generated and how long would they be parked? And should a change of use application for part of the dwelling be considered? The on-road parking bays were for the residents in the corner house beside the application site which had no within-curtilage parking, and visitors to all three in the block.

It was by no means clear why the handrail still extended over the width and length of the extension, when the balcony had been reduced to be almost flush with the housewall. Members would like to see this clarified before the drawings were listed in the decision notice, to avoid any possibility of overlooking the several neighbouring properties.

Without answers to these matters, Members declined to alter their original response of OPPOSE & ATTEND

16/02641/APP

Hamilton Precision Ltd, 10 Tingewick Road

Demolition of existing Class B2 warehouse and construction of 50 residential units with access and parking

Amended items: Revised Design & Access Statement and updated Design Evolution.

These were advised to BTC the day after notice of the 28th June SDMC meeting was received and were not addressed at the meeting (see below).

“Not for consultation”

17/02010/ATP

OPPOSE

Land between Brookfield Lane and Chandos Road

[Works to trees] reason for work is to prepare the site for development and to open up the landscape to improve the amenity space and future landscaping

Members would like to see a report from the Tree Officer on the extent of the works already carried out prior to a decision on the Discharge of Conditions (Tree Protection) application for 16/01413/APP and whether the felling had damaged any of the other trees listed in this application for additional works. It was also felt that a reputable tree surgeon would have known tree work including felling was not permitted in the nesting season, and should have ensured that a protective fence was installed to protect the remaining trees and Root Protection Areas.

188/17 Planning Decisions

To receive for information details of planning decisions made by AVDC as per 'Bulletin' and other decisions.

Approved

		BTC response	Officer recommⁿ
16/00917/APP	Old Police Station Conv. Police station into 5 flats	Oppose & attend*	-
16/01850/APP	University, Hunter St. Vinson Building	Oppose & attend	-
		<i>changed to Support following amendments</i>	
16/03373//AAD	The Kings Head PH Retention of new signage to pub	No comment	-
17/00672/APP	8 Martin Close Single storey rear extension	No objections	-
17/00999/APP	9 Cornwall Centre Ch/use florist → café	No objections	-

17/01373/ALB 6 Bourton Rd. Minor amendments to 16/02361/ALB Oppose & attend** -
* Parallel application 16/00918/ALB was approved in August 2016
**Members' response was "Members agreed to oppose pending the HBO's judgement on the revisions; if the HBO was satisfied and there were no further concerns, then Members would be minded to change their response to No Objections." The HBO was satisfied, but we were not advised so a formal change of response has not been recorded.

Refused

17/00693/AOP Behind 10 Market Sq. Erection of 5 dwellings No objections -
[Refusal dated 9th May but not available on the website until 20th June]

Withdrawn

17/00703/ATP 6 Watchcroft Drive Works to T395 Oak Oppose
[actually land to rear of 7 Pitchford Avenue]

189/17 Development Management Committee

189.1/17 Strategic Development Management (7th & 28th June 2017)

Notes on the 7th June meeting are appended; Min 116.1/17 refers.

The Planning Clerk spoke to Members on the meeting of the 7th June 2017 to consider the application for 1885 houses at Salden Chase and highlighted the following concerns raised:

- Attendees felt that such a large application was premature and should not be approved until Local Plans had been finalised.
- The only access routes onto site were from the A421 and an increase in traffic could cause both entrances to become congested.
- The density and population of the proposal was comparable to a standard Milton Keynes Grid Square and infrastructure should be completed in conjunction with the housing to ensuring existing schools and medical facilities are not flooded with the new housing growth.

The Planning Clerk reported that the majority of Councillors voted to Defer & Delegate with a view to approval if the s106 was agreed. Members thanked the Planning Clerk for attending on their behalf.

Cllr. Harvey made a verbal report to Members of his attendance at the SDMC meeting of the 28th June 2017 to object to the Winslow Rail Station planning application. Cllr. Harvey expressed concern that, in his opinion, all of the many valid objections were seemingly ignored by Committee Members.

Cllr. Cole and Cllr. Stuchbury reported on the Hamilton Precision application at the same meeting, which they attended as objectors, Cllr. Stuchbury as Ward Member. Cllr Cole expressed surprise to Members that Cllr Paternoster had asserted that AVDC were falling behind in their housing quota despite their approval of numerous housing developments, giving as examples Tingewick Road Triangle (450), Salden Chase (1885) and – at the same meeting - Stoke Mandeville (125), all in 2017.

189.2/17 Development Management (29th June 2017) *No Buckingham applications*

Cllr. Stuchbury left the Chamber at 21.20

190/17 Enforcement

190.1/17 To receive the May update – Buckingham cases only
Noted

190.2/17 To report any new breaches
Castle Street - Cllr. Harvey noted the new yellow lines were the wrong width for the conservation area. **ACTION PLANNING CLERK**
58 Nelson Street – Cllr. Bates had reported concerns about extensive work on this listed building. **ACTION PLANNING CLERK**

191/17 Lace Hill Employment/Health site
As all the expected applications have been received, Members were asked whether this standing item can be removed from future agendas.
AGREED ACTION COMMITTEE CLERK

192/17 Transport
192.1/17 To report any damaged superfluous and redundant signage in the town.
Cllr. Try reported a redundant sign on the right of Moreton Road – Cllr. Try to investigate further and pass any information to the Planning Clerk **CLLR. TRY**
The sign to Maids Moreton along Mill Lane is missing – Planning Clerk to investigate. **ACTION PLANNING CLERK**
192.2/17 To receive for information the report on the Freight Strategy Workshop held on 13th February and attended by Cllrs. Hirons and Smith.
Cllr. Hirons spoke to Members on the workshop of the 13th February 2017 and Members thanked Cllr. Hirons for attending.

193/17 Access
To report any access-related issues.
Cllr. Strain-Clark questioned when the proposed parent and child spaces would be in place. Town Clerk to feedback to Committee **ACTION TOWN CLERK**

194/17 Correspondence
194.1/17 To receive and discuss a proposal from Mr. Hudson, Head Teacher of the Royal Latin School, on a means of alleviating pupil parking on Chandos Road. A copy of the decision sheet for their (refused) application 12/00081/APP for car parking above the bus layby was circulated with the agenda for information.
Members discussed various funding streams that could be explored by the Royal Latin School, including the New Homes Bonus, Section 106 funding and the HS2 Community Fund.
Members **AGREED** for the Planning Clerk to respond to Mr Hudson with a list of potential funding streams and indicated if there were to be an application for section 106 contributions then Members would be minded to support.
ACTION PLANNING CLERK

195/17 News releases
None

196/17 Chairman's items for information
None

197/17 Date of the next meeting:
Monday 24th July 2017 following the Interim Council meeting.

Meeting closed at 21.47pm.

Chairman..... Date.....