

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**HELD ON MONDAY 2<sup>ND</sup> AUGUST 2004 at 8.50pm following the Full Council meeting**

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

Also Attending: Cllr. H. Cadd  
D. Isham

For the Town Clerk Mrs K.W.McElligott

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received and accepted from Councillor G. Loftus.

**4677 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest

**4678 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING & MATTERS ARISING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> July and ratified at the earlier Council meeting were received.

**4676.2 Vodaphone mast**

A further report from the residents indicates that the mast is too close to the house; Members considered that both the Planning Department and the installers should have been aware of this. The complainants ought to receive compensation for their distress and loss of service. The Planning Department would be contacted to find out why the proposed position of the mast, within the legal distance from a dwelling, was not queried.

**ACTION THE CLERK**

**4675.3 Buckingham Buildbase**

Members were informed that the 28day period had ended without cessation of the storage activity or a planning application being notified. As this was the third enforcement action placed on Buildbase without result, Members felt the matter should be drawn to the attention of the Chief Executive of AVDC.

**ACTION THE CLERK**

#### **4679 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The following planning applications were received and discussed. –

**04/01849/APP** **SUPPORT**

61 Aris Way  
Conversion of garage into habitable room

**04/01850/APP** **SUPPORT**

14 Coots Close  
Single storey side extension

**04/01909/APP** **OPPOSE**

33 Moreton Road  
Two storey side, single storey side and rear extensions and single storey front extension to form porch  
*Members felt that the proposal was an overdevelopment of the site, and introduced a two-storey element in a single-storey environment.*

**04/01947/APP** **OPPOSE**

12 Robin Close  
Two storey front and single storey rear extension  
*Members would have preferred the front and rear extensions to have been separate applications; there was no objection to the rear extension. However, even though it projected less far forward than in the previous application, the front extension was felt to disturb the rhythm of the evenly stepped street frontage and no indication had been received that the clause in the deeds prohibiting a structure forward of the building had been waived.*

**04/01973/APP** **SUPPORT**

96 Moreton Road  
Removal of porch and two storey rear extension and conservatory – amendment to 03/01283/APP

*The following application from the supplementary agenda was taken next:*

**04/01506/APP** (amended plans) **SUPPORT**

2 Edmonds Close  
Two storey and single storey front extension  
*Members felt that the amendments satisfied their criticisms of the original proposal.*

#### **4680 PLANNING CONTROL**

The following planning decision was received from Buckinghamshire County Council:

##### **APPROVED**

CC/43/04 Bourton Meadow Comb. Sch. New reception classroom and ass. facilities Support  
(04/01533/ACC)

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

**APPROVED**

04/01346/APP 23 Gawcott Road	Part 2 st., part single storey extension	Support
04/01377/APP 45 Moreton Road	Demol. conservatory & erect single st.conservatory	Support
04/01378/ALB 45 Moreton Road	Demol. conservatory & erect single st.conservatory	Support
04/01379/ALB 3 Manor Street	Demolition of outbuilding	Support
04/01402/APP 25 Nelson Street	Single storey rear extension	Support
04/01411/APP 5 Sandy Close	Rear conservatory	
04/01429/APP Superchips, Homestall	Ch.use from public to private landscaped area	
	Oppose	
04/01440/AAD Tesco, London Road	Erection 10 doublesided directional signs	Support
04/01556/ACD 3 Manor Street	Demolition of outbuilding	Support

**REFUSED**

03/03227/APP 12-18 Stratford Road	Conv. & extn. to former cottages to form 3no. dwellings & erect 2no. semi-detached dwellings with parking	Support
-----------------------------------	---	---------

**DEFERRED**

03/03224/APP 12-18 Stratford Road	Conv. & extn. to former cottages to form 3no. dwellings & erect 2no. semi-detached dwellings	Oppose
-----------------------------------	--	--------

*Reason for deferral: Seek additional parking*

**WITHDRAWN**

04/01441/APP81 Fishers Field	Conv. garage to studio & erect rear conservatory & first floor balcony	
------------------------------	--	--

**REPORTS TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

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

04/01506/APP2 Edmonds Close Two storey and single storey front extension

**4681 PLANNING - OTHER MATTERS**

4681.1 (4674.1) Reports on the GOSE Public Consultation document: Proposed changes to RPG9 – Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy & Tourism and Related Sport and Recreation

The Chairman reported on the main points of the Energy section of the document and Members then discussed the specific policy points.

*INF4: Development design for Energy Efficiency & Renewable Energy.*

Applicants should be encouraged to incorporate energy efficiency into their plans.

*INF5: Combined Heat and Power.*

This should be encouraged wherever possible, although it would clearly work best in housing adjacent to industrial sites.

*INF6: Regional Renewable Energy Targets.*

Members were unable to gauge how realistic the stated targets might be.

*INF7: Sub-Regional Targets*

The north of the county was less suitable for wind generated energy than the south, but previously coppiced areas could be re-planted and new ones introduced; on suitable sites this could have additional benefits connected with flood relief.

Members felt that there should be a national policy formula weighing the environmental impact of schemes, which could then be modified at regional and district level to suit particular circumstances.

*INF8: Location of Renewable Energy Development.*

Industrial areas were suggested as suitable locations for plant in addition to the brownfield land and transport corridors in the document. Again, Members thought that a formula needed to be in place to properly consider the pros and cons of sites.

*INF9: Development Criteria.*

Members agreed with criteria, particularly the proximity principle.

Cllr. Mordue felt that much of the Tourism and Sport section was not relevant to this area, being concerned with the coast; however it was recognised that rural areas could also develop tourist facilities e.g. by providing hotel accommodation for adjacent tourist 'hotspots' such as Oxford. A more positive attitude towards tourism should be encouraged at Local Authority level; similarly local councils should play a bigger part in providing sports facilities.

Members discussed these points, pointing out that tourism encouraged trade and Buckingham was well placed amidst various tourist sites, although there was less publicity for nature reserves and similar facilities than for historical sites and buildings. The proposed changes were supported, but comment deferred until the District Plan was available. Meanwhile the Council could consider how else to promote the tourism potential of the town.

#### **ACTION EVENTS COMMITTEE**

##### 4681.2 To discuss a process for commenting on Minor Amended plans

'Minor Amended' plans were supplied to the Council for information only; if the amendment had addressed the concerns of Members which had led to an OPPOSE response, there was no mechanism to withdraw the opposition to save the application being taken to Development Control unnecessarily. The alternative was to designate the changes as 'Amended Plans' which necessitated a repeat of the planning timetable and hence further delay of the decision.

Members discussed various options, but decided that the Planning Authority needed to define 'Minor' amendment; design details were minor, construction changes were not. Members decided that they wished to see again any amendments to plans initially opposed.

#### **4682 CORRESPONDENCE**

##### 4682.1 04/01706/ALB 9 Bristle Hill: Further information from the Planning Officer

Members had criticised the information supplied with the application and the incorrect suffix (APP for ALB); the officer had supplied clearer pictures of the staircase and apologised for the errors. An apology had also been received from the Area Planning Officer.

##### 4682.2 03/03227/APP: AVDC reasons for decision contrary to BTC response

Members responses to the two applications for this site were:

**OPPOSE** 03/03224/APP: Conversion and extension to former cottages to form 3no. dwellings and erection of 2no. semidetached dwellings *Members felt that the position of*

*the semi-detached dwellings impaired the vision of drivers emerging from Mary McManus Drive, and that their side-placed doorways did not reflect the pattern of the street scene. There was also no parking provision.*

**SUPPORT** 03/03227/APP: Conversion and extension to former cottages to form 3no. dwellings and erection of 2no. semidetached dwellings with associated parking  
*Members were pleased to see the renovation of the existing buildings with a sensitive design in matching materials for the new block. However the exit from the garages remained dangerous. Members voted to support 6:2.*

AVDC had given reasons as follows: (03/03227/APP – Permission refused)

“Whilst the renovation and extension of the existing cottages was in principle considered to be acceptable, Members agreed that the design of the proposed new build would have failed to preserve the appearance of the adjacent Conservation Area and it would have adversely affected the setting of the adjacent cottages which contribute significantly to the Conservation Area. The bulk and scale of the proposed three-storey building would overwhelm the existing cottages and would appear intrusive in the Conservation Area. Whilst part of the existing terrace is three-storey in height, this is more modest in scale and not comparable to the proposed development. Furthermore, although there was benefit in providing on-site parking, there was concern regarding the retention of the turning area for its purpose and the ability of vehicles to access the highway safely (a similar point was made by the Town Council). The development was therefore considered to be contrary to Local Plan policy.

For your information, the other application on this site for the conversion and extension of the former cottages to form 3no. dwellings and the erection of 2no. semi-detached dwellings (ref:03/03227/APP) [*sic*] was supported by Members as being a scheme which would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and which would have due regard to the existing cottages. This application was deferred to allow discussions to proceed regarding the provision of parking off Mary McManus Drive.”

#### **4683 CHAIRMAN’S ITEMS**

##### 4683.1 Emergency Access to the Heartland

Alterations to the road levels where the emergency access met Bridge Street meant that surface water was draining into the forecourt drain at Ganderton’s garage; heavy rain could cause this to overflow leading to possible contamination of the fuel tanks and subsequent environmental damage. The District Council would be asked to look into the matter of the drainage.

##### 4683.2 Hollis’s garage

Complaints about the derelict workshop would be made to the Environmental Health department.

##### 4683.3 Trees, river bank

The damage to the trees on the riverbank caused by Buckingham Buildbase’s bonfires had already been reported to the Tree Officer and Environmental Health Officer who had indicated that they would be contacting the Environment Agency about the possible contamination of the river by the ash residue. The trees were not Protected.

Meeting closed at: 9.55pm

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