

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD ON MONDAY 17th MAY 2004 AT 7.05pm

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

Also Attending: Cllr. D. Isham

For the Town Clerk Mrs K.W.McElligott

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor P. Strain-Clark.

4648 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4649 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The following planning applications were received and discussed. –

04/00956/APP 13 Highlands Road Single storey rear extension and conversion of roof space to create additional living accommodation at first floor level	SUPPORT
04/00972/APP 1 Glynswood Road Single storey front and single storey rear extension	SUPPORT
04/01043/APP 46 Moorhen Way Single storey rear extension	SUPPORT
04/01060/ATP 1 Edge Hill Court Reduction in height of one oak	OPPOSE
04/01061/ATP 1 Page Hill Avenue Reduction in height of horse chestnut	OPPOSE

Members criticised the lack of correct procedure for these applications, which had taken the form of a copied letter from the applicants. A Memo from the AVDC Arboriculturalist to the Planning Officer and copied to the Town Council was circulated to Committee Members at the meeting which stated that the trees were part of Maids Moreton Avenue – i.e. AVDC's – and some distance from the applicant's property boundaries, and included recommendations as follows:

- Do not proceed with determination of the issue as a planning application
- Monitoring of the trees should continue, along with any works needed to control serious hazards or legal nuisance
- Decline to prune the trees further at this time

Cllr. Lehmann reported that problems with these trees had occurred 5 or 6 years ago while he was a District Councillor, and that these had been resolved by negotiation and the work done.

04/01103/APP

OPPOSE

14 Mare Leys

Two storey side extension and conservatory to rear

Members felt that the proposed extension was a considerable size and gave the impression of an additional house at the side, and opposed on the grounds of impact on the street scene and overdevelopment of the premises.

04/01161/APP

SUPPORT

Stratford

House, High Street

2metre high gate

The following minor amended plans were posted for members' information only:

04/00792/APP Manor Farm, Bourton Rd. Conversion of barn to offices

Amendment is to red edge on plan showing area affected and access to barn

4650 PLANNING CONTROL

PLANNING DECISIONS (COUNTY COUNCIL)

CC/26/04 Buckingham Youth Centre Erection of lift shaft and glazed lobby

Support

(04/00889/ACC)

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

APPROVED

04/00425/APP	53 Deerfield Close	Two storey and part first floor extension	Oppose
04/00441/AAD	Lunn Poly, 11 Cornwalls Cen.	Nonilluminated fascia and projecting signs	Support
04/00498/APP	8 Woodlands Crescent	Two storey side and single storey rear extn.	Support
04/00523/ALB	22 Well Street	Single storey rear extension	Support
04/00524/APP	22 Well Street	Single storey rear extension	Support
04/00534/APP	3 Brackley Road	Single storey rear extension	Support
04/00548/APP	Stratford House, High Street	Amendment to 03/02153/APP	Support
04/00564/ALB	W H Smiths, 16 Market Sq.	Conv.8 bedsits to 4 flats & 1 st floor porch	Support
04/00565/ALB	W H Smiths, 16 Market Sq.	Conv.8 bedsits to 4 flats & 1 st floor porch	Support
04/00579/AAD	Land at Mallard Drive	Advertisement hoarding	Support
04/00581/APP	26 Campbell Close	Single storey front infill extension	Support

04/00723/AAD Little Chef, Buck'm by-pass Illuminated signage for Travelodge Support
REFUSED

04/00469/APP Superchips, 2-18 Homestall Ch./use, Public Open Space to Private Use Oppose
DEFERRED

03/02897/APP Pine Lodge, Avenue Road Demol. existing bungalow and erection of 4 dwellings
Reason for deferral: Seek bat survey

03/03202/APPLand betw. Brookfield Lane & Chandos Road Demolition of Grenville Cottage etc.
Reason for deferral: Recommendation agreed and additional landscaping along access road

REPORTS TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

A report on the following application had been received and was available in the office

04/00611/APP20 Beech Close Single storey and double storey side extension

4651 PLANNING - OTHER MATTERS

4651.1 Application 04/01001/APP(Parish of Gawcott with Lenborough): Burrows Field, Radcliffe Road: Change of use of land for the siting of sixteen mobile homes and associated internal access together with the insertion of a klargester tank for waste.

The Town Council's views had been sought by AVDC as the site was close to our boundary. It appeared that the application was retrospective, as some installation had already taken place on the site.

Councillors decided that there were no planning reasons to oppose the application, but observed that retrospective applications were, by custom, "Noted".

4651.2(4647.2) To receive suggestions for entries in the AVDC Design Awards 2004.

Members discussed various recent residential developments in the town, and offered the following suggestions:

1. Pateman Close
2. Bernardines Way

Sandmartin Close was felt to be interesting architecturally but too massive for its situation and of impractical design internally. The housing/shop development in Embleton Way was not considered sufficiently outstanding, although it fitted well with its surroundings.

Councillors were asked to look at these developments for decision at the next meeting.

4651.3"Safer Places: The planning system and crime prevention" (ODPM, 2004)

The Town Clerk felt that this would be a useful book to have in the office for reference.

Proposed by Cllr. Stuchbury, seconded by Cllr. Lehmann, and **RECOMMENDED** that a copy of this publication be obtained for reference at a cost of £19.95 (Budget 4010).

4652 CORRESPONDENCE

4652.1 04/00425/APP: 53 Deerfield Close

AVDC reasons for decision contrary to BTC response

BTC response: "Members felt that the building would be more attractive if the extension were clearly subsidiary and that the additions as proposed were overdevelopment of the site and had a detrimental effect on the street scene."

AVDC: "It is the opinion of the Town Council that the proposal would be more attractive if the additions were subsidiary. It is acknowledged that the proposal is not set back or set down to the front. However the proposal has a lean to roof to the front elevation which will

provide a design break. The proposal would be above the garage which extends forward from the main house incorporating the entrance porch and providing continuity. The setting down and setting 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 the setting down and setting back of the proposed extension would not be appropriate as it would detract from the overall aim of the design. As such it is considered that the proposals would respect and be in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and setting.

The Town Council also commented that the additions as proposed were overdevelopment and would have a detrimental effect on the street scene. However the proposals would be in accordance with the advice set out in the Design Guide on Residential Extensions in that they would be set in 1m from the shared boundary at first floor level. The dwelling is set back in the corner of a close and is at an angle. It is not prominent within the street scene and it is considered that the extension would not therefore detract from the street scene or other properties in the locality.”

4652.2 (4639.2) AVDC: further information on developer contributions

The previous table of information received had overlain the column headed ‘Amount due £’ with the data in ‘Areas for Spend’. Members had asked for the amounts.

The new table listed Obligation, Timing and Comments, but no sums of money. AVDC will be asked to supply these.

ACTION THE CLERK

4652.3 AVDC Briefing Note on changes to the Enforcement function within Development Control.

Members felt that reorganisation had made little difference to the enforcement function and quoted the example of Buckingham Buildbase which remained in breach of the Order served in August 2003. The Enforcement Team Leader had informed the Clerk that AVDC were currently in discussion with Buildbase’s agent over either the cessation of the use of the unlicensed area of the Yard or the submission of an application to regularise it.

This was considered an unsatisfactory situation and the matter would be put before the Chief Executive.

ACTION THE CHAIRMAN

4653 CHAIRMAN’S ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

4653.1 Signage matters in the Town.

Cllr. Lehmann drew attention to several prominent signs which had appeared in the town, apparently without permission. These were

- Innternet sign on the New Inn, Bridge Street
- Buckingham Town FC sign on the New Inn, Bridge Street
- Whizzers, in Bridge Street (Clerk to check whether signage formed part of Change of Use application)
- Brown’s Hairdressers in Market Square/Verney Close – banner to front and large permanent sign to rear
- Mill House, Nelson Street – large permanent sign for Faulkners Letting Agents

The planning status of this signage would be queried.

ACTION THE CLERK

4653.2 Speed limits on the Bourton Road

It was noted that the 30mph roadmarkings had been installed on the Bourton Road.

4653.3 (4647.1) Concerns over decision on Grenville Cottage Site

Letters had been received as follows:

1. From Joyce Rance, Assistant Education Officer (Sites and Property), BCC, acknowledging receipt of ours and that the query had been passed to BCC Property Services for reply;
2. From S. Willison, Team Leader, Highway Development Control (North), BCC, stating that in their opinion the likely 13 traffic movements generated at peak times by the development were not a sustainable objection in highway terms;
3. From Joanna Swift, Monitoring Officer, AVDC, enclosing a section of the minutes of the Development Control meeting held on 22nd April 2004 at which a decision was made on this application which showed that Cllr. Rowlands had declared a personal interest as a Governor of the RLS. Councillors may decide for themselves whether a position held in another public body is likely to lead to a prejudicial conflict of interest; a school Governing Body is such a public body.

Members asked the Clerk to check whether the Code of Conduct made a distinction between “taking part” and “voting” in a meeting where an interest had been declared, and if appropriate to pursue the matter.

4653.4 (4645 & 4638.2) RPG9 : Proposed alterations to Waste & Minerals Strategies

Acknowledgement of the Town Council’s comments had been received, with a revised timetable for the Public Examination.

Meeting closed at: 8.05pm

CHAIRMAN DATE