

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**HELD ON MONDAY 26<sup>th</sup> APRIL 2004 at 7.05pm.**

**PRESENT:** Councillors J. Barnett  
Mrs P Desorgher  
R C Lehmann  
G P Loftus  
H Mordue  
Mrs P Stevens (Chairman)  
P. Strain-Clark  
R Stuchbury (Mayor)

Also attending: Cllrs. H. Cadd  
D. Isham

For the Town Clerk Mrs K.W.McElligott

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

**4641 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest at this point.

**4642 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> April 2004, due to be ratified on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2004, were received and accepted.

**4643 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The following planning applications were received and discussed. –

**04/00746/APP**

**SUPPORT**

7 Pitchford Avenue

Rear conservatory

*Members noted that the proposed depth of the extension is 6.8m, in excess of the 3.6m guideline for detached houses given in Design Guide 3, although the 45° rule is adhered to.*

**04/00748/APP**

**SUPPORT**

1 Benthill Cottages

Conservatory

- 04/00855/APP** **SUPPORT**  
 10 Gifford Place  
 Front and rear single storey extension
- 04/00857/APP** **SUPPORT**  
 Rear of 3 West Street  
 Renewal of 02/00683/APP – change of use to alcohol-free bar
- 04/00858/APP** **SUPPORT**  
 10 Adams Close  
 Rear dormer window for loft conversion
- 04/00871/ALB** **SUPPORT**  
 59 Nelson Street  
 Relocation of bathroom  
*Support was given subject to the Historic Buildings Officer's report.*
- 04/00869/APP** **SUPPORT**  
 8 Middlefield Close  
 First floor extension
- 04/00872/APP** **OPPOSE**  
 24 Page Hill Avenue  
 Two storey side extension  
*Members felt that the proposed extension was over-large, giving the impression that the original was subsidiary to the extension, and was too close to the property boundary; Members objected on the grounds of overdevelopment and effect on the street scene.*
- 04/00907/APP** **OPPOSE**  
 25 Moreton Drive  
 Part first floor and ground floor side extension  
*Members noted that the depth of the proposed extension, 5.0m, was in excess of guidelines and that the total increase of area over both floors was 44%; that the first floor extension filled in the aspect viewed from Highlands Road as well as from Moreton Drive, and objected on the grounds of over-development and effect on the street scene.*
- 04/00909/APP** **OPPOSE**  
 31 Western Avenue  
 Two storey side and front extension  
*The increase in floor area over both stories was calculated at 47%, and although the lines of the extension were 'subsidiary' the effect was of an additional block of house unbalancing the effect of the group and inappropriate to the area. Members objected on the grounds of over-development and effect on the street scene.*

**04/00940/APP** **SUPPORT**  
48 Meadow Gardens  
Conservatory

**04/00954/APP** **SUPPORT**  
44 Aris Way  
Insertion of dormer windows to front and rear elevation of garage to create additional accommodation at first floor level

*The plans for the following application had not been received*

**04/00972/APP**  
1 Glynswood Road  
Single storey front and single storey rear extension

**04/00998/ALB** **SUPPORT**  
6 Castle Street  
Internal alterations and repairs  
*Support was given subject to the Historic Buildings Officer's report.*

**04/01009/ATP** **SUPPORT**  
4 Bostock Court  
Pollard one willow tree  
*Support was given subject to the arboriculturalist's report*

*The following minor amended plans were posted for Member's information:*

**04/00323/APP** 29 Overn Avenue 2-st.side ext'n & rear conservatory & loft conversion  
*Minor amendments show proposed extension roof to be subsidiary to existing and related alterations.*

#### **4644 PLANNING CONTROL**

The following planning decisions were received from Aylesbury Vale District Council;

#### **APPROVED**

03/02703/APP	19 Kestrel Way Single st.front & rear extns & alts to access	Support
04/00180/APP	Braeside,Lenboro'Rd. Conservatory to rear	Support
04/00199/APP	6 Kestrel WayPart 2st. & part 1 <sup>st</sup> floor extension	Support
04/00252/APP	6 Portfield Way Single storey side and rear extension	Oppose
04/00253/ALB	Buckingham Lodge Restoration works & decoration	Support

#### **REFUSED**

03/02863/APP	Stowefield,Stowe Ave. Erection of one detached dwelling	Support
04/00173/ALB	3 Manor Street Demol. brick outbuilding + conversion & alteration to basement	Support

#### **APPEAL LODGED**

03/02863/APP Stowefield,Stowe Ave. Erection of one detached dwelling  
(BTC supported)

## **REPORTS TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

Reports on the following applications have been received and are available in the office

03/02863/APP Stowfield, Stowe Ave. Reasons for the basis of AVDC's statement in the appeal.

04/00425/APP 53 Deerfield Close Two storey and part first floor side extension

### **SITE VISITS**

03/02897/APP Pine Lodge, Avenue Rd. Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of 4 dwellings

03/03202/APP Land between Brookfield Lane and Chandos Rd. Demol. Grenville Cottage + erect. block of 9 flats, terrace of 4 dwellings, 4 detached dwellings & 2 semi-det. dwellings

## **4645 PLANNING - OTHER MATTERS**

### Proposed alterations to Regional Planning Guidance, SE Regional Mineral Strategy

Cllr. Strain-Clark circulated copies of his summary of the proposals in this document at the meeting, explaining that we had already commented on the County guidance; the County strategy would have to comply with this Regional Guidance.

Members discussed the summary, expressing concern at the possibility of mineral recycling sites being permitted in green belt land or National Parks, and asked that the Council's response include a request that SSSIs be excluded from this proposal.

Members also wished the response to recommend that dredging for marine aggregates not be permitted unless it could be shown that no long-term damage would ensue, particularly with respect to coastal erosion.

Cllr. Strain-Clark was thanked by the Chairman for his work on this report.

## **4646 CORRESPONDENCE**

### 4646.1 Reasons for AVDC decision contrary to BTC response: 04/00199/APP, 6 Kestrel Way Part two storey and part first floor extension

BTC response: *Members expressed concern that the extension was not clearly subsidiary to the existing building, and thus affected the street scene, giving the appearance of a terrace block.*

AVDC: "It was acknowledged in the report that was presented to the Committee that the proposed extension would not be set down from the roofline or back from the front elevation of the main dwelling. However the proposals would replicate the existing gable end to the southern side of the front elevation, thus creating a dwelling that would be symmetrical in its appearance. The setting down or back of the proposed extension would not compliment this and would lead to the proposals being overly fussy in their appearance. Therefore in this instance, it was considered that the setting down and back of the proposed extension would not be appropriate as it would detract from the overall aim of the design.

With regard to the street scene and appearance of a terraced block, it was considered that the proposals would accord with the advice set out in the Design Guide on Residential Extensions in that the proposed extension would be set in 1m from the shared boundary at first floor level. The existing garage extends up to the shared boundary but as the proposals would be set in 1m at first floor level, a gap would remain between this dwelling and the neighbouring property. As such it was considered that the proposals would not create a terraced block. The proposals would also not have an adverse affect upon the street scene as although the surrounding properties are of a similar appearance, they all vary in detailing and scale. It was therefore considered that the extension of this dwelling would not detract from the street scene or other properties in the locality.”

4646.2 Reasons for AVDC decision contrary to BTC response: 04/00252/APP, 6 Portfield Way Single storey side and rear extension

*BTC response: Members criticised the piecemeal design of the extension and the pitched roof with the ridge at right angles to the road, which was at variance with the general street scene. Overall the extension to the footprint of the property seemed excessive.*

AVDC: “It was considered that although the proposal would come forward of the face of the main dwelling it would not project beyond the front of the porch and would remain set back from the adjacent garage. Being at single storey it was not considered that the garage would be dominant in the street scene and would not result in a terracing effect especially as the roof would be hipped and only 1.5m higher to the ridge than the adjoining flat roofed garage. There would also be a gap between the main dwelling and the roof of then proposal.”

**4647 CHAIRMAN’S ITEMS**

4647.1 03/03202/APP Land between Brookfield Lane and Chandos Rd.

Cllr. Strain-Clark reported on the meeting of Development Control on 22<sup>nd</sup> April 2004 which had considered this application, subsequent to the site visit on Monday 5<sup>th</sup> April 2004 attended by AVDC and BCC Highways’ representatives.

The motion before the Committee had included a reduced amount of housing, additional landscaping and a change to the line of the road; an amendment proposed adopting the Officers’ recommendations (for approval). The amendment was passed 3:2 and became the substantive motion; this was voted in 4:2.

There were two principal concerns:

1. Several Councillors had declared an interest and abstained; Cllr. Isham had withdrawn from the meeting and taken no part in the discussions. However there was concern that a Councillor who had declared an interest at the time of the previous application for this site, had not done so this time and had taken part and voted.
2. It was also felt that, if several years ago the traffic situation in Chandos Road was bad enough to merit a Developer Contribution to pay for traffic

calming, the BCC Highways response that there would be 'no problems' generated by the proposed development was inconsistent.

*Cllr. Stuchbury wished it noted that he had previously declared a personal interest in this application and this still held.*

Members discussed these two concerns, and decided that a direct report of the facts of the matter was required before action could be taken. The minutes of the meeting should be obtained.

**ACTION THE CLERK**

It had also been reported that the amount of the payment for the land depended on the number of houses permitted, and this gave the School an interest in the outcome of the application.

*Proposed by Cllr. Stuchbury, seconded by Cllr. Strain-Clark, and AGREED that Standing Orders be suspended to allow Cllr. Cadd to answer questions.*

Cllr. Cadd stated that the behaviour of a particular Councillor could be referred to the Monitoring Officer, Ms. Joanna Swift.

He had also ascertained that the land was currently owned by the developer, although this not have been the case at the time of the previous application.

*Proposed by Cllr. Stevens, seconded by Cllr. Stuchbury, and AGREED that Standing Orders be reinstated.*

Members decided to put their concerns before the Monitoring Officer, and the County Council asked whether the price received for the land was dependent on the number of properties allowed to the developer, and in what sense they judged that the extra traffic generated 'no problems'. If the County Council gave an unsatisfactory reply then the matter should be referred to the County Councillor for further inquiry.

**ACTION THE CHAIRMAN**

4647.2 AVDC Design Awards 2004

This year's awards are for new or altered/extended residential property within the District completed within the last four years. Members were asked to review recent projects and bring suggestions to the next meeting

**ACTION ALL COUNCILLORS**

4647.3 Position of Chairman

The Chairman gave notice that, owing to pressure of work, she would be unable to bring appropriate diligence to the work of Committee Chairman and wished to stand down.

Meeting closed at: 8.10pm

CHAIRMAN ..... DATE .....